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## Introduction

### Program Overview and Requirements

The California Department of Education (CDE) invites eligible local educational agencies (LEAs), which includes school districts, county offices of education (COEs), and charter schools, or a consortium of the aforementioned entities, to apply for grant funding to:

1. Increase the number of highly-qualified California State Preschool Program (CSPP) and Transitional Kindergarten (TK) program teachers, and;
2. Increase specific competencies for CSPP, TK, and Kindergarten (K) teachers.

The Early Education Teacher Development (EETD) Grant Program is part of the California PreKindergarten (Pre-K) Planning and Implementation Grant Program, which also includes non-competitive apportionments to LEAs for Universal PreKindergarten (UPK) planning and implementation. The California Pre-K Planning and Implementation Grant Program was established with the goal of expanding access to classroom-based Pre-K programs at LEAs and to support costs associated with planning and implementing UPK. The EETD Grant Program provides funding on a competitive basis to LEAs to identify, recruit, and retain a robust early education workforce, as well as increase specific competencies for their workforce.

### Background

While preparing for full UPK implementation, there is a need to plan to increase the number of credentialed and permitted teachers entering the workforce to meet the growing needs and the professional development opportunities for the current workforce. The Budget Act of 2021 includes funding opportunities for workforce development, which includes investments for recruitment and retention to help increase the pipeline for the early education workforce. These additional workforce investments are described on the UPK Teacher Pipeline Resource Compendium <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/gs/p3/documents/upkteachercompendium.pdf>.

Research shows that a well-prepared, well-supported, and diverse early education workforce is essential in providing high-quality learning experiences for children. Children’s potential is maximized when they are provided with high-quality early education experiences. Research demonstrates that one of the most critical elements of quality early education is warm and nurturing teacher-child interactions provided by a well-trained early childhood educator. High-quality early educators have the knowledge and skills to provide engaging culturally and linguistically responsive learning experiences for all children.

California seeks to create equitable pathways for preparation, career development, and career advancement of educators across early education settings in order to ensure they reflect the racial and cultural diversity of the children served.

The availability of an early education workforce has been an ongoing challenge not just in California, but nationwide. California has a critical shortage of highly-skilled early educators, which impedes efforts to expand high-quality early education programs. The challenge was further exacerbated by the Coronavirus Disease 2019 pandemic, as California has seen unmet workforce needs across multiple sectors, including education and early learning and care.

### Authorization

The CDE is authorized to administer the EETD Grant Program through Chapter 2 of Part 6, Division 1 of Title 1 of the California *Education Code* (*EC*), Article 13.2, commencing with Section 8281.5. Full statutory language can be read in appendix A.

## Description

### Grant Information

This application covers the grant period beginning July 1, 2022, and ending June 30, 2025 (fiscal years [FYs] 2022–23, 2023–24, and 2024–25). Total available funding for the EETD Grant Program request for application (RFA) is $100 million.

Grant funding will be dispersed on a competitive basis to awarded LEAs based on the maximum funding allotment per county, over a three-year period. The maximum funding allotment available per county can be found in appendix C: County Funding Allocations.

The county allocation is based on the county-level data available to CDE using methodology pursuant to statutory language (*EC* Section 8281.5).

### Eligibility Requirements

In order to be eligible to apply for EETD Grant funding, LEAs operating a CSPP, TK, or K program, or that plan to operate a program, must have met the requirement of submitting a Letter of Intent (LOI), or be a member of a consortium who submitted an LOI, by the established deadline, which was February 2, 2022, by 5 p.m. A listing of eligible LEAs who submitted an LOI by the established deadline can be found on the EETD Grant Program’s RFA web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r2/eetdg22rfa.asp>.

Eligible LEAs must also submit a completed RFA to be eligible for funding consideration. An LEA may apply independently or on behalf of a consortium of LEAs or providers within the local area, which includes CSPP and Head Start programs that are operated by a community-based organization (CBO). If applying on behalf of a consortium of providers, the LEA must:

1. Remain in the consortium as the lead for the entire project period;
2. Act as the fiduciary agent, including compiling and submitting the consortium’s fiscal and programmatic information; and
3. Collect and submit any data from the other LEAs or providers, as required by the CDE.

### Allowable Activities and Costs

The EETD Grant funds must be used for any purposes consistent with activities that directly support workforce development and capacity building including, but not limited to, purposes specified in California *EC* Section 8281.5 (d)(6)(A-H):

* Tuition, supplies, and other related educational expenses
* Transportation and child care costs incurred as a result of attending classes
* Substitute teacher pay for CSPP, TK, and K professionals that are currently working in a CSPP, TK, or K classroom
* Stipends and professional development expenses, as determined by the Superintendent
* Career, course, and professional development coaching, counseling, and navigation services
* Linked courses, cohorts, or apprenticeship models
* Training and professional development for principals and other administrators of TK, K, and grades one through twelve, inclusive, on the value and tenets of effective instruction for young children
* Other educational expenses, as determined by the Superintendent

The EETD Grant funds must be used to supplement, not supplant, existing state or local workforce development resources. The CDE has final discretion as to whether use of funding is consistent with those expressed purposes.

Sample activities that can be funded through the EETD Grant include, but are not limited to: paying for a substitute teacher for a teacher who is attending child development classes to meet TK teacher requirements; sending directors, principals, and administrators to a training to discuss brain development for young four-year-old children; and sending a CBO CSPP teacher with a TK teacher to a training on providing updated inclusive guidance for their classrooms.

All applicants must comply with the Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audits Requirements for Federal Awards, found at the Title 2 *Code of the Federal Regulations*, Part 200, which can be found at <https://oag.ca.gov/ab1887>, in managing the grant.

In addition, all applicants must comply with the principles and standards specified in the most current California School Accounting Manual, which can be found at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/ac/sa/documents/csam2019complete.pdf>.

Applicant budgets for the use of the grant funds will be reviewed. Any items that are determined to be non-allowable, excessive, or inappropriate may disqualify the submitted RFA from consideration. Awarding funds pursuant to this RFA does not waive CDE's right to later disallow an expense that is not in line with the statutory uses of the money or the above guidance documents.

### Non-Allowable Activities and Costs

All expenditures must contribute to the activities listed above and be reasonable, necessary, and within the project proposal described in the application.

Additionally, funds may not be used for the development of new trainings, courses, or professional development content or the purchase of new technology unless the expense is submitted and pre-approved by the CDE to be a necessary and reasonable expense for the implementation of the grant (for example, altering existing content to make it credit-bearing, content that addresses gaps, or better meet the needs of the early education community).

Funded applicants that are not sure of pre-approval for a particular expense will be able to consult with the Early Education Division (EED) for technical assistance.

### Administrative Indirect Cost Rate

Indirect costs reflect general administration and overhead that cannot easily be charged as direct program costs of the programs or activities they benefit, and that are borne by a primary party as a result of activities it charges as direct costs. Indirect costs may not exceed the approved indirect cost rate for the fiscal year in which the funds are spent. For a consortium, only the lead agency of a consortium can charge indirect costs.

The LEA must limit total administrative indirect costs to the rate approved by the CDE for the applicable fiscal year in which the funds are spent. For a listing of indirect cost rates visit the CDE Indirect Cost Rates web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/ac/ic/>.

## Application Processes and Procedures

### Timeline\*

| **Key Events** | **Date** |
| --- | --- |
| LOI available | December 23, 2021 |
| LOI due by 5 p.m. | February 2, 2022 |
| RFA available | March 25, 2022 |
| RFA Informational Webinar | April 14, 2022 |
| Application due | May 13, 2022 |
| Application Checklist Screening Review | May 6–13, 2022 |
| Notification of Eligibility sent | May 25, 2022 |
| Appeals due by 5 p.m. | June 6, 2022 |
| Appeals Review | June 6–20, 2022 |
| Final Funding Awards posted | June 20, 2022 |
| Grant Award Notification (GAN) sent to eligible applicants for review and signature | June 20, 2022 |
| Signed GANs due to CDE | July 5, 2022 |
| Grant Award Funding Disbursement dispersed for year one | Four to six weeks after date on signed GAN |

**\*Dates subject to change by the CDE. For changes in any date information, visit the RFA web page at** <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r2/eetdg22rfa.asp>**.**

### Application Process

Prior to applying, applicants are strongly encouraged to review the RFA Overview and Instructions and the RFA, and consider all requirements for eligibility.

Each application submitted must include the following documents:

* **Section I:** Applicant Information
* **Section II:** Applicant Narrative
* **Section III:** Application Data
* **Section IV:** Application Budget
* **Section V:** Allocation Priority
* **Section VI:** Application Agreement and Certification

All applicants must submit one application by **Friday, May 13, 2022** to CDE via Snap Survey. Once the application is received, the applicant will automatically receive a notification that their application was submitted successfully.

Submissions received beyond May 13, 2022, and submissions from applicants that did not submit an LOI on time, will not be considered.

When submitting an application via Snap Survey, applicants must adhere to character limits for each applicable field. Responses that exceed the character limits will not be captured by the system and will not be reviewed.

If you do not intend to complete the RFA in one session, you must select the **Save Responses** button located on the bottom of the screen. Once selected, you will be redirected to a new browser window to enter your email address. You will receive an email with a unique web address for entrance back into the RFA. It is recommended that you save the application web address.

### Application Checklist Screening Review

Complete applications will be reviewed by the CDE and evaluated using the Scoring Rubric. Incomplete applications and applications not completed in accordance with the instructions and timelines may be disqualified.

The CDE will review all applications for completeness. Those applications that are incomplete will be disqualified. Disqualified applicants will be informed in writing of the reasons for the disqualification within two weeks. All applications not passing the screening process will be notified of their disqualification, with the reason for disqualification.

Applicants may dispute the disqualification within five business days following receipt of the notification of the disqualification by submitting an email to [UPKWorkforceRFA@cde.ca.gov](mailto:UPKWorkforceRFA@cde.ca.gov) stating the grounds upon which the CDE disqualified the applicant. In the email, the applicant must include a justification rebutting the disqualification. Appeals will be reviewed by CDE staff and all decisions will be final.

### Awarding of Funding

All applications that have passed the disqualification screening of the application checklist criteria will be reviewed by neutral readers with experience reviewing grant applications who will competitively score all sections, with the exception of Section V, to determine whether the application is qualified to receive funding. Reviewers will be instructed to assign points and determine passage in each section of the application as the criteria are met through the descriptions provided in the EETD Grant Scoring Rubric, provided in this RFA. The CDE will ensure that reviewers have no conflict of interest with the applicants.

Funding may only be awarded to applications that pass all required sections and which meet a threshold qualified score of 115 out of 165 total points on Sections II through IV (70 percent of the total score). All applicants will receive a Notice of Eligibility, informing the applicant of whether or not the application met the minimum score necessary to be eligible for funding and will be provided an opportunity to submit an appeal pursuant to Section F, Appeals Process.

Following any appeals, applicants that have been determined to meet the threshold qualified score will be scored on allocation priority points pursuant to Section V. Funding will then be awarded, within each county’s allocation, to applicants in rank order of total score on Section V until funding in that county is expended. If there is additional funding remaining in a county’s allocation after all eligible applicants have been funded, or a county either did not submit an eligible LOI in time or did not have an eligible applicant, the funds unspent will be collected and proportionality redistributed to counties that have run out of funding to award to all qualified applicants.

Do note that the Allocation Priority Section (Section V) of the application is required, and the CDE asks that all applicants complete the section of the application to the best of their ability. The CDE has the right to check this data to ensure it is accurate prior to making any awards.

### Technical Assistance

Questions regarding the application and its process can be submitted to [UPKworkforceRFA@cde.ca.gov](mailto:UPKWorkforceRFA@cde.ca.gov) with the LEA’s name in the subject line.

A Frequently Asked Questions section will be made available on the RFA web page, which is located at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r2/eetdg22rfa.asp>. Questions of a general theme will be answered; anything program specific that potentially could give an applicant an unfair advantage will not be answered.

The CDE will conduct an RFA informational webinar session to provide an overview of the RFA and offer potential applicants an opportunity to ask clarifying questions. This webinar will take place **Thursday,** **April 14, 2022 from 3:30 to 4:30 p.m.** Registration is located at ~~https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN\_u9MCOk\_NTGGECzglr50uzg~~ [Link no longer available].

### Appeals Process

After receiving the written Notification of Eligibility, applicants who wish to appeal their eligibility must submit a Letter of Appeal, which must be received by CDE no later than **10 business days** from Notification of Eligibility, to [UPKWorkforceRFA@cde.ca.gov](mailto:UPKWorkforceRFA@cde.ca.gov). The EETD Grant RFA web page includes the link to the electronic form to submit an appeal at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r2/eetdg22rfa.asp>.

In the case of a consortium, only the lead agency may electronically submit an appeal on behalf of the entire consortium.

**Appeals are limited to addressing how the CDE failed to correctly apply the standards for reviewing the application as specified in the RFA. Additional information will not be accepted.** Missing or incomplete documentation of the required elements cannot be the basis for an appeal. Late appeals will not be considered. Appeals will be reviewed by CDE staff within 10 business days and all decisions will be final.

Applicants may request reader comments on their applications by submitting a request to [UPKWorkforceRFA@cde.ca.gov](mailto:UPKWorkforceRFA@cde.ca.gov) no later than 10 business days following the Notification of Eligibility.

### Grant Award Notification

Applicants selected for funding will receive a GAN, the official CDE document that awards funds to local projects. The grantees must sign and return the notification to the CDE before funds are disbursed. Signature on the GAN indicates the awardee will comply with all the grant requirements.

### Accountability – Reporting Requirements

Ongoing communication with the CDE is an integral part of the reporting requirements. The grantees must participate in an orientation meeting and at least one meeting for each grant year, to be convened by the CDE. The CDE may provide opportunities for technical assistance during additional meetings.

Additionally, the following regular reporting must be completed and submitted by each grantee:

* A semi-annual fiscal activity report;
* An annual narrative progress report that includes a description of accomplishments, challenges, identified resources, effective practices, and next steps to be developed; and
* An annual program report including data on the implementation of the goals and activities described in the proposed plan.

If the required reports are not provided in a timely manner, program activities are not timely completed, or there is a lack of participation in meetings, the CDE may suspend funding to the grantee and, unless satisfactorily remedied, may terminate funding altogether.

## Early Education Teacher Development Grant Application

### Application Instructions

Prior to submitting an application, applicants are strongly encouraged to read the entire EETD Grant Program RFA. The following items must be completed for all sections, as outlined below. The applicant will use Snap Survey to input responses, which can be found on the grant’s RFA web page at [https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r2/eetdg22rfa.asp](https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r2/eetdg21rfa.asp).

The EETD grant application consists of the following sections:

1. Section I: Applicant Information (Required; Not Scored)
2. Section II: Application Program Narrative (Required; Worth up to 130 points)
3. Section III: Application Data
4. Data (Required; Not Scored)
5. Linking to the Data (Required; Worth up to 20 points)
6. Section IV: Application Budget
7. Budget Summary (Required; Not Scored)
8. Budget Narrative (Required; Worth up to 15 points)
9. Section V: Allocation Priority (Required; Worth up to 70 points; Not added to total score. Points are calculated to determine priority for funding only if the rest of the application meets the minimum criteria and achieves a total score of 115)
10. Section VI: Application Agreement and Certification (Required; Not Scored)

As a reminder, only applications that pass all required sections and earn a total score for Sections II through IV of 115 or higher (which is 70 percent of the total points possible of 165) will be eligible for funding. The CDE will then review Section V for all eligible applicants and award allocation priority points based on the applicant’s responses.

Please note that the CDE reserves the right to double check the accuracy of the data provided in Section V and to disallow any applications that contain data that is not accurate or cannot be confirmed.

The CDE will award funding within each county, at the full amount of each application’s requested amount, in order of each application’s allocation priority point total, with the highest allocation priority point applications funded first until all funding is exhausted.

If there is additional funding remaining in a county’s allocation after all eligible applicants have been funded, or a county either did not submit an eligible LOI in time or did not have an eligible applicant, the funds unspent will be collected and proportionality redistributed to counties that have run out of funding to award to all qualified applicants.

#### Section I: Applicant Information [Not Scored]

| **Application Field** | **Instructions** |
| --- | --- |
| **LEA or lead LEA applying on behalf of the consortium** | Provide the name of the entity applying for the grant |
| **Type of Entity Applying** | Select “School District”, “County Office of Education”, “Charter School”, or “Consortium” |
| **Point of Contact** | Insert the name of the person who has the authority to sign and engage with the CDE |
| **Point of Contact’s Office, Telephone Number, Extension (If Applicable), and Email Address** | Insert the office name, telephone number, extension number (if applicable), and email address of the Point of Contact |
| **Fiscal Contact** | Insert the name of the person who has the authority to sign and engage with the CDE |
| **Fiscal Contact’s Office, Telephone Number, Extension (If Applicable), and Email Address** | Insert the office name, telephone number, extension number (if applicable), and email address of the Point of Contact |
| **County** | Provide the applying entity’s county of service |
| **Consortium Members** **(If Applicable)** | If applicable, insert the names of the entities that are a part of the consortium, separated by a comma in between each agency |

#### Section II: Application Narrative [130 Points]

The following requirements must be adhered to for the Workforce and Professional Development written narratives.

1. Information included in the application must be relevant to the program being administered by the applicant.
2. Applicants are welcome to use responses developed or in development for their UPK Planning and Implementation Template to answer the questions raised in the narrative section. The template can be found on the UPK and TK web page at: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/gs/em/index.asp>.
3. Inclusion of false or misleading information is a cause for disqualification.
4. An application that is plagiarized in any part or form from another agency’s EETD Grant application will automatically be rejected.

**Workforce Increases – Worth up to 70 Points**

1. Describe in detail the LEA or consortium’s plan to increase the number of preliminary or clear credentialed teachers who meet the requirements for teaching TK (as defined by subdivision (g) of Section 48000 which can be found at <https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=8281.5.&lawCode=EDC>): (Applicants will have a limit of 2500 characters to complete this question)
2. The need for TK teachers in the region served by the LEA or consortium
3. The plan for recruiting TK teachers with experience in early education settings and how the LEA or consortium is best qualified to lead this plan
4. How the LEA or consortium works with or plans to work with institutions of higher education (IHEs) to create or deepen partnerships to ensure a qualified and diverse UPK teacher pipeline that includes TK teachers, and why the LEA or consortium is positioned to be a leader in this partnership
5. The plan to use and leverage this grant funding with other workforce funding resources, such as other grant programs the LEA is currently a part of, including but not limited to the UPK Planning and Implementation Grant apportionment, (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/gs/em/>) or any other funding resources listed on the *UPK Teacher Pipeline Compendium* (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/gs/p3/documents/upkteachercompendium.pdf>)
6. Describe in detail the LEA or consortium’s plan to increase the number of highly-qualified teachers to teach in a CSPP: (Applicants will have a limit of 2500 characters to complete this question)
7. The need for preschool teachers in the region served by the LEA or consortium
8. The plan for recruiting new CSPP teachers with experience in early education settings and how the LEA or consortium is best situated to lead this plan
9. How the LEA or consortium works with or plans to work with IHEs to create partnerships to ensure a qualified and diverse UPK teacher pipeline that includes CSPP teachers, and why the LEA or consortium is positioned to be a leader in this partnership
10. The plan to use and leverage this grant funding with other workforce funding resources, such as other grant programs the LEA is currently a part of, including but not limited to the UPK Planning and Implementation Grant apportionment, (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/gs/em/>) or any other funding resources listed on the *UPK Teacher Pipeline Compendium* (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/gs/p3/documents/upkteachercompendium.pdf>)

**Professional Development – Worth up to 60 points**

1. Describe in detail the LEA or consortium’s plan to increase the following competencies for CSPP, TK, and K teachers in the following areas: (Applicants will have a limit of 2500 characters to complete this question)
2. Providing instruction in inclusive classrooms
3. Providing culturally responsive instruction
4. Providing support for dual language or multilingual learners
5. Providing enhanced social-emotional learning
6. Implementing trauma or healing-informed and restorative practices
7. Mitigating implicit biases to eliminate exclusionary discipline
8. Describe in detail the LEA or consortium's needs and plans for each of the following items: (Applicants will have a limit of 2500 characters to complete this question)
9. The need for CSPP, TK, or K professional development in the region served by the LEA or consortium
10. The plan to integrate CSPP, TK, and K professional development opportunities and how the LEA or consortium is best situated to lead this plan
11. The plan to provide professional development to principals and administrators overseeing the UPK programs on the value and tenets of effective instruction for young children
12. The plan to partner with CBO CSPPs and Head Start programs in the LEA or consortium’s program area to ensure those teachers have access to professional development along with teachers employed by the LEA and how the LEA or consortium will lead this partnership
13. The LEA or consortium’s ability to connect the CSPP, TK, or K program to before- and after-school programs and extended-day services
14. The presence of, or plan to create, inclusive CSPP or TK programs within the LEA or consortium

#### Section III: Application Data [20 points]

Please provide data for the LEA or consortium using 2021–22 school year data for the LEA or consortium, as applicable, to support the Narrative in Section II.

The data provided will not be scored or monitored. However, it is required to justify the program narrative plans. The CDE will consider how well the applicant has used data to supplement and justify the program narrative plans in Section I. Please see the Linking the Data section for more information, which directly follows the data tables below.

Describe the CSPP workforce the LEA or consortium intends to serve.

| **Application Field** | **Instructions** |
| --- | --- |
| **How many CSPP teachers are currently employed by the LEA or consortium?** | Provide the total amount of CSPP teachers that are employed by your LEA or consortium. |
| **Number of CSPP teachers by permit status** | Provide a number next to each type of permit status. Each teacher is counted only once and should equal the total amount of CSPP teachers that are employed by your LEA or consortium. |
| **Number of Associate Permits** | Provide the number of CSPP teachers in your LEA or consortium who hold an Associate Permit. |
| **Number of Teacher Permits** | Provide the number of CSPP teachers in your LEA or consortium who hold a Teacher Permit. |
| **Number of Master Teacher Permits** | Provide the number of CSPP teachers in your LEA or consortium who hold a Master Teacher Permit. |
| **Number of Site Supervisor Permits** | Provide the number of CSPP teachers in your LEA or consortium who hold a Supervisor Permit. |
| **Number of Program Director Permits** | Provide the number of CSPP teachers in your LEA or consortium who hold a Program Director Permit. |
| **Number of Emergency or Waiver Permits** | Provide the number of CSPP teachers in your LEA or consortium who hold an Emergency or Waiver Permit. |
| **How many CSPP teacher positions are *unfilled* in the 2021–22 school year?** | Provide the number of CSPP teacher positions that are *unfilled*. |
| **How many total CSPP teachers are projected to be needed by 2025–26?** | Provide the number of CSPP teacher positions that are projected to be needed. |
| **How many *additional* teachers do you project you will need to hire by 2025–26, considering turnover, retirements, and so on?** | Provide the number of additional CSPP teachers who will be needed by 2025–26. |

Describe the credentialed TK workforce the LEA or consortium intends to serve.

| **Application Field** | **Instructions** |
| --- | --- |
| **How many credentialed TK teachers are currently employed by the LEA or consortium?** | Provide the total amount of credentialed TK teachers that are employed by your LEA or consortium. |
| **Number of credentialed TK teachers by credential type.** | Provide a number next to each type of credential type. Each teacher is counted only once and should equal the total amount of credentialed TK teachers that are employed by your LEA or consortium. |
| **Multiple Subject Teaching (with additional 24 early childhood education units)** | Provide the number of credentialed TK teachers in your LEA or consortium who hold a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential *with* additional 24 early childhood education units. |
| **Multiple Subject Teaching (without an additional 24 early childhood education units)** | Provide the number of credentialed TK teachers in your LEA or consortium who hold a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential *without* additional 24 early childhood education units. |
| **Preliminary** | Provide the number of credentialed TK teachers in your LEA or consortium who hold a Preliminary Credential. |
| **Less Than a Preliminary** | Provide the number of TK teachers in your LEA or consortium who hold less than a Preliminary Credential. |
| **Education Specialist** | Provide the number of credentialed TK teachers in your LEA or consortium who hold an Education Specialist Credential. |
| **How many credentialed TK teachers hold a bilingual authorization?** | Provide the number of credentialed TK teachers in your LEA or consortium that hold a bilingual authorization. |
| **How many credentialed TK teacher positions are *unfilled* in the 2021–22 school year?** | Provide the number of credentialed TK teacher positions that are *unfilled*. |
| **How many total credentialed TK teachers are projected to be needed by 2025–26?** | Provide the number of credentialed TK teacher positions that are projected to be needed. |
| **How many *additional* credentialed TK teachers do you project you will need to hire by 2025–26, considering turnover, retirements, and so on?** | Provide the number of *additional* credentialed TK teachers that will be needed by 2025–26. |

**Linking the Data – Worth 20 points**

Applicants must ensure that the data provided ties into their written plans. Applicants should ask themselves the following questions:

1. Did you ensure that written prompts in Section II, Numbers 1, 3, and 4 links to the data provided in the CSPP data section? Worth 10 points.
2. Did you ensure that written prompts in Section II, Numbers 2, 3, and 4 links to the data provided in the TK data section? Worth 10 points.

#### Section IV: Application Budget [15 Points]

A projected budget for each fiscal year of the entire grant period (July 1, 2022, through June 30, 2025) is required for the application.

Applicants must use the EETD Grant Proposed Budget Summary and Narrative documents available on the EETD Grant RFA web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r2/eetdg22rfa.asp>. Applicants will use the Proposed Budget Summary and Narrative and will attach it to their Snap Survey application.

**The Proposed Budget Summary** (Required; Not Scored)

Applicants must provide totals for each Object Code and should align with the Proposed Budget Detail. Applicants should group line items by the object code series and provide lines for object code totals. The Proposed Budget Summary includes three project years:

* **Project Year 1:** July 1, 2022, through June 30, 2023
* **Project Year 2:** July 1, 2023, through June 30, 2024
* **Project Year 3:** July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2025

**The Proposed Budget Narrative** (Required; Worth up to 15 points total)

Applicants must provide a completed Proposed Budget Narrative which will provide sufficient detail for each identified cost associated with implementing the proposed goals and activities, including why the costs are reasonable and necessary to support the proposal’s goals and activities.

Once the narrative section of the application has been scored by the readers, the CDE will review the budget for completion, cost-effectiveness, and the amount of details provided. Awarding of funding does not mean that all proposed costs must be approved as costs, as they must first be permitted by statutory and regulatory authority.

#### Section V: Allocation Priority [70 Points]

**This section will only be scored IF the application has met the minimum threshold score of 115 once all appeals have been heard. Therefore, although this section is required, not all applications will have this section scored.**

The goal of this section is to elevate the statutory targeted student population need alongside an LEA’s workforce needs as required by *EC* Section 8281.5(d)(5).

Describe the student population the LEA or consortium intends to serve using the 2021–22 fiscal year data, unless otherwise noted. This includes children that are currently being served or, if applying for additional program expansion funding in fiscal year 2021–22, also includes the numbers of those planning to be served in full-day CSPP, TK, or K programs offered by the LEA or CBO.

| **Application Field** | **Instructions** |
| --- | --- |
| **The extent to which the LEA or consortium is located in a county(ies) that has more than three young children, three to five years of age, inclusive, for every licensed childcare slot.\*** | Provide either a **yes** or **no** response. |
| **What percentage of children will be served in the 2021**–**22 fiscal year by age?** | Provide the percentage of children that will be served in 2021–22 by the following ages: three, four, and five. Applicants will use the definitions of ages from *EC* Section 8208 (ai) and (aj). |
| **Three-year-old children** | Provide the percentage of three-year-old children that will be served. |
| **Four-year-old children** | Provide the percentage of four-year-old children that will be served. |
| **Five-year-old children** | Provide the percentage of five-year-old children that will be served. |
| **What percentage of children were eligible for Free and Reduced-price Meals (FRPM) in TK and K in the 2019–20 school year?** | Provide the percentage of children who were eligible for FRPM in TK and K for the 2019–20 school year. |
| **What percentage of English learner children had dual language status is TK and K in the 2019–20 school year?** | Provide the percentage of children who had dual language status in TK and K for the 2019–20 school year. |
| **What percentage of children with disabilities will be served in the 2021–22 fiscal year?** | Provide the percentage of three-, four-, and five-year-old children with disabilities, as defined by having either an Individualized Education Program (IEP) or an Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). |
| **Does the LEA or consortium operate in an attendance area where a significant disproportionality of particular races or ethnicities, as described in Section 1418(d) of Title 20 of the United States Code, has been identified in special education?** | Provide either a **yes** or **no** response. |
| **What percentage of children will be served in the 2021–22 fiscal year by the following program types?** | Provide the percentage of children that will be served by the following program types: CSPP Part-Day, CSPP Full-Day, TK Part-Day, TK Full-Day, K Part-Day, and K Full-Day. |
| **CSPP Part-Day** | Provide the percentage of children that will be and are served in CSPP Part-Day. |
| **CSPP Full-Day** | Provide the percentage of children that will be and are served in CSPP Full-Day. |
| **TK Part-Day** | Provide the percentage of children that will be and are served in TK Part-Day. |
| **TK Full-Day** | Provide the percentage of children that will be and are served in TK Full-Day. |
| **K Part-Day** | Provide the percentage of children that will be and are served in K Part-Day. |
| **K Full-Day** | Provide the percentage of children that will be and are served in K Full-Day. |

**\*To calculate, find the number of children by age from the California Department of Finance’s (DOF’s) population projections by individual year of age, 2010–2060, California Counties (Report P-2B) and the number of licensed child care slots (including centers and small and large family child care homes) via the California Department of Social Services web page.**

#### Section VI: Application Agreement and Certification [Not Scored]

The applicant will be prompted via Snap Survey to sign the application electronically and certify that the information provided in the application is correct and complete.

### Scoring Rubric

1. Section I: Applicant Information (Required; Pass or Not Pass)
2. Section II: Application Program Narrative (Required; Worth up to 130 points)
3. Section III: Application Data
4. Data (Required; Pass or Not pass)
5. Linking to the Data (Required; Worth up to 20 points)
6. Section IV: Application Budget
7. Budget Summary (Required; Pass or Not pass)
8. Budget Narrative (Required; Worth up to 15 points)
9. Section V: Allocation Priority (Required; Worth up to 70 points; Not added to total score. Points are calculated to determine priority for funding only if the rest of the application meets the minimum criteria and achieves a total score of 115)
10. Section VI: Application Agreement and Certification (Required; Pass or Not Pass)

#### Scoring Criteria for Section II: Application Narrative (130 Points)

**Scoring Criteria for Workforce Increases (Up to 70 points)**

| **Item** | **Did Not Answer (1 point)** | **Answered, but did not meet expectations (3 points)** | **Approaches Expectations (5 points)** | **Meets Expectations (7 points)** | **Exceeds Expectations (10 points)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Increasing TK Teachers** | Does not describe a plan to increase TK teachers | Identifies the need for increasing but does not identify a clear plan to meet outcome | Describes the beginning of a clear plan for increasing TK teachers | Describes and outlines a clear plan for increasing TK teachers | Describes in great detail a clear plan for increasing TK teachers |
| **Increasing CSPP Teachers** | Does not describe a plan to increase CSPP teachers | Identifies the need for increasing but does not identify a clear plan to meet outcome | Describes the beginnings of a clear plan for increasing CSPP teachers | Describes and outlines a clear plan for increasing CSPP teachers | Describes in great detail a clear plan for increasing CSPP teachers |
| **The need for TK Teachers** | Does not describe a need for TK teachers in their region. | Marks the need for TK teachers, but there is no structure to back up claim | Describes the need for TK teachers with minimal detail | Describes the need for TK teachers with clear detail, with one or two supporting statements | Describes the need for TK teachers with great detail, providing many supporting statements |
| **The need for CSPP Teachers** | Does not describe a need for CSPP teachers in their region | Marks the need for CSPP teachers, but there is no structure to back up claim | Describes the need for CSPP teachers with minimal detail | Describes the need for CSPP teachers with clear detail, with one or two supporting statements | Describes the need for CSPP teachers with great detail, providing many supporting statements |
| **Plan for recruiting teachers with early childhood education experience** | No plan to recruit educators with experience in early education settings | Some mention of plans to recruit educators with experience in early education settings but limited details | Describes plans to recruit educators with experience in early education settings; provides an outline and details | Describes plans to recruit and effectively support educators with experience in early education settings | Describes plans to create structures for ongoing cultivation, recruitment, and support of educators from local early education settings |
| **Plans to partner with IHEs to ensure a qualified UPK teacher pipeline** | No plan nor partners identified | Identifies one or two partners but no clear plan for engagement | Identifies one partner with plan to engage in long-term workforce pipeline efforts, with minimal details | Identifies multiple partners with detailed plans to engage in long-term workforce pipeline efforts | Identifies multiple partners with clear plan to engage multiple partners in ongoing, strategic efforts to support educator workforce beyond the scope of this grant |
| **Plans to leverage other workforce funding** | Does not identify other workforce funding opportunities | Identifies another workforce funding opportunity but does not provide a clear plan on how this grant will leverage with the other funding opportunities | Identifies one or more workforce funding opportunities and provides an outline of how the funding will braid together | Identifies multiple workforce funding opportunities and provides a detailed outline of how the funding will braid together | Identifies multiple workforce funding opportunities and provides a clear and detailed plan on how the funding will braid together, and will continue beyond the scope of the grant |

**Scoring Criteria for Professional Development (Up to 60 points)**

| **Item** | **Did Not Answer (1 point)** | **Answered, but did not meet expectations (3 points)** | **Approaches Expectations (5 points)** | **Meets Expectations (7 points)** | **Exceeds Expectations (10 points)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Increase CSPP, TK, and K ability to provide instruction in inclusive classrooms** | Did not describe a plan | Identifies the need for a plan, but does not provide details or an outline | Describes a plan for increasing one or two out of three teachers receiving PD. (For example, CSPP and TK, but not K) | Describes a clear outline and plan for increasing CSPP, TK, and K teachers receiving PD to provide instructions in inclusive classrooms | Describes a detailed plan for increasing CSPP, TK, and K teachers receiving PD, with a clear plan to engage in ongoing, strategic efforts for continued support |
| **Increase CSPP, TK, and K teachers’ ability to provide culturally responsive instruction** | Did not describe a plan | Identifies the need for a plan, but does not provide details or an outline | Describes a plan for increasing one or two out of three teachers receiving PD. (For example, CSPP and TK, but not K) | Describes a clear outline and plan for increasing CSPP, TK, and K teachers receiving PD to provide culturally responsive instruction | Describes a detailed plan for increasing CSPP, TK, and K teachers receiving PD, with a clear plan to engage in ongoing, strategic efforts for continued support |
| **Increase CSPP, TK, and K teachers’ ability to support dual language learners** | Did not describe a plan | Identifies the need for a plan, but does not provide details or an outline | Describes a plan for increasing one or two out of three teachers receiving PD. (For example, CSPP and TK, but not K) | Describes a clear outline and plan for increasing CSPP, TK, and K teachers receiving PD to support dual language learners | Describes a detailed plan for increasing CSPP, TK, and K teachers receiving PD, with a clear plan to engage in ongoing, strategic efforts for continued support |
| **Increase CSPP, TK, and K teachers’ ability to enhance social emotional learning** | Did not describe a plan | Identifies the need for a plan, but does not provide details or an outline | Describes a plan for increasing one or two out of three teachers receiving PD. (For example, CSPP and TK, but not K) | Describes a clear outline and plan for increasing CSPP, TK, and K teachers’ ability to enhance social emotional learning | Describes a detailed plan for increasing CSPP, TK, and K teachers receiving PD, with a clear plan to engage in ongoing, strategic efforts for continued support |
| **Increase CSPP, TK, and K teachers’ ability to implement trauma or healing informed and restorative practices** | Did not describe a plan | Identifies the need for a plan, but does not provide details or an outline | Describes a plan for increasing one or two out of three teachers receiving PD. (For example, CSPP and TK, but not K) | Describes a clear outline and plan for increasing CSPP, TK, and K teachers’ ability to implement trauma or healing informed and restorative practices | Describes a detailed plan for increasing CSPP, TK, and K teachers receiving PD, with a clear plan to engage in ongoing, strategic efforts for continued support |
| **Increase CSPP, TK, and K teachers’ ability to mitigate implicit biases to eliminate exclusionary practices** | Did not describe a plan | Identifies the need for a plan, but does not provide details or an outline | Describes a plan for increasing one or two out of three teachers receiving PD. (For example, CSPP and TK, but not K) | Describes a clear outline and plan for increasing CSPP, TK, and K teachers’ ability to mitigate implicit biases to eliminate exclusionary practices | Describes a detailed plan for increasing CSPP, TK, and K teachers receiving PD, with a clear plan to engage in ongoing, strategic efforts for continued support |
| **Describes the need for PD for CSPP, TK, and K teachers in the region** | Did not describe a need | Identifies the need for a plan, but does not provide details or an outline | Describes the need for one or two out of three teachers needing PD. (For example, CSPP and TK, but not K) | Describes a clear need of PD for CSPP, TK, and K teachers in their region | Describes a clear and highly detailed need of PD for CSPP, TK, and K teachers in their region |
| **Describes the plan to integrate CSPP, TK, and K PD opportunities** | Did not describe a plan | Identifies the need for integration of PD opportunities, and provides little or unclear details for a plan to achieve | Describes a plan for integrating one or two out of three teachers’ PD opportunities. (For example, CSPP and TK, but not K) | Describes a plan and an outline for integrating all teachers’ PD opportunities | Describes a detailed plan and an outline for integrating all teachers’ PD opportunities, with a clear path towards ongoing and strategic efforts for continued support |
| **Describes plan for providing PD for principals and administrators** | Did not describe a plan | Identifies the need for PD opportunities, and provides little or unclear details for a plan to achieve | Describes a plan for providing a few administrator-level PD opportunities, but is not inclusive of all administrators | Describes a plan and an outline for integrating all PD opportunities for principals and administrators in their region | Describes a detailed plan and an outline for integrating all PD opportunities for principals and administrators in their region, with a clear path towards ongoing strategic efforts for continued support |
| **Describes plan to partner with CBO CSPPs and Head Start for teacher PD** | No partners identified | Identifies one partner but no clear plan for engagement | Identifies a plan that engages Head Start **OR** CBO CSPP partners in PD | Identifies a plan that engages Head Start **AND** CBO CSPP partners in PD | Identifies a detailed plan that engages Head Start **AND** CBO CSPP partners in PD, with a clear path towards ongoing strategic efforts for continued support |
| **Description to connect CSPP, TK, or K programs to extended day services** | Did not describe a plan | Identifies the need to connect extended day services, and provides little or unclear details for a plan to achieve | Describes a plan for connecting one or two out of three extended day services opportunities. (For example, CSPP and TK, but not K) | Describes a plan and an outline for connecting all programs to extended day services opportunities | Describes a detailed plan and an outline for connecting all programs to extended day services opportunities, with a clear path towards ongoing strategic efforts and continue support |
| **Plan of how to serve pupils with disabilities in inclusive CSPP and TK programs** | Did not describe a plan | Identifies the need and provides little or unclear details for a plan to achieve | Identifies a plan that will serve pupils with disabilities in inclusive classrooms in **EITHER** CSPP or TK programs | Identifies a plan that will serve pupils with disabilities in inclusive classrooms in **BOTH** CSPP or TK programs | Describes plan that will serve pupils with disabilities in inclusive classrooms in **BOTH** CSPP or TK program and how it will provide ongoing and strategic support |

#### Scoring Criteria for Section III: Application Data (20 Points)

The CDE will score Section III by how well the applicant shows how the data provided in Section III ties back to and supports the narrative plan descriptions in Section II.

**(20 points total)**

1. CSPP Workforce Data (10 points total)

* Data provided in the Workforce Increase Narrative and Professional Development Narrative sections must tie back to the written narrative.

1. TK Workforce Data (10 points total)

* Data provided in the Workforce Increase Narrative and Professional Development Narrative sections must tie back to the written narrative

**Scoring Criteria for Linking the Data**

| **Item** | **Did Not Answer (1 point)** | **Answered, but did not meet expectations (3 points)** | **Approaches Expectations (5 points)** | **Meets Expectations (7 points)** | **Exceeds Expectations (10 points)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CSPP Workforce Data** | Did not provide data in either the narrative or the data. | Provided data in either the narrative or the data, but did not link them. | Provided data in **BOTH** the narrative and the data, and the data provided supplemental support to the applicant’s narrative. | Provided data in **BOTH** the narrative and the data, and the data provided substantiated support to the applicant’s narrative, with increasing detail. | Provided data in **BOTH** the narrative and the data, and the data provided clearly linked to the applicant’s narrative, with great detail. |
| **TK Workforce Data** | Did not provide data in either the narrative or the data. | Provided data in either the narrative or the data, but did not link them. | Provided data in **BOTH** the narrative and the data, and the data provided supplemental support to the applicant’s narrative. | Provided data in **BOTH** the narrative and the data, and the data provided substantiated support to the applicant’s narrative, with increasing detail. | Provided data in **BOTH** the narrative and the data, and the data provided clearly linked to the applicant’s narrative, with great detail. |

#### Scoring Criteria for Section IV: Application Budget (15 points)

Applicants must use the EETD Proposed Budget Summary and Narrative documents when submitting the LEA or consortium budget and will upload the budget to this application. A projected budget for each year of the entire grant period (July 1, 2022, through June 30, 2025) is required for the application and a justifiable budget narrative.

Proposed Budget Summary – Required; Not Scored

Proposed Budget Narrative – Required; Worth up to 15 points.

**Scoring Criteria for Budget Narrative**

| Does Not Meet Expectations (0 points) | Approaches Expectations (8 points) | Meets Expectations (15 points) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Minimally provides a detailed budget narrative using the Proposed Budget Template for the Proposed Budget Detail for each line-item in the grant period.  For each allowable category, the application includes minimal or no description of how the proposed costs are necessary, reasonable, and proportionate in terms of grant activities and outcomes.  Provides minimal or no detail and calculation that justifies each line item for each grant year.  Minimally or does not group the line items by the object code series and does not provide lines for object code totals. | Adequately provides a detailed budget narrative using the Proposed Budget Template for the Proposed Budget Detail for each line item in the grant period.  For each allowable category, the application includes an adequate description of how the proposed costs are necessary, reasonable, and proportionate in terms of grant activities and outcomes.  Provides adequate detail and calculation that justifies each line item for each grant year.  Adequately groups the line items by the object code series and provides lines for object code totals. | Thoroughly and convincingly provides a detailed budget narrative using the Proposed Budget Template for the Proposed Budget Detail for each line item in the grant period.  For each allowable category, the application includes a thorough and convincing description of how the proposed costs are necessary, reasonable, and proportionate in terms of grant activities and outcomes.  Provides thorough detail and calculation that justifies each line item for each grant year.  Thoroughly groups the line items by the object code series and provides lines for object code totals. |

**Scoring Criteria for Section V: Allocation Priority (70 Points)**

Describe the student population the LEA or consortium intends to serve using the 2021–22 fiscal year data, unless otherwise noted. This includes children that are currently being served or, if applying for additional CSPP expansion funding for fiscal year 21–22, also includes the numbers of those planning to be served in full-day CSPP, TK, or K programs offered by the LEA or CBO.

**Scoring Criteria for Allocation Priority**

| **Item** | **Very Low Percentage (1 point)** | **Low Percentage (2 points)** | **Fair Percentage (3 points)** | **High Percentage (4 points)** | **Extremely High Percentage (5 points)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The extent to which the LEA or consortium is located in a county(ies) that has more than three young children, three to five years of age, inclusive, for every licensed childcare slot** | Does Not operate in such an attendance area. | N/A | N/A | N/A | Does operate in such an attendance area. |
| **Percentage of *three-year-old* children who will be served in the 2021–22 fiscal year by age** | 0–10% or did not answer. | 11–20% | 21–30% | 31–40% | 41% or more. |
| **Percentage of *four-year-old* children who will be served in the 2021–22 fiscal year by age** | 0–10% or did not answer. | 11–20% | 21–30% | 31–40% | 41% or more. |
| **Percentage of *five-year-old* children who will be served in the 2021–22 fiscal year by age** | 0–10% or did not answer. | 11–20% | 21–30% | 31–40% | 41% or more. |
| **Percentage of students who are eligible for FRPM** | 0–23% or did not answer. | 24–48% | 49–74% | 75–89% | 90% or more. |
| **Percentage of students who are English learner children who have dual language status** | 0–10% or did not answer. | 11–20% | 21–30% | 31–40% | 41% or more. |
| **Percentage of children who have disabilities** | 0–10% or did not answer. | 11–20% | 21–30% | 31–40% | 41% or more. |
| **If the LEA or consortium operates in an attendance area where a significant disproportionality of particular races or ethnicities has been identified in special education** | Does Not operate in such an attendance area. | N/A | N/A | N/A | Does operate in such an attendance area. |
| **Percentage of children that are or will be served in Part-Day CSPP** | 0–10% or did not answer | 11–20% | 21–30% | 31–40% | 41% or more |
| **Percentage of children that are or will be served in Full-Day CSPP** | 0–10% or did not answer | 11–20% | 21–30% | 31–40% | 41% or more |
| **Percentage of children that are or will be served in Part-Day TK** | 0–10% or did not answer | 11–20% | 21–30% | 31–40% | 41% or more |
| **Percentage of children that are or will be served in Full-Day TK** | 0–10% or did not answer | 11–20% | 21–30% | 31–40% | 41% or more |
| **Percentage of children that are or will be served in Part-Day K** | 0–10% or did not answer | 11–20% | 21–30% | 31–40% | 41% or more |
| **Percentage of children that are or will be served in Full-Day K** | 0–10% or did not answer | 11–20% | 21–30% | 31–40% | 41% or more |

## 

## Appendices

### **Statutory Language**

ARTICLE 13.2. California Pre-K Planning and Implementation Grant Program [8281.5- 8281.5.] (Article 13.2 added by Stats. 2021, Ch. 44, Sec. 4.)

8281.5.

(a) The California Pre-K Planning and Implementation Grant Program is hereby established as a state early learning initiative with the goal of expanding access to classroom-based Pre-K programs at LEAs.

(b) For the 2021–22 fiscal year, the sum of $300 million is hereby appropriated from the General Fund to the department for allocation to LEAs for the California Pre-K Planning and Implementation Grant Program pursuant to this section. These funds shall be available for encumbrance until June 30, 2024.

(c) (1) Of the total amount appropriated under subdivision (b), the Superintendent shall allocate $200 million in the 2021–22 fiscal year to LEAs as follows:

(A) A minimum base grant to all LEAs that operate K programs as determined using California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System Fall 1 K enrollment from the 2020–21 certification, as follows:

(i) For LEAs with an enrollment of 1 to 23 pupils, inclusive, the minimum base grant shall be $25,000.

(ii) For LEAs with an enrollment of 24 to 99 pupils, inclusive, the minimum base grant shall be $50,000.

(iii) For LEAs with an enrollment of 100 or more pupils, the minimum base grant shall be $100,000.

(B) A minimum base grant for each COE of $15,000 for each LEA in their county that operates K programs to support countywide planning and capacity building.

(C) Of the remaining funds after allocations under subparagraphs (A) and (B):

(i) Sixty percent shall be available as enrollment grants. These grants shall be allocated based on the LEA’s proportional share of total California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System Fall 1 K enrollment for the 2019–20 fiscal year, as applied to the total amount of program funds available for the enrollment grant. For purposes of this clause, the total statewide K enrollment shall be calculated using the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System Fall 1 K enrollment minus the TK program enrollment for the 2019–20 fiscal year for each LEA.

(ii) Forty percent shall be available as supplemental grants. These grants shall be allocated based on the LEA’s California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System Fall 1 K enrollment minus the TK program enrollment for the 2019–20 fiscal year, multiplied by the LEA’s unduplicated pupil percentage, as calculated pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 42238.02 or subdivision (b) of Section 2574 certified as of the second principal apportionment. Funds for this purpose shall be distributed percent-to-total from funds available for the supplemental grant.

(2) Grant funds may be used for costs associated with creating or expanding CSPP or TK programs, or to establish or strengthen partnerships with other providers of Pre-K education within the LEA, including Head Start programs, to ensure that high-quality options for Pre-K education are available for four-year-old children. Allowable costs include, but are not necessarily limited to, planning costs, hiring and recruitment costs, staff training and professional development, classroom materials, and supplies.

(3) LEAs receiving grants pursuant to this subdivision shall do both of the following:

(A) Commit to providing program data to the department, as specified by the Superintendent, including, but not limited to, recipient information and participating in overall program evaluation.

(B) Develop a plan for consideration by the governing board or body at a public meeting on or before June 30, 2022, for how all children in the attendance area of the LEA will have access to full-day learning programs the year before K that meet the needs of parents, including through partnerships with the LEA’s expanding learning offerings, the After School Education and Safety Program, the CSPP, Head Start programs, and other community-based early learning and care programs.

(d) (1) Of the total amount appropriated under subdivision (b), the Superintendent shall award $100 million in competitive grants to LEAs to increase the number of highly-qualified teachers available to serve CSPPs and TK pupils, and to provide CSPP, TK, and K teachers with training in providing instruction in inclusive classrooms, culturally responsive instruction, supporting dual language learners, enhancing social-emotional learning, implementing trauma-informed practices and restorative practices, and mitigating implicit biases to eliminate exclusionary discipline, pursuant to this section. These funds shall be available for encumbrance until June 30, 2024.

(2) The Superintendent shall develop and administer a process to award grants under paragraph (1), subject to approval of the executive director of the state board, on a competitive basis to LEAs. To apply for a grant, an LEA shall submit an application to the department describing how it will allocate funds and increase either the number of credentialed teachers meeting the requirements of subdivision (g) of Section 48000, or the competencies of CSPPs, TK, and K teachers to enhance their ability to provide instruction in inclusive classrooms, provide culturally responsive instruction, support dual language learners, enhance social-emotional learning, implement trauma-informed and restorative practices, and mitigate implicit biases to eliminate exclusionary discipline.

(3) An LEA may apply on behalf of a consortium of providers within the LEA’s program area, including CSPPs and Head Start programs operated by CBOs.

(4) An applicant shall demonstrate all of the following to be considered for a grant award:

(A) A need for preschool and TK or K professional development in a region.

(B) A need for preschool and TK teachers in a region.

(C) The presence of, or plan to create, inclusive classroom settings.

(D) The ability to connect the preschool, TK, or K program to before- and after-school programs and extended day services.

(E) A plan to integrate preschool, TK, and K professional development opportunities.

(F) A plan for recruiting new preschool, TK, or K teachers with experience in early learning and care settings and collaborating with IHEs to ensure a qualified Pre-K teacher pipeline.

(G) A plan for how principals and administrators overseeing the TK program, or other Pre-K program, will receive training and professional development on the value and tenets of effective instruction for young children.

(5) In awarding grants under paragraph (1), the Superintendent shall establish a methodology that accounts for all of the following:

(A) The percentage of TK and K pupils eligible for Free and Reduced-price Meals.

(B) The percentage of dual language learners that the LEA is serving or is planning to serve in a CSPP or TK program.

(C) The percentage of pupils with disabilities the LEA is serving or planning to serve in an inclusive CSPP or TK program.

(D) The percentage of pupils served, or planned to be served in full-day CSPP, TK, or K programs offered by the LEA or CBOs.

(E) The extent to which applicants operate in an attendance area where a significant disproportionality of particular races or ethnicities, as described in Section 1418(d) of Title 20 of the United States *Code*, has been identified in special education.

(F) The extent to which the LEA is located in an area that has more than three young children, three to five years of age, inclusive, for every licensed child care slot.

(G) The extent to which applicants plan to partner with community-based CSPPs and Head Start programs in their program area to ensure those teachers have access to professional development along with teachers employed by the LEA.

(6) Grants awarded under paragraph (1) for professional development may be used for costs associated with the educational expenses of current and future CSPP, TK, and K professionals that support their attainment of required credentials, permits, or professional development in early childhood instruction or child development, including developing competencies in serving inclusive classrooms and dual language learners. Professional development grant funds shall be used for any of the following purposes:

(A) Tuition, supplies, and other related educational expenses.

(B) Transportation and child care costs incurred as a result of attending classes.

(C) Substitute teacher pay for CSPP, TK, and K professionals that are currently working in a CSPP, TK, or K classroom.

(D) Stipends and professional development expenses, as determined by the Superintendent.

(E) Career, course, and professional development coaching, counseling, and navigation services.

(F) Linked courses, cohorts, or apprenticeship models.

(G) Training and professional development for principals and other administrators of TK, K, and grades one through twelve, inclusive, on the value and tenets of effective instruction for young children.

(H) Other educational expenses, as determined by the Superintendent.

(7) LEAs awarded funding pursuant to paragraph (1) may partner with local or online accredited IHEs or local agencies that provide high-quality or credit-bearing trainings, or apprenticeship programs that integrate and embed higher education coursework with on-the-job training of professionals.

(8) Professional learning provided pursuant to this subdivision shall, as applicable, be aligned to the preschool learning foundations and academic standards pursuant to sections 51226, 60605, 60605.1, 60605.2, 60605.3, 60605.4, 60605.8, and 60605.11, as those sections read on June 30, 2020, and former Section 60605.85, as that section read on June 30, 2014.

(9) LEAs receiving grants under this subdivision shall commit to providing program data to the department, as specified by the Superintendent, including, but not necessarily limited to, recipient information, including demographic information, educational progress, and the type of courses taken, and participating in overall program evaluation.

(10) The Superintendent shall provide a report to the DOF and the appropriate policy and fiscal committees of the Legislature on or before October 1, 2024, on the expenditure of funds and relevant outcome data in order to evaluate the impact of the grants awarded under this subdivision.

(11) Notwithstanding any other law, on June 30, 2027, any unexpended funds of the amount awarded for purposes this subdivision shall revert to the General Fund.

(e) For purposes of this section, “local educational agency” or “LEA” means a school district, county office of education, or charter school.

(f) For purposes of making the computations required by Section 8 of Article XVI of the California Constitution, the appropriation made by subdivision (b) shall be deemed to be “General Fund revenues appropriated for school districts,” as defined in subdivision (c) of Section 41202, for the 2020–21 fiscal year, and included within the “total allocations to school districts and community college districts from General Fund proceeds of taxes appropriated pursuant to Article XIII B,” as defined in subdivision (e) of Section 41202, for the 2020–21 fiscal year.

(Amended by Stats. 2021, Ch. 252, Sec. 1. (AB 167) Effective September 23, 2021. Note: Section 8281 is in Article 9, which commences with Section 8273.)

### Key Terms and Acronyms

| **Terms and Acronyms** | **Definition** |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicant** | An LEA that requests funding from a grant program administered by the CDE. |
| **CSPP** | California State Preschool Program. A contracted program with CDE per *Education Code* (*EC*) commencing with Article 7, Chapter 2 (sections 8235–8239). This includes full-day, full-year and part-day, school-year programs. |
| **CBO** | Community-based organization |
| **CDE** | California Department of Education |
| **CTC** | California Commission on Teacher Credentialing |
| **Child Development** | A type of course that educators who teach in either a California State Preschool or Transitional Kindergarten program must take. |
| **Child Development Permit** | A Child Development Teacher Permit authorizes the holder to provide service in the care, development, and instruction of children in a child care and development program. Types of Child Development Permits mentioned in this RFA: Associate, Teacher, Master Teacher, Program Director, Site Supervisor, and Temporary or Waiver. |
| **Competencies** | Competencies describe specific knowledge, skills, and dispositions that early childhood educators need in order to provide high-quality care and education to young children and their families. |
| **Consortium/Consortia** | A consortium (plural: consortia) is an association of two or more entities with the objective of participating in a common activity or pooling their resources for achieving a common goal. |
| **COE** | County office of education |
| **Credential** | A credential is official documented credit that verifies an individual's qualification or competency in a specific skill. Credentials are earned and awarded by completing a course of study, successfully passing an assessment, or meeting specified requirements that verify competency. Types of credentials that are mentioned in this RFA: Multiple Subject Teaching Credential, Preliminary Teaching Credential, and Education Specialist Credential. |
| **ECE** | Early Childhood Education |
| ***EC*** | California *Education Code* |
| **EED** | The Early Education Division of the California Department of Education. EED was previously known as the Early Learning and Care Division. |
| **EETD** | The Early Education Teacher Development Grant |
| **ELC** | Early learning and care, and considered to be general education settings for children birth to age five. |
| **ELCD** | The Early Learning and Care Division of the California Department of Education, up until November 1, 2021. |
| **Enrollment** | Registration in and attendance of full or part-day programs. |
| **Expanded Learning** | Before-school, after-school, summer, or intersession learning programs that focus on developing the academic, social, emotional, and physical needs and interests of pupils through hands-on, engaging learning experiences. It is the intent of the Legislature that learning programs are pupil-centered, results-driven, include community partners, and complement, but do not replicate, learning activities in the regular school day and school year. |
| **Grantee** | An applicant who is funded pursuant to an approved award notification. |
| **Inclusion** | The right of every eligible child, regardless of ability, to participate as full members in high-quality early learning and care programs through access, participation, and support. |
| **Inclusive classroom** | A classroom with a propionate number of children that have an IEP or IFSP who receive at least 10 or more instructional hours per week in a CSPP, TK or K general early education classroom. |
| **Kindergarten** | Kindergarten is a public grade that is available to children whose fifth birthdays are on or before September 1st of the school year. Kindergarten curriculum is designed to meet the needs of and teach children who are in this age range. |
| **LEA** | A local educational agency. For purposes of this RFA, LEA may include school districts, county offices of education, and charter schools. |
| **LOI** | Letter of Intent. |
| **Pipeline** | For purposes of this RFA, pipeline refers to the workforce pipeline—a pool of educators who are qualified to teach in early education. Pipeline can also refer to the recruitment space of teachers through to the retention of teachers already in the workforce. |
| **RFA** | Request for Applications |
| **SSPI** | State Superintendent of Public Instruction, California Department of Education |
| **UPK** | Universal PreKindergarten, which is inclusive of CSPP, Head Start, TK, Expanded Learning, and CBO preschool programs. |

### Final County Funding Allocation

| County | Allocation |
| --- | --- |
| Alameda | $3,402,490 |
| Alpine | $40,727 |
| Amador | $92,419 |
| Butte | $477,801 |
| Calaveras | $109,614 |
| Colusa | $117,120 |
| Contra Costa | $2,323,633 |
| Del Norte | $108,023 |
| El Dorado | $301,338 |
| Fresno | $3,296,164 |
| Glenn | $124,543 |
| Humboldt | $352,031 |
| Imperial | $748,447 |
| Inyo | $79,916 |
| Kern | $2,755,743 |
| Kings | $492,636 |
| Lake | $194,052 |
| Lassen | $85,665 |
| Los Angeles | $25,449,846 |
| Madera | $484,247 |
| Marin | $435,415 |
| Mariposa | $68,247 |
| Mendocino | $252,538 |
| Merced | $893,376 |
| Modoc | $57,550 |
| Mono | $61,230 |
| Monterey | $1,466,143 |
| Napa | $368,126 |
| Nevada | $175,344 |
| Orange | $7,666,698 |
| Placer | $663,931 |
| Plumas | $73,936 |
| Riverside | $6,482,864 |
| Sacramento | $3,740,907 |
| San Benito | $201,403 |
| San Bernardino | $6,149,633 |
| San Diego | $8,910,968 |
| San Francisco | $1,529,044 |
| San Joaquin | $2,259,230 |
| San Luis Obispo | $567,763 |
| San Mateo | $1,479,961 |
| Santa Barbara | $1,282,341 |
| Santa Clara | $4,057,046 |
| Santa Cruz | $640,231 |
| Shasta | $439,697 |
| Sierra | $43,860 |
| Siskiyou | $123,799 |
| Solano | $1,054,720 |
| Sonoma | $956,358 |
| Stanislaus | $1,715,905 |
| Sutter | $323,770 |
| Tehama | $234,494 |
| Trinity | $64,735 |
| Tulare | $1,517,566 |
| Tuolumne | $116,708 |
| Ventura | $2,028,631 |
| Yolo | $576,732 |
| Yuba | $282,645 |
| **TOTAL FUNDING** | $100,000,000 |