

Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge

2015 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT



JUNE 2016





**Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge
Annual Performance Report
CFDA Number: 84.412**

Ohio

2015

Due: February 29, 2016

U.S. Department of Education
Washington, DC 20202
OMB Number: 1810-0713
Expiration Date: December 31, 2016

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0713. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 120 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Number 1810-0713. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., S.W., Room 3E320, Washington, DC 20202-6200.



Annual Performance Report Section List

General Information

Executive Summary

A(3) Successful State System

B(1) Developing and Adopting a Common, Statewide TQRIS

B(2) Promoting Participation in the TQRIS

B(3) Rating and Monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs

B(4) Promoting Access to High-Quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs

B(5) Validating the Effectiveness of the State TQRIS

C(1) Early Learning and Development Standards

C(2) Comprehensive Assessment Systems

C(3) Health Promotion

C(4) Engaging and Supporting Families

D(1) Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and Progression of Credentials

D(2) Supporting Early Childhood Educators in Improving their Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities.

E(1) Understanding the Status of Children's Learning and Development at Kindergarten Entry

E(2) Early Learning Data Systems

A(1) Background Data Tables



Performance Report: Cover Sheet

General Information

1. PR/Award#: S412A120028
2. Grantee Name Office of the Governor, State of Ohio
3. Grantee Address 77 South High Street'
City: Columbus'
State: Zip: 43215
4. Project Director Name: Wendy Grove'
Title: Director, Office of Early Learning and School Readiness'
Phone #: (614) 466-2096 Ext.: _____ Fax #: (614) 728-2338
Email: Wendy.Grove@education.ohio.gov

Reporting Period Information

5. Reporting Period: From: 01/01/2015 To: 12/31/2015

Indirect Cost Information

6. Indirect Costs

- a. Are you claiming indirect costs under this grant? Yes No
- b. If yes, do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s) approved by the Federal Government? Yes No
- c. If yes, provide the following information:

Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s): From: 07/01/2014 To: 06/30/2016

Approving Federal agency: ED HHS Other Specify other: _____

(Submit current indirect cost rate agreement with this report.)

Executive Summary

For the reporting year, please provide a summary of your State's (1) accomplishments, (2) lessons learned, (3) challenges, and (4) strategies you will implement to address those challenges.

Accomplishments

Ohio saw many accomplishments throughout the reporting year for Early Learning Challenge Grant. The state legislature put a requirement to participate in the state's tiered quality rating and improvement system into law, with time line benchmarks, to establish a sustainable system for the improvement of early care and development programs. The goals of the Early Learning Challenge Grant were met throughout Year Four for programs entering Step Up to Quality, programs being rated as high quality, and the number of children with needs being served in high quality settings. More than 3,200 programs are now enrolled into Step Up to Quality, and over 1,500 of these programs have been rated at the highest levels of quality, an impressive 50% increase since Year Three. Ohio also accomplished a record number of professional development opportunities (approximately 1,610); opportunities which were attended by over 19,600 early childhood professionals throughout the year. Other accomplishments included progress on grant activities around Family and Community Engagement, the Ohio Child Licensing and Quality System development, and the agreement between state agencies to create and share data for early childhood policy decisions.

Lessons Learned

One of the lessons learned through the reporting year included how much time and effort it takes to plan for sustainability. The state leadership team met frequently on the topic of sustainability and made progress, but the progress has been slower than anticipated. Another valuable lesson learned came in how the state responded to an ineffective vendor when the Ohio Child Licensing and Quality System came to a stand still. The state mobilized its leaders to discuss and plan for an alternative strategy, but it took more time and resources than planned to terminate the contract and restart the procurement process.

Challenges

Challenges Ohio faced during the reporting year included delays in the procurement processes related to certain activities. More specifically, one data system developer was terminated, forcing a rebid of the contract, resulting in a four month window where work was at a stand still. This delay challenged the leadership team in every way, including resource allocation to get to the decisions, facing the inevitable timeline delays, and planning for the possibility of a system which would not be ready by the time grant funds were exhausted. Another challenge came when the Validation Study Request for Proposals did not yield any fund-able options and had to be re-posted, resulting in another delay with potentially negative consequences.

Strategies to Address Challenges

Ohio has implemented numerous strategies to address the challenges faced during the past reporting year. To address the delays experienced with terminating the database vendor, the team investigated all its available state vendors for their ability to move the job forward in the time left on the grant. The eventual award winner is working within the limits of both time and money left on ELCG, with increased state allocated resources. To address the delay of re-posting the Validation Study, the leadership team reduced the number of research questions and simplified the research design to allow for results to be produced during Year Five. Sustainability planning has allowed the leadership team to discuss the whole system of early childhood in Ohio beyond the grant, planning beyond activities so that the infrastructure built with grant funds will continue growing and moving the goals forward.

Successful State Systems

Aligning and coordinating early learning and development across the State (Section A(3) of Application)

Governance Structure

Please provide any relevant information and updates related to the governance structure for the RTT-ELC State Plan (specifically, please include information on the organizational structure for managing the grant, and the governance-related roles and responsibilities of the Lead Agency, State Advisory Council, and Participating State Agencies).

The Ohio Department of Education is the lead agency for the Early Learning Challenge grant, working in close partnership with the Governor's Office and the Ohio Department of Job and Family Services. Early Learning Challenge grant leaders and key staff members at each agency meet biweekly to address any challenges, obstacles, successes and strategies for successful grant implementation.

Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge Grant Cross-Agency Leadership

The state of Ohio's Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge grant leadership and project management team meets monthly and include each participating state agency. Senior early childhood leaders from the Ohio Departments of Education, Job and Family Services, Health, Mental Health and Addiction Services, Developmental Disabilities, and the Governor's Office attend the monthly team meetings. The Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge grant fiscal officer from the Ohio Department of Education and technical assistance providers participate in the meetings as needed. The purpose of the monthly leadership meeting is to discuss governance, fiscal monitoring, communications and Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge grant project updates. These meetings provide a consistent report-out from participating state agencies on grant activities, documented in monthly meeting minutes, to maintain a record of recommendations and decisions. This meeting also provides the opportunity for the Departments of Education and Job and Family Services' grant leaders to report to their participating state agency partners any decisions or information learned during their monthly grant calls with project officers from the U.S. departments of Education and Health and Human Services.

Governor's Office Leadership

Senior staff members from Ohio Governor John Kasich's office have been actively engaged in the planning, implementation and decision-making related to the Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge grant reform agenda. The governor's early childhood officer provides direction, coordination and leadership to the participating state agencies regarding early learning and development priorities and goals. This position has lead responsibility for coordinating policy and administration related to early childhood across the multiple state agencies that fund or administer early childhood programs. Senior staff in the governor's office meet with the early childhood officer on a regular basis to ensure consistent coordination and communication about the grant. During this reporting year, grant leaders from the departments of Education and Job and Family Services met weekly with governor's office senior staff on the topic of early childhood care and education. The early childhood officer has organized and convened four project teams of external stakeholders and state agency representatives related to: (1) Standards and Assessments; (2) Professional Development; (3) Quality, Access and Financing; and (4) Family Support and Engagement. The project teams continued to meet during the reporting year as needed to provide recommendations, guidance and input on activities related to the grant.

State Advisory Council: Ohio's Early Childhood Advisory Council

Senior early childhood program leaders from the Ohio Departments of Education, Job and Family Services, Health, Mental Health and Addiction Services, Developmental Disabilities, and the Head Start Collaboration Office attend monthly meetings of Ohio's Early Childhood Advisory Council. Council members provide input on all major initiatives in the state and act as the advisory body for the Early Learning Challenge grant; Maternal, the Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting program; and the Early Childhood Coordinated Systems grant. The Early Childhood Advisory Council's membership

includes diverse and experienced professionals from the United Way, foundations, local early childhood initiatives, pediatricians' practices and early childhood advocacy organizations. The group has supported the design, rollout and professional development for the state's Early Learning and Development Standards; technology for the assessment system; and an early care and education needs assessment and workforce study. The group's input, feedback and assistance provide Early Learning Challenge grant leaders the ability to anticipate potential obstacles and implement solutions for grant-related challenges.

Stakeholder Involvement

Describe State progress in involving representatives from Participating Programs, Early Childhood Educators or their representatives, parents and families, including parents and families of Children with High Needs, and other key stakeholders in the implementation of the activities carried out under the grant.

Input on the Early Childhood Comprehensive Assessment System

Ohio continues to seek ongoing stakeholder input regarding the design and implementation of the Early Childhood Comprehensive Assessment System. Ohio is collaborating with Maryland to design and implement an early childhood formative assessment, as well as a Kindergarten Readiness Assessment. The national Technical Advisory Committee comprised of developmental psychologists, early childhood content area experts, experts on young English Language Learners and students with disabilities, and psychometricians met with the leadership team in May and December 2015. The Ohio Early Childhood Comprehensive Assessment System Advisory Committee met monthly to review and provide input on the assessment's development. The advisory committee includes local early childhood program administrators from district preschools, child care, family child care and Head Start, as well as elementary building administrators, higher education faculty, private foundations and business-sector representatives.

In January 2015, Ohio gathered two focus groups, one comprised of kindergarten teachers and the other comprised of administrators, to provide feedback on the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment year 1 implementation. Based on feedback from these groups, Ohio shortened its Kindergarten Readiness Assessment from 63 items to 50 items for the fall 2015 administration. Additionally, in February 2015, the state gathered a group of stakeholders to perform standard setting. This group consisted of local teachers, administrators and early childhood experts from higher education. From August to November 2015, all children in kindergarten completed the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment for the second year of required administration in Ohio.

Representatives from Ohio's state agencies regularly present information on early childhood initiatives, policies and supports to a variety of stakeholders, including the Child Care Advisory Council, the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children, the Early Childhood Advisory Council, state support teams, Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies and the English Language Learner Advisory Group.

Ohio formed its **English Language Learner Advisory Group** to assist early childhood professionals in supporting young English language learners and to ensure that the challenges faced by students and families for whom English is not the native language receive consideration in efforts to close the achievement gap for children with high needs. Members of this group include parents of children who are English language learners, educators from institutions of higher learning that specialize in English language learner student populations and professionals that work with parents of young English language learners.

After meeting in 2014, the advisory group created a high-level work plan for each 2015 meeting. The group met four times in 2015 with the support of a meeting coordinator. The group contracted with an expert in bilingualism and bi-literacy from The Ohio State University to give expertise and guidance to project personnel and the advisory group. Key accomplishments in 2015 related to future work and efforts sustainable beyond the Early Learning Challenge grant.

With input from the Ohio Department of Education's Lau Resource Center, the English Language Learner Advisory Group developed a list of 10 recommendations for supporting Ohio's young English language learners, their families and teachers. The recommendations include ways to enhance the state's English language learner education environment for learners from birth to kindergarten.

Another outcome of the group's work was an invitation extended to two early learning specialists to participate on the Lau Resource Center English Language Learner Advisory Committee. The center established the advisory committee to review federal and state policies and programs that provide services and supports to Ohio's growing English language learner population. The committee also provides feedback to the Lau Resource Center and other Ohio Department of Education staff members on best practices, resources and other recommendations to improve educational programs for English language learners. The group is comprised of English language learner practitioners from diverse backgrounds and representatives from institutions of higher education. They meet twice a year to share information and advice, and they provide feedback on the educational services provided throughout Ohio to English language learners. Members provide updates from their fields that affect English language learners. Members also may receive an assignment to review policy recommendations or provide technical assistance and professional development to school districts. The Lau Resource Center English Language Learner Advisory Committee has focused on English language learner education in grades K-12. By including the early childhood field, the group will expand its scope to include young learners from birth to kindergarten.

The **Child Care Advisory Committee** is comprised of early childhood stakeholders, child care providers and county representatives that make recommendations to the Ohio Department of Job and Family Services director on early childhood issues. The Child Care Advisory Committee includes two subcommittees: The policy committee was responsible for recommendations on the statutes and administrative codes regulating child care programs, publicly funded child care and the Step Up To Quality rating system; and the system committee was responsible for recommendations on the data system to support the department's work.

Both subcommittees and the larger council meet on a monthly basis. The Child Care Advisory Committee created the following ad hoc committees, Professional Development, Assessment and Standards, Family Engagement, Access to Quality and Financing which, address current trends and issues for child care in the state.

Input on Ohio's Quality Rating and Improvement System and Program Standards

In 2015, amended Substitute HB 64 of the 131st General Assembly provided a pivotal moment for improving the Step Up To Quality rating and improvement system and program standards. As part of HB 64, the state established requirements for instructional time for Step Up To Quality-rated child care centers and small and large family child care homes. Ohio law now defines instructional time as the time a group spends with the lead teacher each day, excluding nap or rest time. This ensures that all children in a Step Up To Quality-rated program receive at least 3.5 hours of instructional time a day. Moreover, the bill led to changes and clarifications within the departments of Education and Job and Family Services' Step Up To Quality rules around when a rating is determined, process to follow when a child care program changes owners or location, change of provider type, and when a rating has been reduced or removed. The rules became effective Sept. 28, 2015.

HB 64 also required that the departments of Education and Job and Family Services identify specific components and goals for the Step Up To Quality programs. Effective July 1, 2025, child care centers and Type A homes that would like to serve publicly funded children must be rated in the highest tiers (3, 4 or 5 stars) of the system. If the centers and Type A homes do not become highly rated, they will not be able to serve publicly funded children. Additionally, the bill required both departments to continue collaborating and identifying ways to transition early learning and development programs into higher tiers in the Step Up To Quality rating system and identify strategies to increase Type B (home child care) participation in Step Up To Quality.

Licensing

The Ohio Departments of Education and Job and Family Services continued their 2014 efforts to create a single license and Step Up To Quality rating system: the Ohio Child Licensing and Quality System. The Child Care Advisory Council was presented with portions of the system during development to provide feedback. Additionally, an executive committee was established in 2015, which included program and information technology representatives from both departments, the software developer vendor and project management staff overseeing the Ohio Child Licensing and Quality System.

In an effort to better align Type A and Type B child care rules, the Ohio Department of Job and Family Services has combined portions of Ohio law (Ohio Administrative Code 5101:2-14 and 5101:2-13) into singular family child care rules. These rules aligned such things as ratio/group size, along with safety and health requirements. The rule drafts included input from provider organizations, the Child Care Advisory Council, county agency staff members, state staff members and the stakeholder community. The goal is for the rules to be effective with the new Ohio Child Licensing and Quality System, which is expected to be implemented in October 2016.

Per the Ohio Revised Code, the Ohio Department of Job and Family Services also completed the five-year rule review process effective November 2015. The department shared these recommendations with the Child Care Advisory Council policy workgroup for additional input and suggestions before proceeding in the legislative rule process.

The executive committee for Ohio Child Licensing and Quality System implementation met at least monthly during the reporting period and sometimes more frequently to discuss obstacles, challenges, successes and time lines associated with the development of the system. This group ultimately made the decision to terminate the contract with the vendor and seek other bids to complete the development work on the Ohio Child Licensing and Quality System. The work will begin with a new vendor in March 2016.

The **Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies** and the **Ohio Child Care Resource and Referral Agency** provide technical assistance and professional development to Ohio's early learning and development programs. The 12 regional Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies, with support from the Ohio Child Care Resource and Referral Agency, meet regularly to provide input on the successes and challenges faced by programs participating in Step Up To Quality. Effective July 2015, the Ohio Department of Job and Family Services began conducting quarterly meetings with directors from the Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies to discuss issues and resolutions regarding finance, policy, licensing and systems.

The **state support teams** are the education arm of the technical assistance and professional development network for Ohio's early learning and development programs. The grant helps support early childhood consultants in each of 16 regions who met at least monthly during the reporting period to provide input on challenges faced by programs in educational settings, improve the professional development being delivered and discuss issues related to meeting needs of teachers in early learning and development programs.

The **Professional Development Leadership Committee** is comprised of state agency program leaders from the departments of Education, Job and Family Services, Health, Mental Health and Addiction Services, and Developmental Disabilities, as well as partners from the governor's office and the Ohio Child Care Resource and Referral Agency. This group met twice monthly throughout the reporting year to discuss the professional development networks, state policies on professional

development, the Ohio Professional Registry and the professional development resources, trainings and events for the field of early childhood in Ohio. The group revised The Core Knowledge and Competencies document during the reporting year and provided the updated resource to colleges and universities during a Higher Education Summit on Early Childhood in September 2015. The group also provided input on a drafted credentialing structure for early childhood professionals in child care settings. Other topics of discussion included the ongoing evaluation of the Comprehensive Professional Development System in Ohio, revisions to state policies regarding online professional development and sustaining professional development networks after the Early Learning Challenge grant ends.

Grant leaders took the opportunity to provide updates to many existing stakeholder groups on grant activities and early childhood initiatives during the reporting year, including presentations to the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children, State Systemic Improvement Plan planning and workgroups, superintendents of chartered nonpublic schools, the Ohio Association of Community Schools and regional kindergarten readiness summits throughout the state.

Proposed Legislation, Policies, or Executive Orders

Describe any changes or proposed changes to state legislation, budgets, policies, executive orders and the like that had or will have an impact on the RTT-ELC grant. Describe the expected impact and any anticipated changes to the RTT-ELC State Plan as a result.

General changes

Amended Substitute HB 64 of the 131st General Assembly (signed June 30, 2015; enacted Sept. 30, 2015) gave authority to the Ohio Department of Job and Family Services to suspend the license of a child care program immediately under certain circumstances. These circumstances are limited to the following: (1) If a provider has an accepted Public Children's Service Agency (PCSA) complaint; (2) If there has been an indictment, information or complaint with an offense relating to fraud or child abuse or neglect against the owner, administrator or an employee who has not been released from employment or put on administrative leave; or (3) The Ohio Department of Job and Family Services or county agency has determined that the program created a serious risk to the health or safety of a child receiving child care in the program that resulted in or could have resulted in the death or injury of a child.

If a suspension takes effect and the program is Step Up To Quality rated, the program would lose its rating. Additionally, HB 64 required changes to several definitions, including the definition of "Head Start" to include children from birth through three years of age and clarifying the definition of "child care," "part-time" care, and "early learning and development".

Publicly Funded Child Care

HB 64 also made changes to the number of child care providers that a child could be authorized to. With the effective date of the bill, providers who are eligible to receive publicly funded child care are limited to no more than one child care provider per child during a week, with exceptions including: (1) The child needing additional care during non-traditional hours; (2) The child needs to change providers in the middle of the week; (3) The child's provider is closed on school days off; and (4) The child is enrolled in a part time program participating in the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System and needs additional care beyond part time.

The maximum amount of income a family may have for the publicly funded child care initial application is 130 percent of the federal poverty level; continued eligibility shall not be greater than 300 percent of the federal poverty level. The Ohio Department of Job and Family Services also eliminated copayment

for all families at or below 100 percent federal poverty level.

By state fiscal year 2017, the departments of Education and Job and Family Services must align Early Childhood Education (publicly funded preschool) and Publicly Funded Child Care in the following areas: application, program eligibility, funding, attendance policy and attendance tracking system.

Step Up To Quality

HB 64 required instructional time for Step Up To Quality-rated child daycare centers and small and large family child care homes. The requirement and changes were identified in Ohio law (Ohio Administrative Code 5101:2-17-01) and defined instructional time as the time the group spends with the lead teacher each day (at least 3.5 hours), excluding nap or rest time. Additional changes to Step Up To Quality law also included rating effective dates, change of location and change of owner.

HB 64 also required the Department of Job and Family Services, in cooperation with the Department of Education, to identify specific components and goals to be included in Step Up To Quality. Effective July 1, 2025, child care centers and type A homes that serve publicly funded children must be at least 3-, 4- or 5-star rated. In addition, the following benchmarks and time line was established:

- By June 30, 2017, 25 percent of centers and Type A homes which serve publicly funded children must be 3, 4, or 5 star rated in Step Up to Quality;
- By June 30, 2019, 40 percent of centers and Type A homes which serve publicly funded children must be 3, 4, or 5 star rated in Step Up to Quality;
- By June 30, 2021, 60 percent of centers and Type A homes which serve publicly funded children must be 3, 4, or 5 star rated in Step Up to Quality;
- By June 30, 2023, 80 percent of centers and Type A homes which serve publicly funded children must be 3, 4, or 5 star rated in Step Up to Quality; and
- By June 30, 2025, 100 percent of centers and Type A homes which serve publicly funded children must be 3, 4, or 5 star rated in Step Up to Quality.

The departments of Job and Family Services and Education also must continue to collaborate and identify methods to transition early learning and development programs into higher tiers in Step Up To Quality and identify strategies for Type B home Step Up To Quality participation.

Participating State Agencies

Describe any changes in participation and commitment by any of the Participating State Agencies in the State Plan.

There have been no changes in the participating state agencies for the reporting year. The early childhood officer continues to work with all state partners on Ohio's early learning and development reform agenda with a focus on sustainability as the grant comes to a close. The participating state agencies include the Ohio departments of Education, Job and Family Services, Health, Mental Health and Addiction Services, Developmental Disabilities, the Governor's Office, Head Start Collaboration Office and the Early Childhood Advisory Committee.

THIS PAGE IS BLANK DUE TO FORMATTING ISSUES

High-Quality, Accountable Programs

Developing and adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS) (Section B(1) of Application).

During this reporting year of RTT-ELC implementation, has the State made progress in **developing or revising** a TQRIS that is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards?

If yes, these standards currently apply to (please check all that apply):

- State-funded preschool programs
- Early Head Start and Head Start programs
- Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA
- Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA
- Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:
 - Center-based
 - Family Child Care

If yes, these standards currently apply to (please check all that apply): '

- Early Learning and Development Standards'
- A Comprehensive Assessment System'
- Early Childhood Educator Qualifications'
- Family Engagement Strategies'
- Health Promotion Practices'
- Effective Data Practices'

The State has made progress in ensuring that (please check all that apply):

- TQRIS Program Standards are measurable
- TQRIS Program Standards meaningfully differentiate program quality levels
- TQRIS Program Standards reflect high expectations of program excellence commensurate with nationally recognized standards that lead to improved learning outcomes for children
- The TQRIS is linked to the State licensing system for Early Learning and Development Programs.

Describe progress made during the reporting year in **developing or revising** a TQRIS that is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the four-year grant period.

High-Quality, Accountable Programs

Ohio continues to enforce and maintain licensing compliance and quality by requiring a history of compliance to participate in Step Up To Quality. As part of licensing compliance, the departments of Job and Family Services and Education created serious risk licensing non-compliances that affect a program's star rating if they are violated. Likewise, if a program has been issued a serious risk non-compliance, it could be in jeopardy of losing its star rating or having it reduced. A rubric of each serious risk non-compliance and its consequence to rated programs is in state rule and programs have an appeal process to argue against any consequence taken. Each appeal is reviewed by the licensing and Step Up to Quality program leadership, coming to a decision through consensus, which is then communicated back to the program.

During the reporting year, the Department of Job and Family Services assessed all programs previously rated under the three-star system. All staff members that completed the Ohio Classroom Observation Tool were trained to ensure rater reliability. The department increased the number of staff members completing the Step Up To Quality verification process by creating and implementing a comprehensive and integrated (licensing and Step Up To Quality) staff training and mentorship process. Targeted recruitment efforts allowed the Department of Education to also increase the number of staff members completing the Step Up To Quality verification process. New staff are in the process of being trained on the program standards, Step Up To Quality policies and procedures and the Ohio Classroom Observation Tool. The Department of Education also is exploring options for conducting focused licensing visits for programs at the time of the Step Up To Quality verification visit. This process has the potential to add an additional level of efficiency, which would allow the departments to rate programs faster than it is able to do at the current time.

Promoting Participation in the TQRIS (Section B(2) of Application)

Describe progress made during the reporting year in promoting participation in the TQRIS. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the four-year grant period.

Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System

During the revision of the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System, agencies promoted the expansion, revision and inclusion of stakeholder input through email, brochures, fact sheets, public website review and advisory group advocacy. This process consisted of relevant website postings at earlychildhoodohio.org, email communications to programs and early childhood stakeholders from both departments, the Child Care Advisory Council, Early Childhood Advisory Council, state support teams, and the resource and referral agencies. Staff from these agencies provided technical assistance to any program interested in Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System, including helping programs with initial registration, participation in or obtaining an increased rating. They continue to create and revise materials to assist programs in the initial registration and renewal processes.

The agencies have created a number of resource documents and Web-based trainings to assist programs in understanding the intent and requirements of the revised program standards. These resources provide clarification of the verification procedures and the use of the Ohio Classroom

Observation Tool as a means of evaluating the classroom environment and interactions between staff members and children. Resources are available for providers and state staff to explain how to use the new Ohio Child Licensing and Quality System that programs use to register for Step Up To Quality. All of these documents and trainings are available at earlychildhoodohio.org.

With the implementation of the revised Step Up To Quality five-star system, the departments of Education and Job and Family Services continue to work with the above mentioned partners to promote additional participation. The agencies held regular meetings throughout the reporting year with the Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies, Ohio Child Care Resource and Referral Agency, state support teams, stakeholder groups and other partnering agencies to ensure ongoing communication. These meetings have been valuable for explaining implementation and policy decisions, sharing successful strategies in engaging programs and identifying issues from the field where additional support and resources are needed.

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c)

In the table, provide data on the numbers and percentages of Early Learning and Development Programs that are participating in the State's TQRIS by type of Early Learning and Development Program. Targets must be consistent with those in the State's application unless a change has been approved.

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c): Increasing the number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the statewide TQRIS.										
Targets: Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	0	0%	0	0%	99	33%	197	66%	269	90%
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	206	41.5%	220	44%	240	48%	255	51%	270	55%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	0	0%	0	0%	50	10%	126	25%	251	50%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA										
Programs receiving CCDF funds	804	39%	850	41%	933	45%	1,016	49%	1,050	51%
Other 1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	160	1%	330	2%
<i>Describe:</i>	Small family child care homes receiving funds from CCDF									
Other 2	270	12%	288	13%	311	14%	322	14.5%	333	15%
<i>Describe:</i>	Programs not receiving funds from CCDF and licensed by ODJFS									
Other 3										
<i>Describe:</i>										

¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c) - Additional Other rows

Targets: Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS

Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Other 4										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 5										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 6										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 7										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 8										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 9										
<i>Describe:</i>										
Other 10										
<i>Describe:</i>										

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c): Increasing the number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the statewide TQRIS.

Actuals: Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS

Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline			Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four		
	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool	299	0	0%	299	0	0%	326	0	0%	389	159	40.9%	464	298	64.22%
<i>Specify:</i>	Early Childhood Education														
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	496	206	41.5%	496	223	45%	592	274	46%	504	283	56%	440	343	78%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C															
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	502	0	0%	502	0	0%	499	0	0%	497	119	23.9%	508	163	32.09%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA															
Programs receiving CCDF funds	2,074	804	39%	2,074	809	39%	2,946	1,027	35%	2,906	1,029	35.4%	2,908	922	31.7%
Other 1	6,600	0	0%	6,600	0	0%	3,999	0	0%	3,461	50	1.4%	3,218	185	5.7%
<i>Describe:</i>	Small family child care homes receiving funds from CCDF														
Other 2	2,220	270	12%	2,220	365	16%	1,548	405	26%	1,661	391	23.5%	1,694	390	23%
<i>Describe:</i>	Programs not receiving funds from CCDF and licensed by ODJFS														
Other 3															
<i>Describe:</i>															

¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c) - Additional Other rows

Actuals: Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS

Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline			Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four		
	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%
Other 4															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 5															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 6															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 7															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 8															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 9															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 10															
<i>Describe:</i>															

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c) Data Notes

Indicate if baseline data are actual or estimated; describe the methodology used to collect the data, including any error or data quality information; and please include any definitions you used that are not defined in the notice.

The percentages for Year 4 changed from the original Targeted percentages based on the number of new programs reported in Year 4. The target number of programs was actually exceeded, however the denominator significantly increased from the baseline denominator, therefore the resulting percentage calculation is lower.

The zeros in the Baseline and Year One columns indicate the types of Early Learning and Development Programs that were not eligible to participate in Step Up To Quality until Year Two of the grant.

In Years 1 and 2, state-funded preschool and programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619 were reported out using State Fiscal Year information. In an effort to report out on the most current data for highly rated programs and to better align with the other agencies' data in this table, the data provided for Years 3 and 4 for these programs represents the 2014 and 2015 calendar years.

As programs have had to come into Step Up to Quality, the state has lost child care providers who were previously serving children with various public funds.

Family Child Care is not as familiar with TQRIS. The state is employing multiple strategies for addressing the familiarity, including engaging family child care providers in focus group sessions, improving our communications by varying our modes of communicating, and providing information in accessible ways like hot cards during visits which explain the TQRIS and who to contact to become rated. Overall, across all years of the grant, small family child care targets have increased due to strong outreach to the provider community whether they serve publicly funded children or not.

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c) Target Notes

For all targets that were not reached in the reporting year, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in reaching the established grant targets by the end of the grant period.

During the revision of the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System, agencies promoted the expansion, revision and inclusion of stakeholder input through email, brochures, fact sheets, public website review and advisory group advocacy. This process consisted of relevant website postings at earlychildhoodohio.org, email communications to programs and early childhood stakeholders from both departments, Child Care Advisory Committee advocacy, Early Childhood Advisory Council and the use of the Resource and Referral Agencies. Staff from all of these agencies provided technical assistance to any program interested in Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System revision education, preparation for initial participation or expansion of a current star rating. Moreover, each Department required participation in Step Up to Quality for programs serving publicly funded children and invited selected programs to enter in cohorts so that specialists could provide targeted and individualized technical assistance and help to these providers going through the registration and rating processes.

The agencies continue to create Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System materials to promote and educate stakeholders of requirements and changes. Additionally, the departments of Education and Job and Family Services have presented at various state conferences and stakeholder group meetings, including the Ohio Head Start Association, Ohio Association for the Education of Young Children, family child care groups and various local organizations and school districts. The goal of these meetings is to continue to update stakeholders while also providing opportunities for questions and answers.

The agencies have created a number of resource documents and Web-based trainings to help programs understand the intent and requirements of the revised program standards. These resources provide clarification of the verification processes and how to use the Ohio Classroom Observation Tool as a means of evaluating the classroom environment and interactions between staff members and

children. Resources are available for providers and state staff to help navigate the Ohio Child Licensing and Quality System. All of these documents and trainings are available at earlychildhoodohio.org.

As Step Up To Quality continues to grow, the departments of Education and Job and Family Services continue to work with the above mentioned partners to create a collaborative environment that promotes the goals of Step Up To Quality. The agencies hold regular meetings with the Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies, Ohio Child Care Resource and Referral Agency, state support teams, stakeholder groups and other partnering agencies to ensure ongoing communication. These meetings have been invaluable for explaining policy decisions, creating dialogue, providing consistent messaging to providers and, most recently, planning for sustainability.

Additionally, HB 64 requires that all programs who are serving publicly funded children need to be in SUTQ by 2020, and all centers and Type A homes need to be highly rated (3-,4- or 5-star rated) by 2025.

Rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs (Section B(3) of Application).

The State has made progress in developing and enhancing a system for rating and monitoring the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs that participate in the TQRIS that (please check all that apply):

- Includes information on valid and reliable tools for monitoring such programs
- Has trained monitors whose ratings have an acceptable level of inter-rater reliability
- Monitors and rates Early Learning and Development Programs with appropriate frequency
- Provides quality rating and licensing information to parents with children enrolled in Early Learning and Development Programs (e.g., displaying quality rating information at the program site)
- Makes program quality rating data, information, and licensing history (including any health and safety violations) publicly available in formats that are easy to understand and use for decision making by families selecting Early Learning and Development Programs and families whose children are enrolled in such programs.

Describe progress made during the reporting year in developing and enhancing a system for rating and monitoring the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs that participate in the TQRIS. Describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs by the end of the grant period.

The state developed the Ohio Classroom Observation Tool as a measurement of the classroom environment and staff/child interactions. All programs participating in Step Up To Quality at a three-star or higher rating must complete the tool in randomly selected classrooms. The departments of Education and Job and Family Services have trained their staff members who conduct program inspections to use the tool reliably for accurate measurement and assessment. Master trainers and anchors from both departments work collaboratively to conduct trainings and establish inter-rater reliability. During the reporting year, all previously reliable staff completed additional reliability checks. Additional master trainers, anchors and raters were trained.

The agencies continued developing the new licensing system in year four of the grant with the goal of creating a system that allows staff from both departments to use one licensing system to complete the same functions. Additionally, the creation of the system will provide consistent information across the two agencies regarding a program's licensing history and Step Up To Quality ratings. An interagency workgroup is coordinating this work, as described above.

A combined search function, which will allow families access to quality information as they select an early learning and development program, is under development and planned for a summer 2016 release. The business rules identified will allow families to search by proximity to any Ohio address and be linked to a provider's website, as well as licensing reports, violations, Step Up To Quality ratings, funding accepted, programming offered and age of children served.

In order to ensure that programs come into Step Up to Quality, Ohio has remained diligent in its advertising and marketing, as well as mandated programs that receive public funds register and become rated in the TQRIS. Bi-weekly meetings address the progress being made in licensing and Step Up to Quality, as well as strategies to increase information, ease of process, and participation. Every opportunity to present and address the early childhood community is taken advantage of, through the Child Care Resource and Referral and the State Support Team networks; state staff presentations, specialists' technical assistance and help desk supports.

Promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs (Section B(4) of Application).

Has the State made progress in improving the quality of the Early Learning and Development Programs that are participating in your State TQRIS through the following policies and practices? (If yes, please check all that apply.)

- Program and provider training
- Program and provider technical assistance
- Financial rewards or incentives
- Higher, tiered child care subsidy reimbursement rates
- Increased compensation

Describe the progress made in improving the quality of the Early Learning and Development Programs that are participating in your State TQRIS during the reporting year. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.

The departments of Education and Job and Family Services continue to work with programs and providers participating in Step Up To Quality. Training and technical assistance is available through state staff members, state support teams and the resource and referral agencies at various levels based upon the current and future needs of the programs. As programs have achieved initial ratings, training and technical assistance efforts are targeted at helping maintain and/or increase ratings. Programs that are new to the rating process are assigned specific staff members or teams of staff members to support their understanding of the process in demonstrating and improving quality.

Programs are visited at least once yearly for compliance and monitoring visits. In between these visits, they report requested or required data, including any changes to their staffing, location, ownership, or capacity using the Ohio Child Licensing and Quality System.

Performance Measures (B)(4)(c)(1)

In the table below, provide data on the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS. Targets must be consistent with those in the State's application unless a change has been approved.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1): Increasing the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS.					
Targets					
	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
Total number of programs enrolled in the TQRIS	1,074	1,358	1,643	1,986	2,528
Number of programs in Tier 1	548	679	450	375	425
Number of programs in Tier 2	320	405	375	400	520
Number of programs in Tier 3	206	274	338	590	713
Number of programs in Tier 4			270	375	500
Number of programs in Tier 5			210	246	370
Number of programs enrolled but not yet rated					

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1): Increasing the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS.					
Actuals					
	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
Total number of programs enrolled in the TQRIS	1,074	1,200	1,432	1,630	3,260
Number of programs in Tier 1	548	520	690	639	968
Number of programs in Tier 2	320	402	0	130	698
Number of programs in Tier 3	206	278	431	380	387
Number of programs in Tier 4			311	279	301
Number of programs in Tier 5			0	202	906
Number of programs enrolled but not yet rated					247

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1) Data Notes

Describe the methodology used to collect the data, including any error or data quality information; and please include any definitions you used that are not defined in the notice.

The number of rated programs were pulled from the Step Up To Quality database and the newly created Ohio Child Licensing and Quality System (OCLQS).

The percentages for Year 3 may have changed from the original Targeted percentages based on the number of new programs reported in Year 3. The zeros in the Baseline and Year One columns indicate the types of Early Learning and Development Programs that were not eligible to participate in Step Up To Quality until Year Two of the grant. In Years 1 and 2, state-funded preschool and programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619 were reported out using State Fiscal Year information. In an effort to report out on the most current data for highly rated programs and to better align with the other agencies' data in this table, the data provided for Year 3 for these programs represents the 2014 calendar year. In January 2014, Ohio eliminated a category of provider called, Type B Limited Provider. In addition, small family child care homes serving 6 or fewer children, receiving PFCC, were required to become licensed instead of certify by county DJFS. These requirements caused a massive clean-up to provider files and records, decreasing the number of reported providers.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1) Target Notes

For all targets that were not reached in the reporting year, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in reaching the established targets by the end of the grant period.

During year 4 of the grant, state-funded preschool and IDEA Part B programs continued the transition into SUTQ and the use of the Ohio Child Licensing and Quality System OCLQS. The actual number of state-funded preschool programs participating in SUTQ exceeded the target number; however the target number of IDEA Part B programs was not achieved during the reporting period, due primarily to staff capacity. To progress toward the goal, the state invited programs to enter Step Up to Quality in selected cohorts (by geographical region, which is how the specialists who conduct the visits and reviews are situated) rather than at will. More specifically, early childhood education and preschool special education programs came into Step Up to Quality as invited by the state. By the end of the grant period, we expect that all these programs will be in Step Up to Quality, but individual targets set at the start of the grant underestimated the number of programs to enroll as the state's investment has also increased over the life of the grant. Steady progress is being made in rating these programs as the ODE builds capacity in supporting both the IDEA Part B programs and the increasing number of state-funded preschool programs moving forward.

In Year 4, the number of rated programs surpassed the target number. It was estimated that the State of Ohio would have 1503 highly rated programs in TQRIS by year 4 of the grant, the State of Ohio exceeded that goal with 1594 highly rated programs. Additionally, the target for rated programs was 2518 and this was surpassed with 3260 programs being rated. In order to continue reaching our targeted goals the ODJFS and the ODE will continue to target providers who are not star rated to become star rated and recruit programs that are star rated to become highly rated. Additionally, the Ohio Legislature's H.B. 64 mandated that all PFCC programs be rated by 2020.

In Year 5 of the grant, the CCR&Rs will continue to be provided lists of programs that are in their regions that are not currently participating in SUTQ. These programs will be contacted, and provided with information regarding the benefits of participation. Each of the 12 regional CCR&Rs will be asked to come up with recruitment and retention strategies, aimed at meeting the particular needs of their region. Efforts will also focus on small family child care homes, who became eligible to participate in SUTQ in July 2014. All providers will be required to participate in SUTQ by 2020 in order to continue to receive public funding.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) Definition of Highest Tiers

For purposes of Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2), how is the State defining its "highest tiers"?

Ohio has defined its highest tiers as those who rate at a three, four, or five star in the Step Up to Quality System.

Three-Star Rating: Learning and Development: Program implements a written, research based, comprehensive curriculum aligned with the Early Learning and Development Standards and/or Ohio K-12 Standards (appropriate to the age group served) and demonstrates its alignment to assessment. Teachers use a written, dated plan of activities aligned to all the developmental domains in the ELDS and/or Ohio's K-12 Standards. All children receive a developmental screening, formal assessment and ongoing formal and informal assessments to inform instruction. Lead teachers identify areas for improvement and create action plans based on self-assessment. Programs support each child's development by providing a well-structured learning environment and positive interactions among staff and children.

Administrative & Leadership Practices: Program offers two of the approved staff supports. Program completes an annual continuous improvement plan, which includes goals and action steps toward completing the goals identified in the self-assessment. Input from staff and family are included in development of the continuous improvement plan. Results of the formal observations are used to form individual PD plans.

Staff Qualifications and Professional Development: Administrators has an AA in ECE and 50 % of the lead teachers have an AA or Career Pathways Level (CPL) 3. Administrators, lead and assistant teachers receive a minimum of 20 hours of specialized training every two years.

Family and Community Partnerships: Programs meet with families to develop individualized transition plans. Program organizes at least one education training workshop to support family engagement. Program has written policies to ensure children received comprehensive health screenings and/or that families have been provided information on the importance of health screenings and resources to obtain them. Programs and parents collaborate to create annual written developmental /educational goals for children.

Four-Star and Five-Star Rating: To achieve a four or five-star rating programs must meet all the standards for a three-star rating and earn extra points. Extra points can be awarded for accreditation, improved staff/child ratios or for implementing at least one item in each of the following domains:

Learning and Development: teachers planning intentional and purposeful activities and experiences that meet the needs/interests/abilities of children across all developmental domains and/or teachers supporting children's active engagement through opportunities for exploration and learning. Ongoing child assessment results are used to make adjustments to instructional decisions and to evaluate a child's progress. Families are provided multiple opportunities to understand the assessment process and review and contribute to their child's education plan. The lead teacher documents progress on action steps identified during the self-assessment.

Administrative and Leadership Practices: Program offers three or more staff supports. Program's annual continuous improvement plan has strategies to engage community partners. The program conducts an annual survey with families, identified stakeholders and community partners to review accomplishment of program goals. Results of formal observations are used to inform a program's continuous improvement plan. Results of annual classroom self-assessments are used to inform individual professional development plans. Two formal observations are completed annually.

Staff Qualifications and Professional Development: Administrators, and percentages of Lead Teachers and Assistant Teachers have higher educational levels, including Masters Degrees, Associate degrees, CDA or higher CPL levels. Percentages of Administrators, Lead Teachers and Assistant Teachers have obtained 25 or more hours of approved professional development.

Family and Community Partnership: The program has a written transition policy and practices. Program has written documentation of agreements with community partners. Program uses a formal model to enhance family engagement strategies or has an active parent volunteer group.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2)

In the table below, provide data on the number and percentage of children with high needs who are enrolled in Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS. Targets must be consistent with those in the State's application unless a change has been approved.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2): Increasing the number and percentage of Children with High Needs who are enrolled in Early Learning and Development Programs that are in the top tiers of the TQRIS.										
Targets: Number and percent of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	0	0%	0	0%	1,881	33%	3,762	66%	5,130	90%
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	4,711	12%	6,304	16%	9,850	25%	15,760	40%	21,670	55%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	0	0%	0	0%	2,333	10%	5,834	25%	11,668	50%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA										
Programs receiving CCDF funds	7,369	15%	7,667	16%	8,146	17%	8,625	18%	9,639	20%
Other 1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	480	3%	990	6%
<i>Describe:</i>	Small family child care homes									
Other 2										
<i>Describe:</i>										

¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) - Additional Other rows

Targets: Number and percent of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS

Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Other 3										
<i>Describe:</i> Other 4										
<i>Describe:</i> Other 5										
<i>Describe:</i> Other 6										
<i>Describe:</i> Other 7										
<i>Describe:</i> Other 8										
<i>Describe:</i> Other 9										
<i>Describe:</i> Other 10										
<i>Describe:</i>										

THIS PAGE IS BLANK DUE TO FORMATTING ISSUES

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2): Increasing the number and percentage of Children with High Needs who are enrolled in Early Learning and Development Programs that are in the top tiers of the TQRIS.

In most States, the **Number of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State** for the current reporting year will correspond to the **Total** reported in Table (A)(1)-3a. If not, please explain the reason in the data notes.

Actuals: Number and percent of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS

Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline			Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four		
	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool	5,700	0	0%	5,700	0	0%	5,700	0	0%	11,090	4,858	43.8%	14,765	13,546	91.74%
<i>Specify:</i>	Early Childhood Education														
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	39,383	4,711	12%	39,383	11,474	29%	39,106	18,974	48%	41,283	26,952	65%	45,088	33,816	75%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C															
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	23,336	0	0%	23,336	0	0%	24,048	0	0%	22,933	2,377	10.3%	22,411	5,425	24.2%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA															
Programs receiving CCDF funds	47,920	7,369	15%	47,920	9,947	21%	65,049	11,027	17%	62,414	9,895	16%	63,732	10,005	15.8%
Other 1	15,000	0	0%	15,000	0	0%	13,312	0	0%	14,388	104	0.7%	13,577	102	7.5%
<i>Describe:</i>	Small family child care homes														
Other 2															
<i>Describe:</i>															

¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) - Additional Other rows

Actuals: Number and percent of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS

Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline		Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four			
	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%
Other 3															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 4															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 5															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 6															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 7															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 8															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 9															
<i>Describe:</i>															
Other 10															
<i>Describe:</i>															

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) Data Notes

Please indicate whether baseline data are actual or estimated; and describe the methodology used to collect the data, including any error or data quality information; and please include any definitions you used that are not defined in the notice.

The percentages for Year 4 may have changed from the original Targeted percentages based on the increase in the number of new programs reported in Year 4. The expansion of Ohio's state funded public preschool allowed programs, that may have already been rated in one of the top tiers, to serve additional children within identified high needs populations. This increased the number of children served, but decreased the target percentage.

The zeros in Baseline, Year 1 and Year 2 reflect the types of early learning and development programs that were not initially eligible to participate in SUTQ. SUTQ only became available to these types of programs (excluding Type B childcare) in October 2013, with the first star-ratings awarded in January 2014.

In Years 1 and 2, state-funded preschool and programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619 were reported out using State Fiscal Year (7/1 - 6/30) information. In 2013, Publicly funded preschool programs licensed by ODE (i.e., public preschool and preschool special education) started registering and beginning the process to be rated during the 2013-2014 school year, thus the counts were zero. In an effort to report out on the most current data for highly rated programs and to better align with the other agencies' data in this table, the data provided for Years 3 and 4 for these programs represents the 2014 and 2015 calendar years.

The numbers in the "Programs receiving from CCDF funds" and the "Small family child care homes" columns reflect Publicly Funded Child Care (PFCC) service provided in December of 2015. The number of children reflect those served in 3-, 4- and 5-star rated programs.

The total number of children served in PFCC funded programs increased from 47,920 at the beginning of the grant period, to 63,732 in Year 4 of the grant. Due to the increase in number of children, Ohio did not meet the projected percentage of children served in the top tiers of Step Up To Quality. However, the actual number of children served (10,005), exceeded the projected number (9,639). There was an increase in the number of children served in PFCC highly rated programs from Year 1 to Year 4 due to the increase in the number of highly rated programs. Additionally programs that were highly rated served an increased percentage of high needs children.

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) Target Notes

For all targets that were not reached in the reporting year, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in reaching the established targets by the end of the grant period.

The actual numbers for public preschool exceeded the target numbers established for Year 4; however the actual percentage is lower than the target percentage due to an increase in the expansion of public preschool in Ohio. Public preschool and IDEA Part B programs that have never participated, continue to be transitioned into SUTQ as required by the State in geographical cohorts. The expansion of public preschool between years 3 and 4 identified additional programs required to participate in SUTQ, which increased the number of children being served. The increase in number of programs to rate in TQRIS as well as the length of time it takes to conduct a desk review and on-site visit for a rating have both contributed to not meeting the IDEA Part B target. State staff are conducting desk reviews and verification visits for programs that are currently registered, in addition to providing technical assistance and system support for programs in the beginning stages of the transition into SUTQ.

During Year 4 of the grant, technical assistance resources were targeted at recruiting non-rated programs and at increasing the star rating for currently rated programs. All programs with a 2-, 3-, 4-, or 5-star ratings completed the annual report process for the first time. The ODE and the ODJFS collaborated to develop and streamline a process to ensure consistency of the assessment of SUTQ standards. The ODJFS strengthened the relationship between local field offices and the CCR&R serving

their area to assist in providing clear and consistent support to programs. Additionally, H.B. 64 created TQRIS goals for the ODJFS and the ODE which included getting all PFCC programs rated by 2020.

The change over grant years for small family child care homes is due to both previous providers leaving the profession and the increase in outreach to this specific professional population. Outreach to the provider community has been strong whether they serve publicly funded children or not. As programs have had to come into Step Up to Quality, the state has lost child care providers who were previously serving children with various public funds.

Validating the effectiveness of the State TQRIS (Section B(5) of Application).

Describe progress made during the reporting year in validating the effectiveness of the TQRIS during the reporting year, including the State's strategies for determining whether TQRIS tiers accurately reflect differential levels of program quality and assessing the extent to which changes in ratings are related to progress in children's learning, development, and school readiness. Describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made by the end of the grant period.

As the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System, Step Up To Quality, continues to grow with the mandated 2020 and 2025 goals, Ohio will track the impact of the program long term and on a larger group of children. Additionally, all children participating in publicly funded programs are now assigned a unique statewide student identification number that remains with the child from birth through higher education. Statewide student identifiers, combined with a larger population of Step Up To Quality children, will provide data to determine the effect of quality-rated programs on an individual child and the ability to analyze our system to determine performance compared with Step Up To Quality participation.

Ohio completed a request for proposals for the validation study of Step Up To Quality and awarded the project to a vendor. As part of the study, Ohio plans to examine child assessment information in relation to observational measures to show how the one- through five-star tiers correlate to different levels of program quality, while also reviewing the ability to reliably rate the qualities found as critical components to quality settings. Additionally, the study will look at non-rated programs and compare them to those that are star rated to assess child outcomes, in addition to comparing Ohio's tiered rating system to that of other states. Study results are expected to be available by December 2016.

Focused Investment Areas -- Sections (C), (D), and (E)

Select the Focused Investment Areas addressed in your RTT-ELC State Plan:

- (C)(1) Developing and using statewide, high-quality Early Learning and Development Standards.
- (C)(2) Supporting effective uses of Comprehensive Assessment Systems.
- (C)(3) Identifying and addressing the health, behavioral, and developmental needs of Children with High Needs to improve school readiness.
- (C)(4) Engaging and supporting families.
- (D)(1) Developing a Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and a progression of credentials.
- (D)(2) Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities.
- (E)(1) Understanding the status of children's learning and development at kindergarten entry.
- (E)(2) Building or enhancing an early learning data system to improve instruction, practices, services, and policies.

Grantee should complete only those sections that correspond with the focused investment areas outlined in the grantee's RTT-ELC application and State Plan.

Promoting Early Learning Outcomes

Early Learning and Development Standards (Section C(1) of Application)

The State has made progress in ensuring that its Early Learning and Development Standards (check all that apply):

- Are developmentally, culturally, and linguistically appropriate across each defined age group of infants, toddlers, and preschoolers;
- Cover all Essential Domains of School Readiness;
- Are aligned with the State's K-3 academic standards; and
- Are incorporated in Program Standards, curricula and activities, Comprehensive Assessment Systems, the State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, and professional development activities.

Describe the progress made in the reporting year, including supports that are in place to promote the understanding of and commitment to the Early Learning and Development Standards across Early Learning and Development Programs. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in these areas by the end of the grant period.

Tools to Support Use of Birth to Kindergarten Entry Standards

All early learning and development programs in Ohio continue to integrate fully the early learning and development standards in their locally determined curricula and classroom practices. A model curriculum for the Early Learning and Development Standards, called "Implementation Guides," has been in the field for the past two reporting years. The use of these guides support programs in implementing the standards in conjunction with their curricula. In addition, the agencies revised the Curriculum Standards Assessment Alignment Tool to align with the child and program standards, which has been in place for the entire reporting year. Programs have used the tool to support the alignment of the Early Learning and Development standards to their assessments and curricula.

Professional Development

Ohio also is continuing to support the implementation of the standards through professional development and training. During the reporting year, the Ohio Child Care Resource and Referral Agency coordinated all professional development delivery through the state and regional networks. These network teams consist of representatives from each state agency to ensure consistency in implementation throughout the state. In building upon the work done on the Ohio Early Learning and Development Standards Professional Development Modules, the agencies have developed new models to provide continued support. They released Technology in the Classroom, Screening and Assessment, and Supporting English Language Learners during the reporting year through both face-to-face and online modules. The Ohio Child Care Resource and Referral Agency continued to use all early learning and development professional development modules in Ohio through four key networks supported through the Ohio departments of Education, Job and Family Services, Health, and Mental Health and Addiction Services respectively. The networks include state support teams, Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies, health promotion consultants and early childhood mental health consultants. The regional professional development networks provided train-the-trainer sessions and continued to provide these trainings to early learning professionals across the state during the reporting year. Five additional modules also were released during the reporting year, responding to early childhood professionals' identification of areas of greatest need. These new modules included leadership, family and community engagement, inclusion, curriculum alignment and challenging behaviors.

Kindergarten to Grade 3 Standards and Model Curriculum

The State Board of Education reviewed and accepted standards for kindergarten to grade three in the areas of Approaches Toward Learning, Physical Well-being and Motor Development, and Social-Emotional Development in May 2015. These new standards align to and support academic standards

that currently exist in kindergarten to grade three. Posting and public comment led to slight revisions of the new standards. The Ohio Department of Education then posted them on its website, education.ohio.gov and encouraged their use through presentations to the Ohio Association for the Education of Young Children and regional professional development conferences for early childhood professionals.

Comprehensive Assessment Systems (Section C(2) of Application)

The State has made progress in implementing a developmentally appropriate Comprehensive Assessment System working with Early Learning and Development Programs to (check all that apply):

- Select assessment instruments and approaches that are appropriate for the target populations and purposes;
- Strengthen Early Childhood Educators' understanding of the purposes and uses of each type of assessment included in the Comprehensive Assessment Systems;
- Articulate an approach for aligning and integrating assessments and sharing assessment results; and
- Train Early Childhood Educators to appropriately administer assessments and interpret and use assessment data in order to inform and improve instruction, programs, and services.

Describe the progress made during the reporting year. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in these areas by the end of the grant period.

Assessment Instruments and Approaches

With Maryland, Ohio has created two assessments that, together, make up the Early Childhood Comprehensive Assessment System. The Kindergarten Readiness Assessment has been through two census administrations. The Early Learning Assessment is being administered by all required users. Both assessments were developed to be aligned to Ohio's Early Learning Standards. The Early Learning Assessment is designed for children from the beginning of preschool through the end of kindergarten.

Purposes and Uses of the Comprehensive Assessment System

Through the Maryland-Ohio collaboration for the design and implementation of an Early Childhood Comprehensive Assessment System, professional development was provided to more than 10,000 kindergarten teachers and administrators between August and October 2015. The trainings were done in a variety of formats, including face-to-face. This professional development focused on assessment administration, interpretation and use of the assessment data in instruction planning. From August through November 2015, Ohio implemented the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment statewide. Also, between August and September 2015, approximately 3,000 preschool teachers received training on how to complete and score 10 of the available 32 learning progressions of the Early Learning formative assessment. Preschool programs that received funding through the Ohio Department of Education completed a subset of the formative assessment with all children in state-funded prekindergarten. The full-scale rollout of the formative assessment and the related professional development system began in April 2015. Currently, all publicly funded preschool programs are implementing the Early Learning Assessment. Ohio is working closely with our partners to ensure that the online system is ready to use for the fall 2016 administration of the Early Learning Assessment.

Sharing Assessment Results

The Ohio departments of Education and Job and Family Services are working together to create a system that will house the assessment data gathered under the Early Childhood Comprehensive Assessment System. Sharing the data publicly will be accomplished no later than June 2016, by providing aggregated data through the state's Interactive Report Card. The Interactive Report Card allows the public to search and examine assessment results which are aggregated at the elementary school and school district levels on-line and on demand.

Training Users

Following training, users must successfully prove they can score observational rubrics accurately by passing a Simulator and Content Assessment at an 80 percent accuracy rate in order to obtain a certificate authorizing them to administer assessments in the Early Childhood Comprehensive Assessment System. Any users who do not pass this assessment are retrained until they can pass.

The state has employed numerous strategies to ensure that progress continues to be made, including continuous improvement to our Comprehensive Assessment System's functionality and ease of use for teachers and data managers; Help Desk supports which have been able to address issues quicker and to resolution; continuous creation and dissemination of professional development and resource guides; and almost-daily leadership meetings to discuss plans and address obstacles.

Health Promotion (Section C(3) of Application)

The State has made progress in (check all that apply):

- Establishing a progression of standards for ensuring children's health and safety;
- Ensuring that health and behavioral screening and follow-up occur; and
- Promoting children's physical, social, and emotional development across the levels of your TQRIS Program Standards;
- Increasing the number of Early Childhood Educators who are trained and supported in meeting the health standards;
- Promoting healthy eating habits, improving nutrition, expanding physical activity; and
- Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual targets.

Describe the progress made during the reporting year. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.

OHIO DID NOT ADDRESS FOCUS AREAS C(3) OR C(4) IN ITS RTT-ELC APPLICATION.
PAGES 40 of 98 THROUGH 42 of 98 HAVE BEEN DELETED

Early Childhood Education Workforce

Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and progression of credentials.

(Section D(1) of Application)

The State has made progress in developing (check all that apply):

- A common, statewide Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework designed to promote children's learning and development and improve child outcomes; and
- A common, statewide progression of credentials and degrees aligned with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

Describe the progress made during the reporting year, including progress in engaging postsecondary institutions and other professional development providers in aligning professional development opportunities with the State Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.

Ohio revised the Early Childhood Core Knowledge and Competencies along with the Core Knowledge and Competencies Instructor Guide that all Ohio early childhood professionals use. The process of creating and revising the Early Childhood Core Knowledge and Competencies involved early childhood professionals representing diverse roles and backgrounds. The writing teams were committed to revising the Early Childhood Core Knowledge and Competencies using guiding principles. The group ensured that the document:

- Identifies key concepts that apply to anyone working with young children in early learning settings;
- Applies to early childhood professionals in all settings and roles;
- Represents knowledge and observable skills needed for all levels of professionals;
- Is relevant to the development, care and learning of children from birth to kindergarten entry;
- Recognizes special needs children;
- Is written to be culturally sensitive and respectful; and
- Includes up-to-date research.

Ohio's two- and four-year education institutions primarily utilize the Early Childhood Core Knowledge and Competencies. Supporting the understanding and use of the core knowledge and competencies in higher education, Ohio coordinated and held an Early Childhood Higher Education Summit in September 2015. The summit planning committee included state agencies, two- and four-year higher education institutions, and the Ohio Child Care Resource and Referral Association. The meetings looked at articulation agreements, as well as how to apply the Early Childhood Core Knowledge and Competencies to maximize education and professional development among early childhood professionals. The summit was considered a success with more than 29 different institutions of higher education sending representatives and engaging with state agency early childhood staff members. There are plans to make the summit an annual event.

The revisions made to the Core Knowledge and Competencies Instructor Guide provided programs and schools with a basis for new instructor orientation curriculum. All trainers who deliver state-approved professional development must use the guide. The agencies are widely distributing the core knowledge and competencies documents to institutions of higher education across the state, as well as to early learning and development programs.



Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities.

(Section D(2) of Application)

The State has made progress in improving the effectiveness and retention of Early Childhood Educators who work with Children with High Needs with the goal of improving child outcomes (check all that apply):

- Providing and expanding access to effective professional development opportunities that are aligned with your State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework;
- Implementing policies and incentives that promote professional and career advancement along an articulated career pathway that is aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, and that are designed to increase retention, including
 - Scholarships
 - Compensation and wage supplements,
 - Tiered reimbursement rates,
 - Other financial incentives
 - Management opportunities
- Publicly reporting aggregated data on Early Childhood Educator development, advancement, and retention
- Setting ambitious yet achievable targets for --
 - Increasing the number of postsecondary institutions and professional development providers with programs that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and the number of Early Childhood Educators who receive credentials from postsecondary institutions and professional development providers that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework; and
 - Increasing the number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who are progressing to higher levels of credentials that align with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

Describe the progress made during the reporting year. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.

OHIO DID NOT ADDRESS FOCUS AREA D(2) IN ITS RTT-ELC APPLICATION
PAGES 45 of 98 THROUGH 48 of 98 HAVE BEEN DELETED

Measuring Outcomes and Progress

Understanding the Status of Children's Learning and Development at Kindergarten Entry (Section E(1) of Application)

The State has made progress in developing a common, statewide Kindergarten Entry Assessment that (check all that apply):

- Is aligned with the State's Early Learning and Development Standards and covers all Essential Domains of School Readiness;
- Is valid, reliable, and appropriate for the target population and for the purpose for which it will be used, including for English learners and children with disabilities;
- Is administered beginning no later than the start of the school year in the fourth year of the grant to children entering a public school kindergarten. States may propose a phased implementation plan that forms the basis for broader statewide implementation;
- Is reported to the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, and to the early learning data system, if it is separate from the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, as permitted under and consistent with the requirements of Federal, State, and local privacy laws; and
- Is funded, in significant part, with Federal or State resources other than those available under this grant, (e.g., with funds available under section 6111 or 6112 of the ESEA).

Describe the domain coverage of the State's Kindergarten Entry Assessment, validity and reliability efforts regarding the Kindergarten Entry Assessment, and timing of the administration of the Kindergarten Entry Assessment.

Ohio's new Kindergarten Readiness Assessment includes the areas of mathematics, science, social studies, language and literacy, physical well-being and motor development, and social foundations (which includes social emotional development, approaches toward learning and executive functioning).

Ohio, Maryland and our assessment development partners are conducting a careful process to ensure the technical adequacy of the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment. The states have gathered, and will continue to gather, extensive evidence to document the validity and reliability of the assessment for determining the status of each child's learning and development at kindergarten entry. This is done through quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis over the phases of assessment design, development and implementation. Specifically, we engaged experts and stakeholders (national technical advisory committee, state and local advisory councils, stakeholder and expert ad hoc committees and a multi-partner leadership team) in the assessment design and development phases and will continue to seek their input throughout implementation.

The administration window for Ohio's Kindergarten Readiness Assessment is set in state law as "not earlier than the first day of the school year and not later than the first day of November." The Kindergarten Readiness Assessment was administered for the second time in fall 2015 for all Ohio kindergarten students (approximately 125,000 students) statewide.

Describe the progress made during the reporting year. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.

In 2015, Ohio reviewed the data from the fall 2014 census administration and decided, based on the item performance and feedback from focus groups held in 2014, to shorten the test by 13 questions. Following this process, a committee set the standards. The committee determined cut scores for the overall score and for the four reported sub scores and generated an Individual Student Report. Ohio

distributed these to districts in the summer of 2015. Beginning in August 2015, the state administered the second census administration of the shortened Kindergarten Readiness Assessment, entering more than 150,000 students into the system. The assessment window closed on Nov. 2, 2015, and that day schools were able to download scaled score reports for their kindergarten students, followed by Individual Student Reports that teachers could access and use during parent-teacher conferences.

Early Learning Data Systems (Section E(2) of Application)

The State has made progress in enhancing its existing Statewide Longitudinal Data System or building or enhancing a separate, coordinated, early learning data system that aligns and is interoperable with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System and that (check all that apply):

- Has all of the Essential Data Elements;
- Enables uniform data collection and easy entry of the Essential Data Elements by Participating State Agencies and Participating Programs;
 - Facilitates the exchange of data among Participating State Agencies by using standard data structures, data formats, and data definitions such as Common Education Data Standards to ensure interoperability among the various levels and types of data;
 - Generates information that is timely, relevant, accessible, and easy for Early Learning and Development Programs and Early Childhood Educators to use for continuous improvement and decision making; and
- Meets the Data System Oversight Requirements and complies with the requirements of Federal, State, and local privacy laws.

Describe the progress made during the reporting year, including the State's progress in building or enhancing a separate early learning data system that aligns with and is interoperable with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System and that meets the criteria described above. Describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in this area by the end of the grant period.

Essential Data Elements and Status of Early Childhood Coordinated Data System

The state collects the essential data elements necessary to support the development of an Early Childhood Coordinated Data System. In 2015, Ohio continued work on multiple projects to support and enhance this objective. All of the program, workforce and child data has been identified, which exists among the Ohio departments of Education, Job and Family Services, Health, Mental Health and Addiction Services, and Developmental Disabilities. Through several projects in the Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge Grant, Ohio is building on the data elements with a primary goal of sharing data across agencies. A contract to engage a vendor to build the Early Childhood Data Warehouse, as well as an inter-agency memorandum of understanding, began during the reporting year and will go before the state's Controlling Board in March 2016 for approval. The memorandum of understanding will establish a data governance committee and an executive committee that will oversee the data sharing agreement and decide on how data are shared, stored, protected and reported publicly.

Enabling Uniform Data Collection and Easy Entry of the Essential Data Elements; Facilitating the Exchange of Data Among Participating State Agencies

Child Link System Status

Ohio has implemented a project that will ensure all children in publicly funded early learning and development programs are assigned a unique statewide student identification number used for children in prekindergarten through postsecondary education. This number allows for tracking student progress without the Ohio Department of Education having access to personally identifiable student information, such as student name or social security number, which state law prohibits. Ohio legislation effective July 2012, mandated the use of this student identification number by state agencies that serve children from birth to kindergarten entry in publicly funded early learning and development programs. This project funds the information technology infrastructure for assigning the unique identification number, which will enable state agencies to share information and data across the age spectrum from birth to kindergarten entry and link it to K-12 as well. The statewide student identification number is now in

place. Any child attending an early learning and development program funded with public dollars receives an identification number, including those in early intervention (Part C of IDEA), early childhood education, publicly funded child care and preschool special education (Part B 619 of IDEA) programs.

State Longitudinal Data System/P-20 Repository Status

The Ohio Department of Education continues to advance its work on the Statewide Longitudinal Data System. The data from systems has been grouped by content and prioritized based on the importance of the data, operational capacity and agency schedules. At this time, the Department of Education has finished the work of loading the first six groups (out of nine total) of data. Moreover, the six completed groups are operational. The remaining groups are in various stages of development and the department will continue to load the remaining groups of P-12 data as they are completed. The P-20 repository is scheduled to be fully loaded and work completed in 2016.

Generation of Information that is Timely, Relevant, Accessible and Easy to Use for Continuous Improvement and Decision-making

Statewide Student Identification Number

By leveraging these key cross-state agency projects and using Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge funding to expand on existing early learning data system infrastructure, Ohio is working toward its ability to generate information that is timely, relevant and accessible for state agencies, local programs and early childhood educators. By implementing the unique statewide student identification number for all children in publicly funded programs and creating the Early Childhood Data Warehouse, Ohio will be able to link information across programs, agencies and funding streams without personally identifying the child. Seven key policy questions have been identified which include:

1. What number and percentage of Ohio's children are ready for kindergarten?
2. What is relationship of program quality (Step Up To Quality) to kindergarten readiness of the children participating in programs?
3. Does participation in early childhood programs impact kindergarten readiness?
4. How does kindergarten readiness compare for children who had varying types of early childhood experiences (high quality/low quality preschool/childcare, early intervention, home visiting, Medicaid Managed Care, no early childhood experience before school entry)? And what is the impact of each of these for a child living in poverty? With a disability? Learning English as a second language?
5. What is the relationship between kindergarten readiness and third grade reading assessment?
6. Which children are at risk for not being able to read at grade level in kindergarten? And is the only question, "which children" or is it also which children living in which school district, or county or region? Or some other variable?
7. Does participation in early childhood programs impact (a) identification for special education p-k through 3rd grade or (b) amelioration of special education identification by 3rd grade?

Step Up To Quality Data System

Step Up To Quality, Ohio's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System, contains program quality data for Ohio Department of Education-funded and Ohio Department of Job and Family Services-funded programs across the two agencies. This data is based on Ohio's Step Up To Quality program standards, which will allow for a common way of evaluating the quality of early childhood programs. Work continues to expand this system to include licensing data for the departments of Education and Job and Family Services-funded and licensed programs, which when implemented also will ensure compliance with basic health and safety standards.

Through work accomplished in 2015, annual report data on continuous improvement of star-rated programs is now collected through the data system. The Ohio Child Licensing and Quality System is a Web-based system that allows programs to register for star ratings and monitor their continuous

improvement efforts through Step Up To Quality. We are in the process of being able to track compliance and history of health and safety standards through reports that are generated after licensing or Step Up To Quality visits. The development of a consumer Web search is currently underway that will allow families and members of the public to access information about the quality of early childhood programs online.

Maryland and Ohio Early Childhood Comprehensive Assessment System Data System

State programs will have access to a data system that will house aggregated child assessment information in all areas of school readiness at the prekindergarten and kindergarten levels through the Maryland and Ohio Early Childhood Comprehensive Assessment System project. Early childhood programs from all sectors, including school districts, child care and family child care, will use a standardized technology infrastructure to input child assessment results into Ohio's longitudinal data system and the Department of Job and Family Services' early childhood assessment database. Programs licensed or funded through these state agencies will be able to immediately access this child assessment information to assist them in making instructional decisions and sharing information with families. State-level decision-makers also will have access to aggregate information that does not include personally identifiable student information. Disaggregated data by district, program and region also will be available only to the extent it does not reveal information that could be used to identify any individual students.

Meets Data System Oversight Requirements and Federal, State and Local Privacy Laws

Each of the agencies has data governance policies in place, but new cross-agency governance committees are being established to address data sharing and confidentiality. Ohio law (Ohio Revised Code 1347.15) requires each state agency to adopt rules related to accessing confidential personal information and designation of an individual who serves as the data privacy point of contact. The rules adopted by the various state agencies are to ensure compliance with all applicable federal and state privacy/confidentiality laws including, but not limited to, the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, Americans with Disabilities Act, and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Additionally, Ohio has established an information technology standard that specifies the minimum requirements for information security in all agencies and identifies the National Institute of Standards and Technology Special Publication 800-53, revision 3 (NIST 800-53) as the framework for information security controls implementation for the state. Early efforts are underway to initiate different projects that will address cross-agency and global data system oversight requirements.

Cross-Agency Memorandum of Understanding on Data Sharing and Use

Ohio's participating state agencies are finalizing a general data sharing memorandum of understanding for the agencies cooperating on the Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge grant. The memorandum is drafted as a general data sharing agreement between the agencies that will provide a framework and overall commitment for sharing data. As previously described, it also will allow each agency to sit on the data governance and executive committees established to provide oversight and make decisions as to the use, protection and reporting of the data.

Strategies to Ensure Measurable Progress

Recent changes to state policies, such as requiring a statewide student identification number for early childhood publicly funded programs, are establishing a foundation for enabling data linkages, integration and sharing that have not been possible in the past. State of Ohio initiatives such as the Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge work and the Integrated Eligibility and Health and Human Services Business Intelligence Project will establish the technical infrastructure and capabilities for supporting cross-system data sharing and integration on a statewide basis. To support this focus and investment, various projects described above were initiated or continued through the reporting year. These projects will create the foundation needed to support an enterprise-level and cross-agency early learning and data sharing system.

Data Tables

Commitment to early learning and development.

In the tables that follow, provide updated data on the State's commitment to early learning and development as demonstrated in Section A(1) of the State's RTT-ELC application. Tables A(1) -1 through 3 should be updated with current data. Tables 4 and 5 should provide data for the reporting year as well as previous years of the grant. Tables 6 and 7 may be updated only where significant changes have occurred (if no changes have occurred, you should note that fact).

Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income¹ families, by age		
	Number of children from Low-Income families in the State	Children from Low-Income families as a percentage of all children in the State
Infants under age 1		
Toddlers ages 1 through 2	194,193	24%
Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry	218,336	26%
Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families	412,529	50%

¹ Low-Income is defined as having an income of up to 200% of the Federal poverty rate.

Data Table A(1)-1 Data Notes

Enter text here to indicate data source and clarify or explain any of these data if needed.

National Center for Children in Poverty, 50-State Data reports calculated from the 2013 American Community Survey, representing information from 2013.

*The 194,194 number represents all children infant - age 2, as this number was not available separated into infants under age 1 and toddlers age 1 through 2.

Table (A)(1)-2: Special populations of Children with High Needs

The State should use these data to guide its thinking about where specific activities may be required to address special populations' unique needs.

Special populations: Children who	Number of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who...	Percentage of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who...
Have disabilities or developmental delays ¹	32,576	4.68%
Are English learners ²	10,763	1.55%
Reside on "Indian Lands"	0	0%
Are migrant ³	606	0.09%
Are homeless ⁴	6,828	0.98%
Are in foster care	13,579	1.95%
Other 1 as identified by the State		
<i>Describe:</i>		
Other 2 as identified by the State		
<i>Describe:</i>		

¹For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children with disabilities or developmental delays are defined as children birth through kindergarten entry that have an Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) or an Individual Education Plan (IEP).

²For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children who are English learners are children birth through kindergarten entry who have home languages other than English.

³For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children who are migrant are children birth through kindergarten entry who meet the definition of "migratory child" in ESEA section 1309(2).

⁴The term "homeless children" has the meaning given the term "homeless children and youths" in section 725(2) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (425 U.S.C. 11434a(2)).

Data Table A(1)-2 Data Notes

Enter text here to indicate data source and clarify or explain any of these data if needed.

The population under 5 years old in Ohio is from US Census Bureau, using 2010 actual counts and 2014 projected estimates.

Migrant data is from the 2014-2015 Head Start Program Information Report.

Foster care data is from the Office of Families and Children's BIC Placement Snapshot Report as of 12/31/15.

Table (A)(1)-3a: Participation of Children with High Needs in different types of Early Learning and Development Programs, by age

Note: A grand total is not included in this table since some children participate in multiple Early Learning and Development programs.

Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age				
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Infants under age 1	Toddlers ages 1 through 2	Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry	Total
State-funded preschool			14,765	14,765
<i>Specify:</i>	Early Childhood Education			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Slots offered statewide through Early Childhood Education Entitlement Grant for sch			
Early Head Start and Head Start¹	1,934	5,631	37,523	45,088
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Program Information Report 2014 - 2015			
Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619	1,389	8,768	22,411	32,568
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Part C Child Count Report December 2015 and December Child Count 12/1/15 (EMIS			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA		16	29,330	29,346
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	CSPR School Report for FY14 (FY15 not available until April 2016)			
Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	13,950	21,372	41,164	76,486
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Child Care Information Data Systems (CCIDS) - 2015			
Other 1	3,067	2,563		5,630
<i>Specify:</i>	Home Visiting			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	ODH - Early Track Child Count - 2015			
Other 2	145	1,354	15,175	16,674
<i>Specify:</i>	Mental Health Treatment from Public Mental Health System			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Community Service Data Fiscal 2015			
Other 3				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
Other 4				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
Other 5				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
Other 6				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				

Table (A)(1)-3a - Additional Other rows

Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age				
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Infants under age 1	Toddlers ages 1 through 2	Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry	Total
Other 7				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
Other 8				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
¹ Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.				

Data Table A(1)-3a Data Notes

Enter text here to clarify or explain any of these data if needed.

CCDF: The number used reflects the monthly averages for calendar year 2015 (January - December 2015).

Table (A)(1)-3b: Participation of Children in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State, by Race/Ethnicity

Note: Totals are not included in this table since some children participate in multiple Early Learning and Development programs.

Number of Children							
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Number of Hispanic Children	Number of Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Asian Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Black or African American	Number of Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Children of Two or more races	Number of Non-Hispanic White Children
State-funded preschool	785	16	192	2,479	10	971	9,076
<i>Specify:</i>	ECE						
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	4,370	314	450	15,710	98	4,491	22,685
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	374	37	185	1,530	25	484	7,522
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	1,093	17	378	2,624	19	1,037	17,243
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	1,567	23	248	5,916	23	1,545	20,054
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	4,088	88	243	43,321	29	7,175	23,844
Other 1	410	33	63	1,607	10	467	2,749
<i>Describe:</i>	Home Visiting						
Other 2	75	18	43	4,545	10	27	10,758
<i>Describe:</i>	Mental Health Treatment from Public Mental Health System						

¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

Table (A)(1)-3b - Additional Other rows

Number of Children

Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Number of Hispanic Children	Number of Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Asian Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Black or African American	Number of Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Children of Two or more races	Number of Non-Hispanic White Children
Other 3							
<i>Describe:</i>							
Other 4							
<i>Describe:</i>							
Other 5							
<i>Describe:</i>							
Other 6							
<i>Describe:</i>							
Other 7							
<i>Describe:</i>							
Other 8							
<i>Describe:</i>							

Data Table A(1)-3b Data Notes

Enter text here to indicate data source and clarify or explain any of these data if needed.

Due to data reporting rules, counts of less than 10 students have been entered as a count of 10.

Some of the Race/Ethnicity totals by program reported do not match the number of children served in table Table (A)(1)-3a. Data systems for the following programs: IDEA Part B; Title I of ESEA; CCDF and Home Visiting do not have an unduplicated count of children by Race/Ethnicity and a child may count in two different categories.

Due to Ohio Department of Education reporting period and finalization of data, state-funded preschool and programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619 are reported based on State Fiscal Year 2015, which ended June 30th 2015.

Race/ethnic categories collected by the ODMHAS system do not correspond to listed categories. 1277 children served were coded as Other in the ODMHAS system.

CCDF numbers are for children who received services in December of 2015. Table (A)(1)-3a reflects the monthly averages for calendar year 2015 (January - December 2015). Also, caretakers are not

required to identify a race/ethnicity so this table's total will not total Table (A)(1)-3a. '

Table (A)(1)-4: Data on funding for Early Learning and Development.

Note: For States that have a biennial State budget, please complete for all fiscal years for which State funds have been appropriated. We are not asking for forecasting, but for actual allocations. Therefore, States that do not have biennial budgets need not complete for years for which appropriations do not yet exist.

Funding for each Fiscal Year					
Type of investment	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start and Head Start¹	0	0	0	0	0
State-funded preschool	\$23,268,341	\$23,268,341	\$23,268,341	\$33,318,341	\$45,268,341
<i>Specify:</i>	ECE				
State contributions to IDEA Part C	\$9,933,144	\$10,105,050	\$10,279,696	\$11,597,277	\$9,573,433
State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry	\$85,459,542	\$85,459,542	\$103,000,000	\$103,000,000	\$104,000,000
Total State contributions to CCDF²	\$84,732,478	\$84,682,658	\$84,732,730	\$84,713,372	\$84,713,372
State match to CCDF Exceeded / Met / Not Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
<i>If exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded</i>					
TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs³	\$261,614,496	\$251,657,792	\$257,665,313	\$195,953,249	\$140,497,836
Other State contributions 1	\$27,716,856	\$23,568,495	\$23,393,877	\$30,284,782	\$15,935,879
<i>Specify:</i>	Help Me Grow (non-Part C)				
Other State contributions 2	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$252,130	0
<i>Specify:</i>	Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation				
Other State contributions 3	\$133,131,501	\$123,643,393	\$123,596,474	\$123,578,549	\$101,820,680
<i>Specify:</i>	State GRF - ALI Early Care and Education used for Publicly Funded Child Care				
Other State contributions 4					
<i>Specify:</i>					
Other State contributions 5					
<i>Specify:</i>					
Other State contributions 6					
<i>Specify:</i>					

Table (A)(1)-4 - Additional Other rows

Funding for each Fiscal Year

Type of investment	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
Other State contributions 7					
<i>Specify:</i>					
Other State contributions 8					
<i>Specify:</i>					
Total State contributions:	\$626,056,358	\$602,585,271	\$626,136,431	\$582,697,700	

¹ Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.

² Total State contributions to CCDF must include Maintenance of Effort (MOE), State Match, and any State contributions exceeding State MOE or Match.

³ Include TANF transfers to CCDF as well as direct TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs.

Data Table A(1)-4 Data Notes

Enter text here to indicate data source and clarify or explain any of these data, including the State's fiscal year end date.

The funding information provided for Year Four is for State Fiscal Year 2015 which runs July 1, 2014 - June 30, 2015.

Table (A)(1)-5: Historical data on the participation of Children with High Needs in Early Learning and Development Programs in the State

Note: Totals are not included in this table since some children participate in multiple Early Learning and Development programs. However, the current year should match the program totals reported in Table (A)(1)-3a.

Total number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program¹					
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
State-funded preschool <i>(annual census count; e.g., October 1 count)</i>	5,700	5,700	5,700	11,090	14,765
<i>Specify:</i>	Early Childhood Education				
Early Head Start and Head Start² <i>(funded enrollment)</i>	39,383	39,181	39,106	41,283	45,088
Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619 <i>(annual December 1 count)</i>	37,256	36,886	35,121	33,154	32,568
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA <i>(total number of children who receive Title I services annually, as reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report)</i>	21,658	25,727	26,309	27,229	29,346
Programs receiving CCDF funds <i>(average monthly served)</i>	62,920	77,774	78,227	77,500	76,486
Other 1	7,881	6,133	5,007	4,866	5,630
<i>Describe:</i>	Home Visiting Program				
Other 2	13,281	14,114	15,616	15,930	16,674
<i>Describe:</i>	Mental Health Treatment from Public Mental Health System				
Other 3					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 4					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 5					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 6					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 7					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 8					
<i>Describe:</i>					

¹ Include all Children with High Needs served with both Federal dollars and State supplemental dollars.

² Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.

Data Table A(1)-5 Data Notes

Enter text here to indicate data source and clarify or explain any of these data if needed. Include current year if data are available.

In Years 1 and 2, state-funded preschool was reported out using State Fiscal Year information. In an effort to report out on the most current data for highly rated programs and to better align with the other agencies' data in this table, the data provided for Years 3 and 4 for these programs represents the 2014 and 2015 calendar years respectively.

CCDF numbers are for children who received services in December of 2015.

Table (A)(1)-6: Current status of the State's Early Learning and Development Standards

Please place an "X" in the boxes to indicate where the State's Early Learning and Development Standards address the different age groups by Essential Domain of School Readiness.

Essential Domains of School Readiness	Age Groups		
	Infants	Toddlers	Preschoolers
Language and literacy development	X	X	X
Cognition and general knowledge (including early math and early scientific development)	X	X	X
Approaches toward learning	X	X	X
Physical well-being and motor development	X	X	X
Social and emotional development	X	X	X

Data Table A(1)-6 Notes

Enter text to explain or clarify information as needed.

There have been no changes to this table for 2015.

The State Board of Education adopted Ohio's Birth to Kindergarten Entry Early Learning and Development Standards in October of 2012 which address all Essential Domains of School Readiness.

Table (A)(1)-7: Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State.

Please place an "X" in the boxes to indicate where an element of a Comprehensive Assessment System is currently required.

Types of programs or systems	Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System				
	Screening Measures	Formative Assessments	Measures of Environmental Quality	Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions	Other
State-funded preschool	X	X	X	X	
<i>Specify:</i>					
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	X	X		X	
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	X	X	X		
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	X	X	X	X	
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	X				
Programs receiving CCDF funds	X				
Current Quality Rating and Improvement System requirements (Specify by tier)					
Tier 1					
Tier 2			X	X	
Tier 3	X	X	X	X	
Tier 4	X	X	X	X	
Tier 5	X	X	X	X	
State licensing requirements	X				
Other 1	X				
<i>Describe:</i>	Home Visiting Evidence-based parent education programs				
Other 2	X	X	X		
<i>Describe:</i>	Early Health Mental Consultation				
Other 3					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 4					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 5					
<i>Describe:</i>					
¹ Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.					

Table (A)(1)-7 - Additional Other rows'

Types of programs or systems	Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System'				
	Screening Measures	Formative Assessments	Measures of Environmental Quality	Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions	Other
Other 6					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 7					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 8					
<i>Describe:</i>					

Data Table A(1)-7 Notes

Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data if needed.

There have been no changes to this table for 2015.'

Budget and Expenditures

Budget Summary Table Narrative

Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

Please see the individual Project Budget Narrative questions for an explanation for each project. '

Budget Summary Table Explanation of Changes

Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

Ohio is currently reviewing all project funds and the Ohio grant leadership team will review and recommend modifications to the budget based on Ohio's early learning reform agenda and priorities of the Governor's Office. The 2016 Budget includes initial projections for no cost extensions approved in 2015. Ohio will seek a budget amendment for any substantive changes following rules and requirements established by US Departments of Education and Health and Human Services.

Project Budget 1

Project Name: Grants Management

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

Project 1 was underspent in Year 4 due to a delay in roll-out of the Family and Community Engagement work. Ohio requested and received a re-allocation around this project late in 2014. While weekly meetings have been occurring, hiring staff to run the Family and Community Engagement work has not yet been successful. All unspent funds have been included in the no-cost extension requested and approved and will be spent as staff and contractors are hired and deployed into the twelve high-needs areas.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

Ohio is currently reviewing all project funds and the Ohio grant leadership team will review and recommend modifications to the budget based on Ohio's early learning reform agenda and priorities of the Governor's Office. The 2016 Budget includes initial projections for no cost extensions approved in 2015. Ohio will seek a budget amendment for any substantive changes following rules and requirements established by US Departments of Education and Health and Human Services.

Per the July 20, 2015 approved No Cost Extension amendment, \$414,886 will be used to continue to allow the project management team to provide leadership, direction, monitoring and support of approved grant activities.

Project Budget 2

Project Name: Validation and Consumer Education

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

The validation study was awarded to Compass Evaluation and Research at the end of year four of the grant. The funds from this project will be reallocated to year five of the grant, and used for the same project. Additionally, the vendor is billing at a slower than anticipated time-frame but all funds have been obligated and are expected to be spent in this project as projected.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

Ohio is currently reviewing all project funds and the Ohio grant leadership team will review and recommend modifications to the budget based on Ohio's early learning reform agenda and priorities of the Governor's Office. The 2016 Budget includes initial projections for no cost extensions approved in 2015. Ohio will seek a budget amendment for any substantive changes following rules and requirements established by US Departments of Education and Health and Human Services.

Per the July 20, 2015 approved No Cost Extension amendment, up to \$800,000 will be used to complete Ohio's validation and evaluation study of Step up to Quality.

Project Budget 3

Project Name: Increase Access to High Quality Programs

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

Due to staff turnover, personnel costs including fringe benefits, travel, and the restructuring of the funding formula for Quality Achievement Awards the funds were not fully expended as originally anticipated. The funds from this project will be reallocated to year five of the grant, and used for the project.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

Ohio is currently reviewing all project funds and the Ohio grant leadership team will review and recommend modifications to the budget based on Ohio's early learning reform agenda and priorities of the Governor's Office. The 2016 Budget includes initial projections for no cost extensions approved in 2015. Ohio will seek a budget amendment for any substantive changes following rules and requirements established by US Departments of Education and Health and Human Services.

Per the September 2, 2015 approved No Cost Extension amendment, Ohio will continue to support the continued growth of the State's expanded but still voluntary SUTQ tiered quality rating and improvement system for all early childhood programs. Specifically, Ohio will use up to \$352,600 to continue support for four ODJFS staff positions. In addition, Ohio will use up to \$2,900,000 to continue contracts with 12 Resource and Referral Agencies to allow them to continue to provide technical assistance to programs participating in SUTQ.

Project Budget 4

Project Name: Maryland Collaboration

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

Less funding than expected was used to support personnel for this project in 2015. This is primarily because positions were not filled until June and November. Slightly more funds than originally planned for were spent on the contract and supplies. These increases did not compensate for the lower amounts spent in other areas, however.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

Ohio is currently reviewing all project funds and the Ohio grant leadership team will review and recommend modifications to the budget based on Ohio's early learning reform agenda and priorities of the Governor's Office. The 2016 Budget includes initial projections for no cost extensions approved in 2015. Ohio will seek a budget amendment for any substantive changes following rules and requirements established by US Departments of Education and Health and Human Services.

Per the November 20, 2015 approved No Cost Extension amendment, Ohio will use funding to continue the collaboration with Maryland on components of a Comprehensive Assessment System (CAS) for young children. Specifically Ohio will use up to \$1,494,663 to continue work including updating the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment based on lessons learned in the first two years; completing an external evaluation of the professional development (PD) created for the CAS; and engaging trainers for the Early Learning Assessment (ELA) non-paper launch.

Project Budget 5

Project Name: Professional Development and Formative Instruction Modules

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

Project 5 came in just under budget due to timelines associated with completing the work of the formative assessment professional development modules. The procurement took longer than expected, but the work was completed during Grant Year 4 and is now complete.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

This project's grant activities have been completed and it is not being extended into Grant Year 5. The unspent funds will be re-allocated when Ohio submits a re-allocation request in early Spring 2016.

Project Budget 6

Project Name: Professional Development Coordination

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

Project 6 has many activities within it which were successfully completed during Grant Year 4. Of the almost \$6 million budgeted, 92% was spent during the reporting period. The discrepancy in funds spent from those budgeted was due to slight underspending across the many contracts included in this project.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

Ohio is currently reviewing all project funds and the Ohio grant leadership team will review and recommend modifications to the budget based on Ohio's early learning reform agenda and priorities of the Governor's Office. The 2016 Budget includes initial projections for no cost extensions approved in 2015. Ohio will seek a budget amendment for any substantive changes following rules and requirements established by US Departments of Education and Health and Human Services.

Per the November 20, 2015 approved No Cost Extension amendment, Ohio will use up to \$1,551,819.15 to continue work, including: employing trainers; completing an external validation of the Comprehensive Professional Development System (CPDS), and supporting PD system deliverers such as Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies, State Support Teams, and Health Promotion Consultants.

Project Budget 7'

Project Name: Measures of Quality'

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

Project 7 came in slightly under budget for the reporting period, which can be explained with transitions of personnel. As we draw certain projects to a close, personnel paid on the projects have been moved to other funding sources, resulting in a slight balance of funds unspent.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

Ohio is currently reviewing all project funds and the Ohio grant leadership team will review and recommend modifications to the budget based on Ohio's early learning reform agenda and priorities of the Governor's Office. The 2016 Budget includes initial projections for no cost extensions approved in 2015. Ohio will seek a budget amendment for any substantive changes following rules and requirements established by US Departments of Education and Health and Human Services.

Per the November 20, 2015 approved No Cost Extension amendment, Ohio will complete development of the PD system in 2016, and will use up to \$78,584.02 to implement training using the newly developed PD. The remaining unspent funds in project 7 will be part of Ohio's re-allocation request in early Spring 2016.

Project Budget 8

Project Name: Progression of Credentials

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

In year four, this project did not include any grant funds. '

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

This project is complete and it is not being extended in 2016.

Project Budget 9

Project Name: Alignment with Ohio's Core Knowledge and Competencies (CKC)

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

In year four, this project did not include any grant funds.'

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

Ohio is currently reviewing all project funds and the Ohio grant leadership team will review and recommend modifications to the budget based on Ohio's early learning reform agenda and priorities of the Governor's Office. The 2016 Budget includes initial projections for no cost extensions approved in 2015. Ohio will seek a budget amendment for any substantive changes following rules and requirements established by US Departments of Education and Health and Human Services.

Per the September 2, 2015 approved No Cost Extension amendment, Ohio will use up to \$10,000 to revise the Instructor Manual for individuals who offer Ohio Approved early childhood professional development; and to produce materials to introduce and train people on Ohio's newly revised Core Knowledge and Competencies for Early Childhood Professionals.

Project Budget 10

Project Name: Child Link System

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

Actual for Contractual line was \$58,000 less than budgeted, because the BA/QA contract resource at ODE did not work/bill as much as expected on the OCLQS project.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

Ohio is currently reviewing all project funds and the Ohio grant leadership team will review and recommend modifications to the budget based on Ohio's early learning reform agenda and priorities of the Governor's Office. The 2016 Budget includes initial projections for no cost extensions approved in 2015. Ohio will seek a budget amendment for any substantive changes following rules and requirements established by US Departments of Education and Health and Human Services.

Per the November 20, 2015 approved No Cost Extension amendment, Ohio will use up to \$320,000 to continue funding for project management and technical staff to complete data system work, including: interfacing with the Statewide Student Identification (SSID) system to facilitate the assignment of SSIDs to children served by Ohio's publicly funded early childhood programs; cross agency work around a data integration system; and cross agency work to continue development of a licensing database.

Project Budget 11

Project Name: Re-engineer Step Up To Quality and Licensing Database

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

Due to additional enhancements that are being made to the data system, to support both departments in the work of assessing and verifying quality and essential health and safety regulations, the costs of this project were higher than anticipated in year four of the grant. . Based on projections for year five in this project, funds were reallocated from the supplies and other line items to the personnel, fringe and travel line items for year three expenditures and year four projected budget.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

Ohio is currently reviewing all project funds and the Ohio grant leadership team will review and recommend modifications to the budget based on Ohio's early learning reform agenda and priorities of the Governor's Office. The 2016 Budget includes initial projections for no cost extensions approved in 2015. Ohio will seek a budget amendment for any substantive changes following rules and requirements established by US Departments of Education and Health and Human Services.

Per the September 2, 2015 approved No Cost Extension amendment, Ohio will use up to \$712,000 to retain seven staff to complete the Ohio Child Licensing and Quality System.

Project Budget 12

Project Name: Child Assessment System

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

Due to delays in the development of the Early Learning Assessment, work on this project was not completed in year four as originally anticipated. All funds are expected to be spent in this project as projected. Therefore, all unspent funds from year four will be shifted to year five of the grant, and used for the same project.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

Ohio is currently reviewing all project funds and the Ohio grant leadership team will review and recommend modifications to the budget based on Ohio's early learning reform agenda and priorities of the Governor's Office. The 2016 Budget includes initial projections for no cost extensions approved in 2015. Ohio will seek a budget amendment for any substantive changes following rules and requirements established by US Departments of Education and Health and Human Services.

Per the September 2, 2015 approved No Cost Extension amendment, Ohio will use up to \$312,329 to continue work to complete the interface between Ohio's Ready for Kindergarten and existing databases in ODJFS. Specifically, funds will be used to retain two staff members and continue a contract with a vendor.

Project Budget 13

Project Name: Sustain in the Early Grades

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

Recruiting families continues to be challenging for the initiative. The grantee continues to adapt ' recruitment strategies and all unspent funds are expected to be expended as originally planned. '

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

Ohio is currently reviewing all project funds and the Ohio grant leadership team will review and recommend modifications to the budget based on Ohio's early learning reform agenda and priorities of the Governor's Office. The 2016 Budget includes initial projections for no cost extensions approved in 2015. Ohio will seek a budget amendment for any substantive changes following rules and requirements established by US Departments of Education and Health and Human Services.

Per the September 2, 2015 approved No Cost Extension amendment, Ohio will use up to \$137,287 to continue successful SPARK (Supporting Partnerships to Assure Ready Kids) programs to extend school-readiness services to an additional 75 children and families in high need rural areas of two Ohio Counties.

Project Budget 14

Project Name: _____

Project Budget Narrative

For this project, please provide an explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and expenditures for the reporting year.

THE OHIO RTT-ELC APPLICATION INCLUDED 13 PROJECTS.
PAGES 83-98 HAVE BEEN DELETED.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

For this project, please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

RTT-ELC Budget Summary of Actual Expenditures

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$152,969.00	\$825,498.59	\$1,072,414.08	\$0.00	\$2,050,881.67
2. Fringe Benefits	\$76,980.00	\$315,818.56	\$399,558.48	\$0.00	\$792,357.04
3. Travel	\$7,269.00	\$12,852.64	\$15,502.90	\$0.00	\$35,624.54
4. Equipment	\$1,534.00	\$8,589.23	\$1,260.59	\$0.00	\$11,383.82
5. Supplies	\$1,593.00	\$3,435.79	\$2,359.84	\$0.00	\$7,388.63
6. Contractual	\$180,181.00	\$13,932,336.78	\$13,284,018.45	\$0.00	\$27,396,536.23
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$309,190.91	\$345,392.23	\$0.00	\$654,583.14
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$420,526.00	\$15,407,722.50	\$15,120,506.57	\$0.00	\$30,948,755.07
10. Indirect Costs*	\$7,236.00	\$37,250.58	\$50,068.88	\$0.00	\$94,555.46
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$120,000.00	\$1,112,363.00	\$1,138,123.00	\$0.00	\$2,370,486.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$2,650.00	\$3,747.04	\$1,148.49	\$0.00	\$7,545.53
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$550,412.00	\$16,561,083.12	\$16,309,846.94	\$0.00	\$33,421,342.06
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$20,789,145.00	\$24,107,285.48	\$27,485,639.21	\$0.00	\$72,382,069.69
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$21,339,557.00	\$40,668,368.60	\$43,795,486.15	\$0.00	\$105,803,411.75

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Actual Expenditures for Project 1 - Grants Management

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$26,283.00	\$74,022.80	\$93,362.02	\$109,614.27	\$303,282.09
2. Fringe Benefits	\$1,343.00	\$0.00	\$2,377.53	\$8,764.41	\$12,484.94
3. Travel	\$1,534.00	\$4,180.28	\$952.95	\$1,599.21	\$8,266.44
4. Equipment	\$1,019.00	\$305.09	\$148.27	\$274.01	\$1,746.37
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$36,365.00	\$210,255.12	\$346,966.06	\$593,586.18
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.02	\$0.02
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$19,726.95	\$34,174.41	\$6,035.49	\$59,936.85
8. Other	\$84,391.00	\$325,979.36	\$583,313.08	\$709,187.92	\$1,702,871.36
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$1,777.00	\$13,135.80	\$28,350.88	\$58,866.71	\$102,130.39
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$2,650.00	\$3,747.04	\$1,148.49	\$0.00	\$7,545.53
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$88,818.00	\$342,862.20	\$612,812.45	\$768,054.63	\$1,812,547.28
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$88,818.00	\$342,862.20	\$612,812.45	\$768,054.63	\$1,812,547.28
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Actual Expenditures for Project 2 - External Validation and Consumer Education

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$50,000.00	\$47,000.00	\$0.00	\$97,000.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$50,000.00	\$47,000.00	\$0.00	\$97,000.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$50,000.00	\$47,000.00	\$0.00	\$97,000.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$5,804.00	\$53,616.00	\$78,511.19	\$6,511.19	\$144,442.38
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$5,804.00	\$103,616.00	\$125,511.19	\$6,511.19	\$241,442.38
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Actual Expenditures for Project 3 - Increase Access to High Quality Programs

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$34,440.68	\$74,291.16	\$105,858.56	\$214,590.40
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$5,403.66	\$4,004.00	\$2,936.20	\$12,343.86
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$307.64	\$0.00	\$307.64
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7.75	\$0.10	\$7.85
5. Supplies	\$32,090.00	\$4,215,960.67	\$6,570,532.41	\$0.00	\$10,818,583.08
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.06	\$0.06
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,748,711.02	\$3,748,711.02
8. Other	\$32,090.00	\$4,332,893.57	\$6,818,819.69	\$4,096,721.46	\$15,280,524.72
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$32,090.00	\$4,332,893.57	\$6,818,819.69	\$4,096,721.46	\$15,280,524.72
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$18,629,917.00	\$17,883,100.77	\$24,464,865.52	\$16,258,286.83	\$77,236,170.12
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$18,662,007.00	\$22,215,994.34	\$31,283,685.21	\$20,355,008.29	\$92,516,694.84
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Actual Expenditures for Project 4 - Maryland Collaboration

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$11,376.00	\$16,383.00	\$14,769.03	\$5,530.75	\$48,058.78
2. Fringe Benefits	\$5,294.00	\$4,605.45	\$3,629.83	\$5,010.42	\$18,539.70
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$1,469.97	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,469.97
4. Equipment	\$495.00	\$493.67	\$669.13	\$2,417.62	\$4,075.42
5. Supplies	\$85,500.00	\$1,417,290.80	\$732,700.72	\$1,909,179.20	\$4,144,670.72
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$15,369.25	\$3,715.26	\$483.37	\$19,567.88
8. Other	\$125,170.00	\$1,502,294.87	\$796,117.19	\$1,934,560.65	\$4,358,142.71
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$1,869.00	\$8,263.31	\$7,011.70	\$12,895.14	\$30,039.15
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$127,039.00	\$1,510,558.18	\$803,128.89	\$1,947,455.79	\$4,388,181.86
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$403,307.00	\$700,692.75	\$1,155,000.00	\$0.00	\$2,258,999.75
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$530,346.00	\$2,211,250.93	\$1,958,128.89	\$1,947,455.79	\$6,647,181.61
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Actual Expenditures for Project 5 - Professional Development and Formative Instruction Modules

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$618,630.00	\$618,630.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$618,630.00	\$618,630.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$300.00	\$300.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$618,930.00	\$618,930.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$103,167.00	\$1,269,952.65	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,373,119.65
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$103,167.00	\$1,269,952.65	\$0.00	\$618,930.00	\$1,992,049.65
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Actual Expenditures for Project 6 - Professional Development Coordination

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$10,938.00	\$16,264.79	\$15,127.76	\$5,734.81	\$48,065.36
2. Fringe Benefits	\$371.00	\$1,754.45	\$2,234.46	\$1,195.36	\$5,555.27
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$1,469.00	\$0.00	\$35.18	\$1,504.18
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$1,469.98	\$145.76	\$86,439.18	\$88,054.92
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$4,068,373.69	\$2,924,439.04	\$4,007,767.98	\$11,000,580.71
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$13,562.83	\$46,720.64	\$532.33	\$60,815.80
8. Other	\$32,672.00	\$4,148,356.08	\$3,031,965.34	\$4,114,760.62	\$11,327,754.04
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$1,769.00	\$7,910.44	\$7,350.30	\$33,889.00	\$50,918.74
10. Indirect Costs*	\$120,000.00	\$1,112,363.00	\$1,138,123.00	\$1,041,338.00	\$3,411,824.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$154,441.00	\$5,268,629.52	\$4,177,438.64	\$5,189,987.62	\$14,790,496.78
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$1,425,162.00	\$1,931,936.36	\$1,787,262.50	\$18,029.06	\$5,162,389.92
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$1,579,603.00	\$7,200,565.88	\$5,964,701.14	\$5,208,016.68	\$19,952,886.70
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Actual Expenditures for Project 7 - Measures of Quality

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$11,163.00	\$16,292.20	\$15,136.52	\$5,621.24	\$48,212.96
2. Fringe Benefits	\$261.00	\$1,089.08	\$1,956.17	\$1,339.96	\$4,646.21
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$1,469.98	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,469.98
4. Equipment	\$79.00	\$1,167.05	\$408.23	\$0.00	\$1,654.28
5. Supplies	\$148.00	\$104,032.54	\$284,536.90	\$379,696.15	\$768,413.59
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$13,595.88	\$13,845.92	\$497.60	\$27,939.40
8. Other	\$33,393.00	\$183,392.05	\$359,157.97	\$399,469.45	\$975,412.47
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$1,821.00	\$7,941.03	\$7,356.00	\$15,415.99	\$32,534.02
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$35,214.00	\$191,333.08	\$366,513.97	\$414,885.44	\$1,007,946.49
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$35,214.00	\$191,333.08	\$366,513.97	\$414,885.44	\$1,007,946.49
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Actual Expenditures for Project 8 - Progression of Credentials

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$34,656.25	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$34,656.25
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$34,656.25	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$34,656.25
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Actual Expenditures for Project 9 - Align Ohio CKC

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$175,199.78	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$175,199.78
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$175,199.78	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$175,199.78
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Actual Expenditures for Project 10 - Child Link

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$62,443.00	\$235,644.68	\$430,854.29	\$277,380.71	\$1,006,322.68
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$62,443.00	\$235,644.68	\$430,854.29	\$277,380.71	\$1,006,322.68
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$953.22	\$953.22
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$62,443.00	\$235,644.68	\$430,854.29	\$278,333.93	\$1,007,275.90
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$221,788.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$221,788.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$284,231.00	\$235,644.68	\$430,854.29	\$278,333.93	\$1,229,063.90
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Actual Expenditures for Project 11 - Reengineer SUTQ and Licensing Database

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$12,915.00	\$142,189.64	\$180,428.89	\$258,149.99	\$593,683.52
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$975.68	\$712.50	\$1,688.18
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$980.70	\$920.07	\$1,900.77
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$3,232,131.92	\$1,752,693.95	\$5,020,729.36	\$10,005,555.23
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$49.82	\$49.82
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$246,936.00	\$246,936.00	\$246,936.00	\$740,808.00
8. Other	\$37,775.00	\$4,000,674.58	\$2,697,982.58	\$6,259,614.02	\$12,996,046.18
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$37,775.00	\$4,000,674.58	\$2,697,982.58	\$6,259,614.02	\$12,996,046.18
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$2,058,130.92	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,058,130.92
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$37,775.00	\$6,058,805.50	\$2,697,982.58	\$6,259,614.02	\$15,054,177.10
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Actual Expenditures for Project 12 - Child Assessment System

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$4,305.00	\$16,225.45	\$6,443.10	\$0.00	\$26,973.55
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$325.23	\$0.00	\$325.23
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$365,493.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$365,493.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$12,592.00	\$421,442.83	\$24,290.41	\$0.00	\$458,325.24
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$12,592.00	\$421,442.83	\$24,290.41	\$0.00	\$458,325.24
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$12,592.00	\$421,442.83	\$24,290.41	\$0.00	\$458,325.24
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Actual Expenditures for Project 13 - Sustain in the Early Grades

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$207,044.48	\$331,006.02	\$349,111.38	\$887,161.88
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$207,044.48	\$331,006.02	\$349,111.38	\$887,161.88
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,134.58	\$1,134.58
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$207,044.48	\$331,006.02	\$350,245.96	\$888,296.46
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$207,044.48	\$331,006.02	\$350,245.96	\$888,296.46
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Columns (a) through (d): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all grant years.

Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract included in line 6.

Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The State must set aside \$400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT-ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.

Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.

Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.