

# 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**

**Massachusetts**

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](mailto: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#: S412A120017

2. Grantee Name Office of the Governor, State of Massachusetts

3. Grantee Address 51 Sleeper St., 4th floor  
City: Boston  
State: Massachusetts Zip: 02210

4. Project Director Name: Thomas L. Weber  
Title: Commissioner  
Phone #: (617) 988-6612 Ext.: \_\_\_\_\_ Fax #: (617) 988-2451  
Email: Tom.Weber@state.ma.us

### 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: 07/01/2013 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.

Massachusetts continued to make great progress implementing its 2012-2015 Early Learning Plan, developed to carry out projects funded by the Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) grant. This plan articulates strategies to build strong partnerships among state agencies and communities to ensure every child in Massachusetts has an opportunity to succeed in school and beyond. The Early Learning Plan consists of the following components:

- Developing and using statewide, high-quality early learning and development standards;
- Promoting and supporting program quality;
- Supporting effective uses of comprehensive assessment systems, including the assessment of children's learning and development at kindergarten entry;
- Engaging and supporting families;
- Supporting early childhood educators to improve their knowledge, skills, and abilities; and
- Building an early learning data system to improve instruction, practices, services, and policies.

The following is a summary of key 2015 accomplishments, lessons learned and strategies to address some of the challenges with implementing the Massachusetts Early Learning Plan.

### **High Quality Early Learning and Development Standards**

#### ***Preschool and Kindergarten Standards in the Domains of Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) and Approaches to Play and Learning (APL)***

Based on an alignment study of the state's early learning and development standards that was completed in 2013, Massachusetts began working with the University of Massachusetts-Boston in 2014 to develop comprehensive preschool and kindergarten standards in the domains of Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) and Approaches to Play and Learning (APL). In 2015, Massachusetts convened public hearings and stakeholder meetings to complete the development of these standards and the Department of Early Education and Care (EEC) adopted the early learning standards for preschool and kindergarten in the domains of SEL and APL. This was a collaborative initiative between the Department of Early Education and Care (EEC) and the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) and DESE will be using these standards as guidance for kindergarten curriculum and teaching practices. The SEL standards focus on areas such as self-knowledge and self-management, while the APL standards focus on areas such as initiative, curiosity, and creativity. In the fall of 2015, EEC and DESE hired a vendor to develop a professional development course and a train-the-trainer model on the Standards for early educators, Kindergarten teachers, administrators, directors, and family engagement practitioners. All of these professional development trainings will be completed and offered in 2016, and these trainings will provide opportunities for the early childhood field to better understand and integrate these new standards into their curriculum and practices.

#### ***Early English Language Development Standards***

More than one in four children in Massachusetts under age six live in households that speak a language other than English. In 2013, EEC developed the Dual Language Learners' School Readiness Initiative to support early learning of these children, and partnered with World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) from the University of Wisconsin to develop Early English Language Development Standards (E-ELDS). In May 2015, EEC adopted the E-ELDS to support Dual Language Learners from 2.5 years old to 5.5 years old. The Standards include social emotional and physical development, and cover the domains of early literacy, math, social studies, and science. The E-ELDS are designed to: help guide lesson planning to ensure that the different linguistic needs of dual language learners are being met through their program day; support Dual Language Learners to reach their next level of English language development; make programmatic decisions about class composition, staffing, curriculum, and assessment in programs that serve dual language learners; and advance

within Massachusetts Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS). EEC has collaborated with WIDA to provide statewide professional development trainings on E-ELDS to support educators working with young Dual Language Learners and their families. To date, approximately 3,400 individuals have participated in various professional development opportunities, including statewide conferences, webinars, institutes, training of 72 Master-Cadre trainers, and regional focus groups. In 2016, EEC will continue to conduct more professional development trainings to provide an additional 200 educators with support on implementing the E-ELDS in various early childhood settings.

### **Promoting and Supporting Program Quality**

#### ***Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) Validation Study***

In December 2015, the state completed a QRIS Validation Study of 126 randomly selected center-based programs in QRIS. Evidence in the study suggests that programs at higher levels of QRIS are more likely to be engaged in a range of practices that reflect quality early education and care. The increase in scores across levels for most quality measures suggests that QRIS is creating a pathway to quality in which programs move up in the levels with a series of incremental improvements that are distinguishing quality, and are associated with better outcomes for children in several notable areas.

#### ***Sustainability of State Infrastructure to Support High Quality Early Education***

Various EEC staff positions were created with RTT-ELC grant funds to enhance the state's infrastructure to better support early education programs. Other child-serving health and human service agencies used RTT-ELC funds to create early childhood specialist staff positions. EEC was successful in securing state funding in the state fiscal year 2016 budget for nine permanent staff positions to continue providing technical assistance and other support to early education programs in QRIS. These staff positions were critical in helping over 6,000 programs participate in QRIS and increase their capacity to provide high quality early education opportunities for children across the state. The Department Children and Families (DCF) was also able to secure state funding to maintain two permanent early childhood staff positions at the agency to continue the progress made in the last four years of the RTT-ELC grant in improving policies and implementing best practices in child development within the child welfare system. A legislative bill has been filed to increase funding for early childhood mental health within the Department of Mental Health's (DMH) budget. DMH has committed to continue providing training to practitioners on early childhood mental health and embedding best practices for young children and their families.

### **Comprehensive Assessment Systems**

In 2015, there were 165 public school districts that participated in the Massachusetts Kindergarten Entry Assessment (MKEA), assessing over 47,000 students using a valid and reliable formative assessment tool. The state increased the supports and professional development training available to school districts in: conducting observational assessment, using a formative assessment tool, data collection, and using observational data to improve classroom instruction. To lessen the workload of kindergarten teachers in entering formative assessment data, the state evaluated the number of indicators in the Teaching Strategies GOLD® formative assessment tool, identified those indicators that are most critical to assess children's progress and reduced the number of required domains. The state increased its communication efforts with MKEA school districts to share best practices through regional networking meetings with other kindergarten teachers and administrators. A research firm was hired to analyze the MKEA initiative and make recommendations on the key indicators that most align with the state's kindergarten standards, as well as make suggestions on how the state could improve its assessment practices in the future. EEC, DESE and the Department of Higher Education (DHE), have been working collaboratively to clarify and align all of the state's assessment policies. In 2016, these three education agencies will be developing a joint policy statement that highlights the value of observational formative assessment and identify the best practices of formative assessment in the classroom.

### **Family Engagement and Support**

#### ***Sustainability of Early Learning Resources from Community Partners***

Boston Children's Museum, the WGBH Educational Foundation, and the United Way of Massachusetts Bay and Merrimack Valley -- three community partners who collaborated with the state to develop and implement various family and community engagement initiatives -- have all agreed to sustain these initiatives at the end of the RTT-ELC grant. Boston Children's Museum, the lead partner with EEC in the Museums and Libraries Partnership for Family and Community Engagement, secured an Institute of Museums and Libraries Services (IMLS) federal grant funding to continue the work of increasing the capacity of museums and libraries to support the optimal development of all children through intentional family engagement activities and early learning opportunities. EEC collaborated with the WGBH Educational Foundation, a public media organization, to create a comprehensive website of early learning resources for families and educators called *Resources for Early Learning*. WGBH will continue maintaining the website beyond 2015. The United Way of Massachusetts Bay and Merrimack Valley, EEC's lead partner in designing and implementing the statewide early education public awareness campaign, *Brain Building In Progress (BBIP)*, will continue to maintain the public BBIP website in 2016 and beyond.

### **Supporting Early Educator Competencies**

#### ***Higher Education for English Language Learners***

From 2014 to 2015, EEC contracted with the CAYL Institute to develop a roadmap for English Language Learners (ELLs) that informs higher education and EEC on how to support multi-lingual educators as they navigate entry to higher education institutions, matriculate into degree programs and earn their degrees. In December 2015, CAYL issued a written report titled *Opening Pathways: Strengthening Opportunities for Massachusetts Early Educators Who Are English Language Learners*, to inform EEC and DHE on the needs of ELLs as they navigate the higher education system. The report highlighted some key strategies to better support ELL adult learners to access higher education and persist in their education:

- Within a case management model, provide ELLs and adult learners with academic and emotional supports to succeed in higher education through strong relationships with mentors and advisors.
- Build the capacity of leaders in community programs to mentor and guide educators toward a career pathway as well as provide outreach to ELLs and their families about career opportunities.
- Align Adult Basic Education (ABE) and ESL coursework with early childhood education content, so that as individuals are building their proficiency in English they also build competencies in quality early childhood education practices.

#### ***Peer Assistance and Coaching***

In 2012, Massachusetts designed a model for Peer Assistance and Coaching (PAC) to help early educators to improve their teaching practices. The PAC model focuses on using peer colleagues as coaches to support early educators with their growth and development. PAC promotes the use of training and coaching methods, including the use of video technology that gives teachers opportunities to see and try out effective practices and receive real time feedback about their efforts to improve their competencies. Participants utilize an online platform to capture videos of practice for feedback from coaches, and the platform stores data that allows coaches and participants to use these videos as part of their evaluation process. PAC coaches receive specialized training and implementation support from facilitators of the state's professional development delivery system, Educator and Provider Support grantees (EPS), via regional monthly professional learning communities and other professional development supports as needed. In 2015, there were 36 pairs of educator coaches and mentees that participated in PAC. The Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) scores in the area of instructional practices of the PAC mentees showed significant increases as a result participating in PAC. Massachusetts is developing strategies to sustain the PAC model and deliver it to more educators across the state.

#### ***Post-Master's Certificate Program in Early Education Research, Policy, and Leadership***

In 2012, EEC partnered with the University of Massachusetts-Boston (UMass Boston) to create the Post-Master's Certificate Program (PMC) in Early Education Research, Policy, and Leadership. The purpose of the PMC is to improve the knowledge, skills, and abilities of early childhood educators from public and private

programs. The coursework designed for the PMC aligned with EEC's core competency areas, QRIS standards, the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) Advanced Standards (AS) within NAEYC's Six Professional Preparation Standards, and the Division of Early Childhood Advanced Personnel Preparation Standards. To date, PMC has funded the costs of tuition, books, support services, and stipends for four cohorts of educators (a total of 53 individuals). The success of the PMC prompted UMass Boston to create a doctoral program in early education that will be launched in September 2016. The PMC program will continue at UMass Boston after the RTT-ELC grant ends, with UMass Boston exploring other means to sustain early educator participation in the PMC program, including alumni of the program. UMass Boston was recently approached by an philanthropic organization who is interested in supporting entrepreneurial leadership development in early education.

### **Lessons Learned**

Massachusetts used RTT-ELC funds to support early childhood screening and assessment related activities, including the Massachusetts Kindergarten Entry Assessment (MKEA). Though some activities required adjustments during implementation, Massachusetts has made great strides over the four years of the RTT-ELC in efforts to develop a comprehensive system of screening and assessment for children birth through third grade. Strategies included leveraging the network of Coordinated Family and Community Engagement (CFCE) grantees that coordinate local network of providers and services, many of whom provide developmental screening services. EEC was also able to leverage and strengthen its partnership with DESE through their collaborative work on MKEA. The DHE, EEC and DESE staff and Strategies for Children were original members of the Massachusetts team involved with the National Governors' Association (NGA) Early Learning Policy Academy that focused on building a policy for a comprehensive assessment system. Though the NGA Policy Academy ended in 2014, the state team continued to meet on birth through grade three policy issues, as part of the Birth through Grade Three Advisory Group.

Over the past year, the work of the Birth through Third Grade Advisory Group has grown in both size and level of state leadership involvement. The Birth through Grade Three Advisory Group currently includes staff that represent Early Intervention, home visiting, family support, assessment, as well as staff from the Department of Public Health. DHE maintains an Associate Commissioner as their founding member on the Committee and the Undersecretary of Education has recently taken a leadership role with the Birth through Grade Three Advisory Group. Since assessments used in public schools are largely determined by local school districts, the Birth through Third Grade Advisory Group is preparing to visit several communities to learn more about what assessments are taking place locally throughout the state. This work will help the state understand how to support school districts to align assessment practices, thereby reducing the work load, while supporting best practices.

In July 2015, Harvard University Professor Nonie Lesaux, Ph.D. was appointed Chair of the Board of Early Education and Care. Chair Lesaux is a national expert on reading development and co-chairs the state's Early Literacy Expert Panel, which is focusing on the use of child screening and assessments to improve third grade literacy outcomes. With the lessons learned through implementing MKEA during RTT-ELC and the current momentum of the state's educational leadership, Massachusetts is well poised to continue and expand its efforts to develop a comprehensive birth through third grade assessment system that includes a state-wide assessment of children at kindergarten entry. Massachusetts' federal Preschool Expansion Grant award also provides an opportunity to implement new and improved strategies to support kindergarten assessment, as well as the collaboration and data sharing between preschool and kindergarten classrooms to facilitate transitions.

### **Challenges and Strategies to Address Challenges**

Initially, EEC did not have the staffing capacity to conduct site visits at all programs to verify their QRIS self-assessment Levels one and two, and all document review was conducted by one staff person. EEC reorganized to integrate quality initiatives into the all areas of the agency's work. The Program Quality Unit is now overseen by an Associate Commissioner of Program Quality Supports, who reports directly to the Deputy Commissioner of Legal and Field Operations. This change will increase the alignment of field operations as well as the agency's overall approach to supporting a system of high quality early education and care in the state.

Over the four years of the grant, the new Program Quality Unit was able to verify the quality ratings of over 5,000 programs, including 192 QRIS Level three and 15 QRIS Level four programs. EEC was able to secure state funding to support the QRIS for SFY16, including all of the regional Program Quality Specialists positions within EEC, a Child Health Specialist and two regional Health Advisor positions in partnership with the Department of Public Health.

## 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).

On January 8, 2015, Charlie Baker was inaugurated as the 72nd Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Governor Baker appointed James A. Peyser to oversee the Executive Office of Education and act as his advisor on education in the Commonwealth. The Department of Early Education and Care (EEC) is led by Commissioner Thomas L. Weber, who continues to oversee the implementation and success of the Massachusetts Early Learning Plan.

In July 2015, Governor Baker appointed Nonie Lesaux, Ph.D., as the new Chair of the Board of Early Education and Care. The Board oversees the development and administration of high-quality early education and care services in communities across the Commonwealth. There are eleven members on the Board, including the Secretaries of Education and Health and Human Services; together, they represent a variety of constituencies with diverse perspectives from business and education sectors, parents, health and human service providers, evaluation and assessment practitioners, and psychologists and psychiatrists.

In the past year, there have been significant advances in the early education and care delivery system throughout the Commonwealth. Considerable progress has been made in improving the quality of its services and resources, while ensuring that they are accessible to families. From increased funding for programs, to expanded resources for workforce development, to a new system and additional supports for quality improvement, the system of early education and care in Massachusetts has both moved forward in progress, and upward in visibility. The state budget for fiscal year 2016 included a third straight year of new investments in access to high-quality child care programs for low income families on the child care subsidy waitlist, and \$5M for reimbursement rate increases for providers who serve these children.

The Board's 2014-2019 Strategic Plan for EEC continues to guide the agency's work. The Plan focuses on four key areas:

- All young children in the Commonwealth will be ready to enter the K-12 education system and be successful, and their families will be provided with opportunities to support their children's cognitive, social-emotional, language, and physical development.
- Programs offered in early childhood and out-of-school time settings (licensed or license exempt) by EEC will promote and support the high quality education and healthy development of children that enables all children to be successful as students and citizens.
- The early childhood and out-of-school time workforce who works with children and families in the Commonwealth is professionally prepared, adequately compensated, and diverse.
- The Department and Board of Early Education and Care will provide leadership, direction and resources to meet the mission of the agency with utmost integrity, transparency and accountability to the people of the Commonwealth.

In accordance with M.G.L. c. 15D, §3A, there is also an Advisory Council on early education and care. EEC's Advisory Council members represent a geographic balance and reflect the diversity of the Commonwealth in race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation. All appointees have a special expertise or interest in high-quality early childhood education and care and are a mix of representatives of the early childhood community, civic, labor, academic, and business communities, parents, teachers, social service providers, and health care providers. The Advisory Council may review and offer comments on any rules or regulations before promulgation by the Board of Early Education and Care, and may, from time to time, make recommendations to

the Board that it considers appropriate for changes and improvements in early education and care programs and services. The EEC Advisory Council met four times in 2015, and reviewed several initiatives supported by the Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge grant including the QRIS Continuous Quality Improvement plan, Interagency Partnerships, and the state's Workforce/Professional Development system.

### **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.

Massachusetts continues to involve many stakeholders in the implementation of its Early Learning Plan. Stakeholder groups include leadership governing bodies, advisory committees, and working groups from the early education field. The following is a list of committees and advisory councils that continue to support and guide EEC's work:

- **Board Early Education and Care:** as described above, the Board is the governing body of the Department of Early Education and Care (EEC) and consists of members that are a cross disciplinary group that represents education, health and human services, higher education, early childhood programs, and families and community members. The Board provided guidance on sustainability planning of various RTT-ELC initiatives.
- **EEC Advisory Council:** The Advisory Council is comprised of a wider representation of stakeholders involved in the systems of early education and care, as well as family support and human services. The Advisory Council provides guidance to the agency's work and initiatives and provides a comprehensive stakeholder audience to gather feedback to vet the work of the agency. The Advisory Council offered guidance on how EEC could sustain various RTT-ELC initiatives within the existing state infrastructure.
- **Project Specific Advisory Committees:** In addition to the governance of the Board and guidance from the Advisory Committee, EEC convenes several groups to provide stakeholder input on specific projects and initiatives, including:
  - Post-Masters Certificate Program Advisory Committee
  - Peer Assistance and Coaching Advisory Panel
  - Brain Building in Progress Advisory Committee
  - QRIS Working Group
  - QRIS Professional Development Review Team
  - QRIS Public School Task Force
  - QRIS Validation Study Advisory Board
  - Birth through Grade Three Advisory Group

In the partner organizations and agencies that participate in the groups mentioned above, some of the key partners include:

- United Way of Massachusetts Bay and Merrimack Valley
- University of Massachusetts
- WGBH Educational Foundation
- Boston Children's Museum
- Massachusetts Association of Early Education and Care
- Strategies for Children
- Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
- Department of Higher Education

### **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.

#### Legislation

Bill H.326, " An Act to expand universal pre-kindergarten", introduced in the 189th (2015-16) legislative session, would establish a special commission for the purpose of making an investigation and study relative to how to expand universal pre-kindergarten to provide pre-kindergarten to every pre-kindergarten aged child in the Commonwealth. The Universal Pre-Kindergarten Commission would study the optimum way to expand participation in the Quality Rating Information System (QRIS) or other curriculum standards programs adopted by Massachusetts, including providing grants or other financial incentives for participation.

Bill H.341, " An Act to establish pilot programs and subsequent study for universal pre-kindergarten", also established in the 189th (2015-16) legislative session, specifies that the Massachusetts universal pre-kindergarten grant must assure that all funded programs fall within the quality standards established by the Massachusetts quality rating and improvement system.

Neither of these bills, as currently drafted, are expected to impact Massachusetts' Early Learning Plan.

#### Policies

No EEC policies are expected to impact Massachusetts' Early Learning Plan.

#### Executive Orders

None of the Executive Orders enacted in 2015 are expected to impact Massachusetts' Early Learning Plan.

### **Participating State Agencies**

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

In 2015, EEC continued to advance the state agency partnerships established through the Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge grant to strengthen the knowledge and capacity of providers who work with young children and their families, including the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD), the Department of Public Health (DPH), the Department of Mental Health (DMH), the Department of Children and Families (DCF), and the Office of Immigrants and Refugees (ORI). More information on the work of the Interagency Partners can be found in the Engaging and Supporting Families Section C(4) of this report. The state has also strengthened partnerships with the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) and the Department of Higher Education (DHE) through participation in the Birth through Grade Three Advisory Group, in which the Undersecretary of Education at the Executive Office of Education (EOE), is an active member.

## 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.

The Massachusetts QRIS is a comprehensive system with four levels that defines all aspects of program quality. The goals of QRIS include:

- Support educators, programs, and systems across the Commonwealth to engage in a process of continuous quality improvement.
- Enhance outcomes for all children in Massachusetts, especially those populations most at risk.
- Educate and engage families in an easy to understand rating system that increases participation in high quality programs.
- Provide policymakers and legislators with the tools and data to allocate and direct limited resources most effectively.

The QRIS is built on a strong foundation of licensing, which is QRIS Level 1, and the QRIS standards become more rigorous at the higher Levels to bring quality programming to children and families. The QRIS Levels begin with Level 1, which requires that a program is either EEC licensed or meets EEC licensing standards. At each Level, the standards are designed to gradually increase towards the full integration of practices known to be indicators of high quality education and care across the mixed-delivery system. Level 2 is titled "Commitment to Quality," and requires Level 1 criteria and a series of self-assessments using QRIS measurement tools. Programs are encouraged to start a Continuous Quality Improvement Plan (CQIP). Policy documents and professional qualifications are verified by the EEC Program Quality Specialists before programs are granted Level 2. Level 3 is titled "Focused Development," and requires all Level 2 criteria, plus higher benchmarks on QRIS measurement tools scores. At Level 3, EEC Program Quality Specialists verify policy documents, professional qualifications, and at this Level, EEC Program Quality Specialists also observe classrooms using Environment Rating Scales (ERS) to confirm minimum subscale and overall score benchmarks. The minimum overall benchmark for Level 3 is 4.5. Level 4 is titled "Full Integration," and requires all Level 3 criteria plus higher benchmarks on QRIS measurement tools. At Level 4, Environment Rating Scales reliable raters perform an observation to confirm benchmarks on each ERS subscale, and an overall minimum score of 5.5. EEC verifies required policy documents and professional qualifications.

The QRIS standards include:

- Standard 1: Curriculum, Assessment, Interactions, and Diversity
- Standard 2: Safe, Healthy Indoor and Outdoor Environments
- Standard 3: Workforce Qualifications and Professional Development
- Standard 4: Family and Community Engagement
- Standard 5: Leadership, Management, Administration, and Supervision

Programs and providers in the lower tiers (Levels 1 and 2) are supported through group trainings and orientations, online trainings, and webinars, along with support from coaches and mentors that are staffed by Educator and Provider Support (EPS) grantees. EEC Program Quality Specialists verify Level 1 and Level 2 MA QRIS applications and provide technical assistance visits to programs and providers in the lower tiers on an as-needed basis only. At Level 3, EEC Program Quality Specialists provide in-person technical assistance. During this visit, they work with the program staff to review their documentation, professional qualification requirements, measurement tool self-assessment scores, and conduct their own Environmental Rating Scale (ERS) observations. If they meet these criteria, they will be granted a MA QRIS Level 3 status. That same process continues for Level 4, in addition to the requirement that programs must be verified by a ERS reliable rater. The benchmarks on all measurement tools (ERS, Business Administration Scale/Program Administration Scale, Classroom Interaction Scoring System, Arnett Caregiver Interaction Scale, Assessment of After School Program Practices Tool - Observation and Questionnaire), policy and procedure documentation, and professional qualification requirements become more rigorous at each higher MA QRIS level.

Below is a summary of the activities the state conducted in 2015 to strengthen the QRIS.

**Revised Program Standards:** In 2015, the state continued to remove barriers to achieving quality and advancing through the MA QRIS. This work included gathering recommendations to revise QRIS standards from a series of committees. The QRIS Working Group focused on verification guidance for programs and providers, in particular, clarifying which measurement tools and documentation are required as part of QRIS applications, which eliminated inefficiencies in communication among Program Quality staff and programs and providers. The QRIS Professional Development Review Team researched the types of qualifications and professional development necessary for high-quality programs and made subsequent recommendations. The QRIS Public School Task Force continued to develop a QRIS program type to meet the unique needs of public school preschool programs. With the content collected from these working groups, Massachusetts plans to hire a vendor in 2016 to make recommendations for the next iteration of the state's QRIS. The vendor will also examine the results of the QRIS Validation Study, as well as best practices from other states, including hybrid (block and point) QRIS structures, as part of their recommendations.

**QRIS Improvement Grant and Continuous Quality Improvement Process:** In 2015, 349 programs or providers received funding from the QRIS Improvement Grant. This impacted over 13,850 children. The grant awarded \$630,000 for program planning, during which grantees reviewed their measurement tools self-assessment scores and used that data to develop a Continuous Quality Improvement Plan (CQIP) with the help of designated technical assistance providers. The CQIP is a tool for educators to identify concrete action steps they can take to improve the quality of their programs. After CQIP plans were completed, grantees received \$1,470,000 for durable goods to address the areas of potential growth they identified. Grantees were largely intentional in ordering durable goods that would help them improve based on their data -- over 80 percent of the grantees reported that they made changes based on their measurement tool assessments. The QRIS Improvement Grant appeared to motivate and support early childhood programs to apply for the next QRIS level -- over 85 percent of programs reported that they planned to apply for the next QRIS Level. In 2015, 18 grantees were granted QRIS Level 3, one grantee was granted QRIS Level 4, and 62 programs started an application for the next QRIS Level.

The successes of the QRIS Improvement Grant served a source of best practices for providing technical assistance. An outside evaluation conducted by Wellesley College showed that the QRIS Improvement Grant and the CQIP deepened program and educator engagement with QRIS standards, and enhanced capacity to create and maintain high-quality environments. In 2015, Massachusetts adapted the CQIP for a system-wide launch. The CQIP is now required for all programs applying for QRIS at Levels 2, 3, and 4, and is translated into multiple languages.

**Health and Safety:** The QRIS Health Advisors, who provide technical assistance (TA) to programs on the health and safety standards of the QRIS, developed five training modules in 2015. The modules include: emergency readiness, health policy, personal care routines, nutrition and food allergies, and individual health care plans. In fall 2015, the Health Advisors began piloting the training modules with programs and providers to prepare for the implementation of a required 0.5 Continuing Education Units (CEU) health and safety course. The pilot will continue through June 2016. EEC plans develop and implement these trainings in an e-learning format once the agency has purchased an on-line learning management system.

The QRIS Health Advisors also developed a pilot health and safety self-assessment, which will be used as a QRIS measurement tool to help programs and providers identify the areas of growth that could be supported by a visit from a Child Care Health Consultant at QRIS Level 3. The QRIS Health Advisors are also developing a certification procedure for Early Childhood Health Care Consultants, which will include a training on the five modules and an orientation on how QRIS works. Upon certification, Early Childhood Health Care Consultants will be entered into a registry managed by the Department of Public Health (DPH), where programs can contact them to arrange a Level 3 visit.

**Further QRIS Revisions:** EEC will continue its contract with the University of Massachusetts Donahue Institute (UMDI) in 2016, to further analyze workforce data from the QRIS Validation Study, explore best practices from other states, and study the recommendations the Massachusetts QRIS working groups made in 2014 and 2015. UMDI will use this data to support EEC's QRIS revisions, including a possible transition to a hybrid (block and point) QRIS structure.

### **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.

In 2015, the state has made progress in increasing the number of programs participating in QRIS. For Performance Measure (B)(2)(c), the following early learning and development programs participated in QRIS:

- 3,332 Child Care Development Fund (CCDF) funded programs (91%)
- 255 License-exempt programs (64%)
- 224 Universal Pre-Kindergarten (UPK) programs (100%)
- 221 Head Start programs (100%)
- 137 Inclusive Early Learning Environment programs (100%)
- 112 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) part B, section 619 funded programs (22%)
- 33 Title I funded programs (16%)

Massachusetts has instituted several activities that have increased participation in QRIS. These activities include:

**Direct Technical Assistance.** Over 1,000 programs and providers across the mixed delivery system were given QRIS technical assistance (TA) in 2015. This TA included orientations, trainings, on-site classroom/program observations, and targeted technical assistance via phone and email support. The most common topics addressed through the technical assistance were health and safety, continuous program improvement, and business management practices. Eighty percent (80%) of preschool classrooms and fifty-two percent (52%) of infant/toddler classrooms that received TA from a Program Quality Specialist achieved the Level 3 requirements, as confirmed by Environment Rating Scales Reliable Raters.

**Supplemental Technical Assistance.** Massachusetts offers supplemental technical assistance to programs and providers in a variety of ways. These include:

- **Technical Assistance Webinars:** These monthly opportunities focus on topics that are critical to program quality and advancement in the QRIS. In 2015, webinar topics included family engagement, health and safety, child assessment, and planning for continuous quality improvement, and are recorded for future access. Webinars averaged 471 participants, an increase from 350 average participants in 2014.
- **QRIS Newsletter:** This quarterly email communication announces upcoming webinars, provides links for resources, and includes contact information for program quality staff.
- **QRIS Community:** This website ([www.qriscommunity.org](http://www.qriscommunity.org)) was developed for educators, administrators, and providers, and includes specialized groups, discussion forums, and a section for sharing resources and best practices.

**Supports for Technical Assistance Providers.** Massachusetts has put a premium on building the knowledge base of technical assistance providers, who supplement the work of the QRIS team. They include family child care system administrators, education specialists and home coordinators, and sponsored coaches and mentors.

Massachusetts hosted webinars for technical assistance providers, focusing on critical topics that support improved program quality, such as family engagement, health and safety, child assessment, and planning for continuous quality improvement. Technical assistance providers also joined the QRIS team for training in QRIS measurement tools, and how to use these tools in continuous quality improvement planning.

**QRIS Toolboxes:** Massachusetts added user-friendly, accessible resources, called "QRIS Toolboxes", to its QRIS webpage, in an effort to help programs and providers understand the requirements of the QRIS, and prepare to participate and advance in the QRIS. Resources in the QRIS Toolbox include:

- Checklists of requirements (self-assessment scores, required documentation with descriptive guidance, and required professional qualifications and professional development) for each program type (center based/school based, family child care, and afterschool/out-of-school time) at each QRIS Level
- Continuous Quality Improvement Plans (CQIPs) for each program type, available in 6 different languages
- Resources to help programs improve their environments such as meal guidelines, and procedures for diapering and table-washing.

**Information Technology:** In an effort to improve the current QRIS Information Technology (IT) infrastructure and better support programs in QRIS, Massachusetts worked with an information technology contractor in 2015 to conduct a needs assessment and develop recommendations for future IT improvements. The state is in the process of prioritizing these recommendations.

**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.

<b>Performance Measure (B)(2)(c): Increasing the number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the statewide TQRIS.</b>										
<b>Targets: Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS</b>										
Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	192	89%	216	100%	216	100%	216	100%	216	100%
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	112	51%	145	66%	221	100%	221	100%	221	100%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	29	6%	102	20%	229	45%	356	70%	508	100%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	18	11%	34	20%	56	33%	112	66%	128	100%
Programs receiving CCDF funds	1,088	26%	8,406	100%	8,406	100%	8,406	100%	8,406	100%
Other 1	25	33%	26	35%	27	40%	33	45%	37	50%
<i>Describe:</i>	License-exempt									
Other 2	25	15%	50	30%	164	100%	164	100%	164	100%
<i>Describe:</i>	Inclusive Early Learning Environments/Inclusive Preschool Learning Environments (IPLE)									
Other 3										
<i>Describe:</i>										

<sup>1</sup> 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	216	192	89%	166	166	100%	226	226	100%	224	224	100%	224	224	100%
<i>Specify:</i>	Universal Pre-Kindergarten (UPK)														
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	221	112	51%	214	214	100%	219	219	100%	233	233	100%	221	221	100%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	508	29	6%	504	70	14%	504	98	19%	515	103	20%	514	112	22%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	170	18	11%	172	28	16%	172	24	6.6%	194	20	10%	206	33	16%
Programs receiving CCDF funds	8,406	1,088	26%	8,469	3,287	75%	4,410	3,393	80%	4,410	3,702	83%	3,671	3,332	91%
Other 1	75	25	33%	75	136	79%	75	9	39%	233	122	52%	255	163	64%
<i>Describe:</i>	License-exempt														
Other 2	164	25	15%	164	69	48%	164	130	96%	136	136	100%	137	137	100%
<i>Describe:</i>	Inclusive Early Learning Environments/Inclusive Preschool Learning Environments (IPLE)														
Other 3															
<i>Describe:</i>															

<sup>1</sup> 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.

**UPK:** This data is from the FY2015 UPK Program Survey and is cross-referenced with the QRIS Program Manager database. The total number of UPK program participating in QRIS is 224.

**Head Start:** This data is from the FY 2015 MA Head Start Participation Survey and is cross-referenced with the QRIS Program Manager database. The data includes Head Start Center Based programs and Family Center Based programs that are required to be in QRIS (it does not include Home-Based programs as they are not required to participate in QRIS). There are 221 Head Start programs participating in QRIS.

**IDEA Part C:** The state does not report on IDEA part C for this performance measure. The MA QRIS Standards were not designed to address program quality in Early Intervention (EI) programs (Part C), as the Commonwealth's Early Intervention service delivery model is very different than early education and care programs. As a result, the state's QRIS does not include EI programs funded under Part C of IDEA. The state is unable to collect data on children receiving EI services in early education programs participating in QRIS.

**IDEA Part B:** This data is from the Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Education for school year 2015-2016. There are 514 public schools receiving IDEA part B funding with preschool classrooms. Of the 514 schools, there are 112 schools with preschool programs that are in QRIS. The percentage was calculated as follows: 112 schools in QRIS divided by 514 public schools with preschool programs equals 22%.

**Title I:** This data is from the Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Education for school year 2015-2016. There are 206 public schools receiving Title I school wide funding with preschool programs. Of the 206 schools, there are 33 schools with preschool programs that are in QRIS. The percentage was calculated as follows: 33 schools in QRIS divided by 206 public schools with preschool programs equals 16%.

**CCDF:** The CCDF data comes from the Early Childhood Information System (ECIS) which is extracted from financial billing data for CCDF from January to June 2015\*. There are 3,671 programs receiving CCDF funding between January and June 2015 and of this total 3,332 programs are in QRIS. The percentage was calculated as follows: 3,332 CCDF funded programs in QRIS divided by 3,671 total number CCDF funded programs equals 91%. The CCDF funded programs in QRIS include those who have a granted QRIS rating and those who have started a QRIS application but have not received a granted QRIS rating yet. The numbers of CCDF programs in QRIS in the state vary from grant year because programs close and new programs open. Programs close voluntarily or because of financial constraints.

\* EEC rolled out a new Child Care Financial Assistance (CCFA) System on July 1, 2015. The CCFA was designed as a single platform for managing subsidy awards, replacing the two separate systems for vouchers in the Child Care Information Management System (CCIMS) and contracted slots in the Electronic Child Care Information Management System (eCCIMS). CCFA is the tool through which child care providers and intermediaries document family eligibility for financial assistance, track child attendance for billing purposes, and request reimbursement from EEC for their services. Due to some unexpected challenges, use of the billing module was delayed. As a result of these challenges, EEC developed an interim alternative payment method for services beginning in July 2015. Since an alternative payment method was in use during July through December 2015, billing data is not available for reporting at this time. For calendar year 2015, data for January to June 2015 is available from the legacy financial assistance systems. Data presented in the tables for CCDF children and programs are based off of billing data and in this report only represents data from January to June 2015. EEC will provide the July-December 2015 data as soon as the CCFA technical challenges are resolved in 2016.

**License Exempt:** According to data provided by the QRIS Program Manager, EEC has identified 255 license-exempt programs (public schools, private schools, community based organizations, and faith-based organizations) that are participating in QRIS. Of this total, 163 have a granted QRIS level rating. EEC does not have data on the total number of license-exempt programs throughout the state because these programs are

overseen by other local entities. The percentage was calculated as follows: 163 total number of identified license-exempt programs in QRIS divided by 255 license-exempt programs with a granted QRIS level equals 64%.

**IPLE:** All data is from FY16 IPLE Site Survey and the information was verified using the EEC QRIS Program Manager. As of December 31, 2015, there are 137 IPLE programs participating in QRIS.

**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.

**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.

Massachusetts engaged in the following activities to ensure that early learning and development programs are accurately rated and monitored:

- The EEC Program Quality Specialists and the Associate Commissioner of Program Quality and Improvement met on a monthly basis in 2015 to review QRIS inter-rater reliability protocols. The purpose of these meetings was to develop and review practices that ensure consistency of program quality monitoring and measures, enhance the verification process, and examine means to make the rating process more efficient. The group also used this time to develop tools and resources to support programs and providers with the QRIS application process.
- The EEC Program Quality Specialists continued to streamline their process for QRIS caseload management. The number of open applications are calculated monthly, as well as the number of programs granted at each Level. The Program Quality Specialists use this data to identify and address trends in caseload management and to strategically prioritize their technical support. Through the new monthly caseload review process, the Program Quality Specialists now process 95% of applications within one month of submission, which is 23% more programs than in December 2014.
- The full Program Quality Unit (EEC Program Quality Specialists, Associate Commissioner of Program Quality and Improvement, QRIS Health Advisors, Universal Pre-Kindergarten Project Manager, and the QRIS Workforce Specialist) meet monthly to ensure integration of QRIS-related efforts.
- The EEC Program Quality Unit has also worked closely with Environment Rating Scales (ERS) Reliable Raters from Wellesley College. Wellesley's Reliable Raters provided extensive trainings to the Program Quality Specialists in the comprehensive set of ERS tools including Infant/Toddler (ITERS), Early Childhood (ECERS), Family Child care (FCCERS), and School Age Child Care (SACERS). Wellesley College also provided ongoing ERS support, answered ERS-related questions from the EEC Program Quality Unit, hosted ERS webinars for the field, and provided resources and tools for the field to address ERS challenges. As the vendor performing Reliable Rater visits, Wellesley College provided detailed site visit summary reports that served as a guide for programs to develop their Continuous Quality Improvement

plans with their EEC Program Quality Specialists.

**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.

Massachusetts promotes access to quality programs for children with high needs by mandating that programs and providers serving children with child care subsidies participate in the QRIS. In August 2015, 95.7% of children enrolled in a child care program through an EEC-subsidy attended a program in the QRIS; nearly two-thirds of these children were in a program at Level 2, 3, or 4 in the QRIS. Massachusetts is working to assure that the programs and providers serving the remaining children with subsidies participate in QRIS.

Massachusetts funded the QRIS Improvement Grant to support early educators to improve quality within their classrooms and advance with the state's QRIS. In 2015, 349 programs across the state received a total of \$1,470,000 from the QRIS Improvement Grant. Combined these programs serve 13,850 children. Educators used these funds to purchase durable goods to address the areas of potential growth they identified in their CQIP. Grantees were largely intentional in ordering durable goods that would help them improve based on their data -- over 80 percent of the grantees reported that they made changes based on data from their measurement tool assessments. The grants have motivated and supported programs to apply for the next level of QRIS -- over 85 percent of programs reported that they planned to apply for the next level of QRIS. To date, 18 grantees were granted QRIS Level 3, one grantee was granted QRIS Level 4, and 62 programs started an application for the next QRIS Level. The QRIS Program Quality Improvement grant also provided \$630,000 for program planning so that educators could reviewed their measurement tools self-assessment scores and used that data to develop Continuous Quality Improvement Plans (CQIP), which are developed in collaboration with EEC staff and other technical assistance providers.

The success of the QRIS Improvement Grant has provided the state with critical data to design policies for providing technical assistance to the field. An evaluation of the QRIS Improvement Grant and the CQIP showed that this model resulted in deepened program and educator engagement with QRIS standards and enhanced capacity to create and maintain high-quality environments. The model provided a blueprint for universal adoption of the CQIP. Massachusetts adapted the CQIP for a system-wide launch in April 2015. The CQIP is now required for all programs applying for QRIS at Levels 2, 3, and 4, and is translated into multiple languages.

In 2015, Massachusetts completed an alignment study between QRIS and Head Start, in order to reduce redundancy and ease the QRIS application process for Head Start programs. The state learned that IT issues present the greatest obstacles to Head Start programs. EEC is in the process of reviewing the recommendations on changes that need to be made and will develop a plan to address these obstacles for Head Start programs that want to participate in QRIS.

The state continued to make improvements to its QRIS in 2015 to ensure that high needs children have access to programs of the highest quality. Massachusetts has implemented a system to review, verify and support early education programs and providers in QRIS. Programs and providers in the lower tiers (Levels 1 and 2) are

supported through group trainings and orientations, online trainings, and webinars, along with support from coaches and mentors that are staffed by Educator and Provider Support (EPS) grantees. EEC Program Quality staff verify Level 1 and Level 2 QRIS applications and provide technical assistance visits to programs and providers in the lower tiers on an as-needed basis only. At Level 3, Program Quality Specialists provide in-person technical assistance. During this visit, they work with the program staff to review their documentation, professional qualification requirements, measurement tool self-assessment scores, and conduct their own Environmental Rating Scale (ERS) observations. If they meet all of the above criteria, they will be granted a QRIS Level 3 status. That similar review and verification process continues for Level 4, in addition to the requirement that programs must be verified by a ERS reliable rater. The benchmarks on all measurement tools (ERS, Business Administration Scale/Program Administration Scale, Classroom Interaction Scoring System, Arnett Caregiver Interaction Scale, Assessment of After School Program Practices Tool - Observation and Questionnaire), policy and procedure documentation, and professional qualification requirements become more rigorous at QRIS levels 3 and 4.

**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.

<b>Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1): Increasing the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS.</b>					
<b>Targets</b>					
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year One</b>	<b>Year Two</b>	<b>Year Three</b>	<b>Year Four</b>
<b>Total number of programs enrolled in the TQRIS</b>	1,345	8,187	8,647	8,647	6,015
<b>Number of programs in Tier 1</b>	1,111	222	722	922	5,000
<b>Number of programs in Tier 2</b>	86	4	9	17	1,700
<b>Number of programs in Tier 3</b>	84	1	2	3	175
<b>Number of programs in Tier 4</b>	9	1	2	3	20
<b>Number of programs in Tier 5</b>					
<b>Number of programs enrolled but not yet rated</b>					

<b>Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1): Increasing the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS.</b>					
<b>Actuals</b>					
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year One</b>	<b>Year Two</b>	<b>Year Three</b>	<b>Year Four</b>
<b>Total number of programs enrolled in the TQRIS</b>	1,345	4,489	4,410	5,891	5,207
<b>Number of programs in Tier 1</b>	1,111	2,099	1,820	4,589	2,975
<b>Number of programs in Tier 2</b>	86	1,075	1,344	1,497	1,320
<b>Number of programs in Tier 3</b>	84	156	324	94	182
<b>Number of programs in Tier 4</b>	9	23	24	2	15
<b>Number of programs in Tier 5</b>					
<b>Number of programs enrolled but not yet rated</b>					715

### **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.

This data comes from the QRIS Program Manager, EEC's online QRIS application management system. The data provided reflects the number of programs in each tier/level of QRIS that have a granted QRIS rating. The total number of programs participating in QRIS is 5,207. Here is the breakdown of programs by QRIS level:

- Level 1: 2,975 programs
- Level 2: 1,320 programs
- Level 3: 182 programs
- Level 4: 15 programs

There are 715 programs enrolled in QRIS but do not yet have a granted QRIS rating. Please note that year 1 and year 2 reporting at all levels was based on a program's self-assessment of their QRIS rating; for year 3 and year 4, the state is reporting on actual granted QRIS Levels.

### **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.

The Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1) target numbers in the state's grant application were based on the self-assessment of a program's QRIS rating. These target numbers were high. At the time of the grant application, the state did not have the capacity to set more accurate target numbers based on verified information about a program's demonstrated quality (actual granted QRIS level).

Over the first two years of the grant, the state developed more capacity to support programs and verify the QRIS applications of programs based demonstrated quality. EEC staff were able to visit programs and review extensive documentation to grant a verified QRIS level. In year 3, the state reported on a program's granted QRIS level, not a self-assessed rating. This process of verifying demonstrated quality of a program (granted QRIS level) helped the state to see that the target numbers set for Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1) were not realistic.

Over the four years of the RTT-ELC grant, the state has come to understand the real time frame it takes programs to move up from QRIS level to another. In addition, the state also better understands the kinds of technical assistance and resources programs need to successful move up QRIS and offer higher quality services to children and their families.

For year 3 and year 4, the actual numbers in Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1) are based on a program's granted QRIS level, not self-assessment. The state will continue to verify the quality of program's that have applied for a QRIS rating moving forward.

### **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"?

The QRIS is built on a strong foundation of licensing, which is QRIS Level 1, and they become more rigorous at the higher Levels to bring quality programming to children and families. The QRIS Levels begin with Level 1, which requires that a program is either EEC licensed or meets EEC licensing standards. At each Level, the standards are designed to gradually increase towards the full integration of practices known to be indicators of

high quality education and care across the mixed-delivery system. Level 2 is titled "Commitment to Quality," and requires Level 1 criteria and a series of self-assessments using QRIS measurement tools. Programs are encouraged to start a Continuous Quality Improvement Plan. Policy documents and professional qualifications are verified by the EEC before programs are granted Level 2. Level 3 is titled "Focused Development," and requires all Level 2 criteria plus higher benchmarks on QRIS measurement tools scores. At Level 3, EEC verifies policy documents, professional qualifications, and at this Level, EEC Program Quality Specialists observe classrooms using Environment Rating Scales to confirm minimum subscale and overall score benchmarks. The minimum overall benchmark for Level is 4.5. Level 4 is titled "Full Integration," and requires all Level 3 criteria plus higher benchmarks on QRIS measurement tools. At Level 4, Environment Rating Scales reliable raters perform an observation to confirm benchmarks on each ERS subscale, and an overall minimum score of 5.5. EEC verifies required policy documents and professional qualifications.

**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.

<b>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.</b>										
<b>Targets: Number and percent of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS</b>										
Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	4,308	70%	6,193	100%	6,193	100%	6,193	100%	6,193	100%
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	9,614	58%	10,751	65%	12,405	75%	14,059	85%	6,193	100%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	2,045	13%	3,721	25%	7,441	50%	11,162	75%	14,882	100%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	662	4%	2,963	25%	5,926	50%	8,889	75%	11,852	100%
Programs receiving CCDF funds	13,153	89%	14,846	100%	14,846	100%	14,846	100%	14,846	100%
Other 1	2,911	48%	3,301	55%	1,892	65%	4,501	75%	6,002	100%
<i>Describe:</i>	Inclusive Early Learning Environments/Inclusive Preschool Learning Environments (IPLE)									
Other 2										
<i>Describe:</i>										

<sup>1</sup> 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>										

**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	6,193	4,308	70%	5,844	5,844	100%	3,456	3,456	96%	4,248	3,071	72%	4,267	4,208	99%
<i>Specify:</i>	UPK														
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	16,540	9,614	58%	16,469	10,770	65%	16,086	16,086	100%	14,199	8,246	58%	15,566	6,193	40%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C															
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	14,882	2,045	13%	14,915	3,594	24%	14,915	1,271	36%	15,133	522	3%	15,898	694	18%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	11,852	662	4%	11,167	1,164	10%	11,167	914	37%	17,019	324	1%	6,848	477	26%
Programs receiving CCDF funds	14,846	13,153	89%	61,655	7,966	15%	61,655	37,113	67%	67,637	20,261	30%	46,124	24,794	54%
Other 1	6,936	2,911	48%	6,002	1,915	27%	6,936	2,090	65%	3,657	732	20%	2,426	954	3,900%
<i>Describe:</i>	Inclusive Early Learning Environments/Inclusive Preschool Learning Environments (IPLE)														
Other 2															
<i>Describe:</i>															

<sup>1</sup> 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.

**UPK:** This data is from the FY2015 UPK Program Report. There are 4,267 high needs children served by UPK programs in all levels of QRIS. Of this total, 4,208 are in programs that are in the top tiers of QRIS (levels 2, 3 and 4). The percentage calculation was based on the following: 4,208 (total number high needs children in top tiers of QRIS) divided by 4,267 (total number high needs children in all QRIS levels) equals 99%.

**Head Start:** This data is from the FY2015 Massachusetts Head Start Program Information Report. This includes Head Start Center Based programs and Family Center Based programs that are required to be in QRIS (it does not include Home-Based programs as they are not required to participate in QRIS). There were 15,566 high needs children served in Head Start programs participating in QRIS at all levels. Of this total, only 6,193 high needs children were in programs at the top tiers of QRIS (levels 2, 3 and 4). The percentage calculation was based on the following: 6,193 (total number high needs children in top tiers of QRIS) divided by 15,566 (total number high needs children in all QRIS levels 1, 2, 3 and 4) equals 40%.

**IDEA, Part C:** The state does not report on IDEA Part C for this performance measure. The MA QRIS Standards were not designed to address program quality in Early Intervention programs (Part C), as the Commonwealth's Early Intervention service delivery model is very different than early education and care programs. As a result, the state's QRIS does not include EI programs funded under Part C of IDEA. The state does not collect data on children receiving EI services in early education programs participating in QRIS.

**IDEA, Part B:** This data is from the Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Education. The total number of schools receiving IDEA Part B funding in school year 2015-2016 is 514 serving 15,898 high needs children. Of this total, there are 112 programs participating in QRIS with 3,889 high needs children. There are 694 high needs children in programs at the top tiers of QRIS (levels of 2, 3 and 4). The percentage calculation was based on the following: 694 (total number high needs children in top tiers of QRIS) divided by 3,889 (total number high needs children in all QRIS levels 1, 2, 3 and 4) equals 18%.

**Title I:** This data is from the Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Education. The total number of Title I schools receiving school wide funding (that have prekindergarten classrooms) in school year 2015-2016 is 206. Of this total, there are 33 programs in QRIS with 1,868 high needs children. There are 477 high needs children in programs with a QRIS level of 2, 3 and 4. The percentage calculation was based on the following: 477 (total number high needs children in top tiers of QRIS) divided by 1,868 (total number high needs children in all QRIS levels 1, 2, 3 and 4) equals 26%.

**CCDF:** The data source is the Early Childhood Information System (ECIS). In year 4, there were 46,124 (from January to June 2015\*) high needs children in CCDF funded programs participating in QRIS. Of this total, 24,794 children are in QRIS programs at levels 2, 3 and 4. The percentage calculation was based on the following: 24,794 (total number high needs children in top tiers of QRIS in January to June 2015) divided by 46,124 (total number high needs children in all QRIS levels 1, 2, 3 and 4 in January to June 2015) equals 54%.

\* EEC rolled out a new Child Care Financial Assistance (CCFA) System on July 1, 2015. The CCFA was designed as a single platform for managing subsidy awards, replacing the two separate systems for vouchers in the Child Care Information Management System (CCIMS) and contracted slots in the Electronic Child Care Information Management System (eCCIMS). CCFA is the tool through which child care providers and intermediaries document family eligibility for financial assistance, track child attendance for billing purposes, and request reimbursement from EEC for their services. Due to some unexpected challenges, use of the billing module was delayed. As a result of these challenges, EEC developed an interim alternative payment method for services beginning in July 2005. Since an alternative payment method was in use during July through December 2015, billing data is not available for reporting at this time. For calendar year 2015, data for January to June 2015 is available from the legacy financial assistance systems. Data presented in the tables for CCDF children and programs are based off of billing data and in this report only represents data from January to June 2015. EEC

will provide the July-December 2015 data as soon as the CCFA technical challenges are resolved in 2016.

**IPLE:** This data is from the FY16 Site Survey for IPLE grantees. During Calendar Year 2015 there were 137 IPLE funded programs and 100% of these programs participated in QRIS as center-based and school-based programs. There were 2,426 high needs children served in programs. Of the total number of high needs children served, 954 high needs children participated in 48 programs in the top tiers of QRIS (levels 2, 3, or 4). The percentage calculation was based on the following: 954 (total number high needs children in top tiers of QRIS) divided by 2,374 (total number high needs children in all QRIS levels 1, 2, 3 and 4) equals 39%. Although the number of high needs children served decreased, the percentage of high needs children enrolled in top tier IPLE programs has increased.

**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.

**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.

The QRIS Validation Study has spanned over four years, starting with a pilot phase in 2012, a field survey in 2013, study design revisions in 2014, and an at-scale launch including observation, data collection and evaluation in 2015. Below is an executive summary that provides an overview description of the study and the findings, as well as highlights of progress made in 2015.

As part of its ongoing commitment to ensuring the highest quality of early education and care for all children in the Commonwealth, EEC launched QRIS in January 2011. The system is designed to assess, communicate, and ultimately improve the quality of early education and care programs throughout the state. To understand whether the QRIS and its levels meaningfully impact program quality, the University of Massachusetts Donahue Institute, in partnership with the Wellesley Centers for Women at Wellesley College, conducted a QRIS Validation Study of the Massachusetts QRIS from 2012 through 2015. The primary goal of the QRIS Validation Study was to:

- understand the QRIS levels and whether those levels correspond to gradually increasing levels of quality, as defined by the system
- and to understand if children attending programs in higher levels have better outcomes in specifically assessed learning domains.

### Defining quality in the MA QRIS

The MA QRIS was developed by key stakeholders with expertise in special education, Universal Pre-Kindergarten, early education public and fiscal policy, public preschools, after-school and out-of-school time providers, community- and faith-based providers, and Head Start programs, as well as professional development, child development content, and research. Through a process of development, piloting and revision, EEC has adopted several key quality standards and measurement methods in the MA QRIS, including: Curriculum, Assessment, and Diversity; Teacher-Child Relationships and Interactions; Safe, Healthy Indoor and Outdoor Environments; Workforce Qualifications and Professional Development; Family and Community Engagement; Leadership, Management and Administration; and Supervision.

### Study procedure

The study focused exclusively on community center-based programs in Massachusetts and involved 126 programs randomly selected to reflect QRIS Levels 1, 2 and 3 (a small number of programs transitioned into Level 4 during the study and the data from those programs is being used as a case study only). Comparative analyses show that within each level, study programs can be considered representative of the population of QRIS programs across the state at time of study selection during the Summer of 2014.

- Program level data: Program level data about business practice, professional development, workforce qualifications, family and community engagement, curriculum and assessment was also collected through staff interviews and surveys.
- Classroom level data: In each program, up to two classrooms --one serving preschoolers and one serving either infants or toddlers --were randomly selected. Classrooms were observed using the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scales- R (ECERS-R) or the Infant/Toddler Environment Rating Scales-R (ITERS-R).
- Child level data: Children's development was assessed using a pre-post design that followed children from fall 2014 to spring 2015. Academic development was directly assessed on 481 randomly selected preschoolers using the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, 4<sup>th</sup> edition (PPVT-4), and two subtests of the Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Achievement, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition (WJ-III). The social and emotional development of the same preschoolers was assessed through teacher ratings using The Devereux Early Childhood Assessment for Preschoolers, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (DECA P2), and the Preschool Learning Behavior Scale (PLBS). Additionally, the social emotional development of 190 toddlers was measured using the Devereux Early Childhood Assessment for Toddlers (DECA-T).

### Do QRIS levels distinguish overall observed classroom quality?

The study found evidence that the Massachusetts QRIS levels are in fact distinguishing quality for center-based programs, as measured through observations using well-established tools.

- For both preschool and infant and toddler care, classrooms from programs with higher QRIS levels received significantly higher global quality ratings, as measured by the Environmental Rating Scales (ECERS-R and ITERS-R), than those in lower QRIS levels.
- The range of global quality scores in Levels 1 and 2 was larger than in Levels 3 and 4, meaning that not only was observed global quality higher in the two upper tiers of the QRIS, it was also more consistent.
- The significant relationship between QRIS level and observed quality was also evident for ERS subscale scores, including all seven subscales for preschool classrooms and four of the seven subscales for infant and toddler classrooms (Listening and Talking, Activities, Space and Furnishings, Parents and Staff).
- The quality of caregiver interactions in preschool classrooms, as measured by the Arnett CIS, was significantly higher at Level 3 programs compared to Level 2. Caregiver interaction tended to be strong overall, across both preschool and infant and toddler classrooms.

### Do children attending higher-level programs have greater developmental gains?

Analyses of children's outcomes show that QRIS levels are related to children's outcomes in several important areas, providing further evidence that the Massachusetts QRIS and its levels differentiate quality.

- On average, preschoolers attending a Level 3 program had significantly larger gains in receptive language, as measured by the PPVT-4, than children attending programs at Level 2. There is substantial literature that indicates receptive vocabulary, and scores on the PPVT-4 in particular, are associated with later

academic outcomes for children.

- On average, preschoolers attending a Level 2 program made significantly larger gains in letter-word identification, as measured by the WJ-III Letter-Word Identification subtest, than children attending programs at Level 1.
- On average, preschoolers attending a Level 3 program made significantly greater gains in attachment and relationships than children attending programs at Level 1, as measured by the Attachment/Relationships subscale of the DECA P2. Research has demonstrated strong connections between protective factors (including attachment) and positive social-emotional and academic outcomes for children.

Finally, at both and pre- and post-test, preschool children assessed for the study on average outperformed their peers nationwide on all pre-academic measures, regardless of level. In two of the three pre-academic areas assessed --receptive language and early mathematics --children's gains exceeded expectations relative to their peers nationally.

#### Recommendations

Validation study results show that programs that have reached higher levels do demonstrate higher quality as defined by the MA QRIS, in terms of everyday practice aligned with the QRIS categories, observed classroom quality, and some better outcomes for children in key areas. The researchers recommended the following based on the study findings:

- Ensure sufficient infrastructure to support timely and continuous progression of programs to higher levels, especially as it relates to Program Quality Specialists and Reliable Raters.
- Provide targeted supports and resources to independent community-based programs to reach higher QRIS levels.
- Provide additional supports for center-based programs serving infants and toddlers to assist them in progressing through the system at rates comparable to programs with preschool classrooms only. Particular areas of attention include: Space and Furnishings, Personal Care Routines, and Activities.
- Revise or remove QRIS requirements that do not distinguish quality among levels.

#### Next Steps

EEC will contract with a vendor to continue analysis of the data collected through the QRIS Validation Study. Full analysis is expected to take 6-12 months.

## 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.

#### Enhancing Preschool and Kindergarten Learning Standards

##### Development of Preschool and Kindergarten Standards in the Domains of Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) and Approaches to Play and Learning (APL)

The Massachusetts Preschool and Kindergarten Learning Standards in the Domains of Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) and Approaches to Play and Learning (APL) were drafted in 2014 as a collaborative initiative between EEC, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE), and the University of Massachusetts-Boston (UMB). These standards bring attention to these critical areas of development and learning, and further support a learning continuum from birth through school age.

In January 2015, three public hearings were held in Boston, Worcester, and Brockton, for input on the draft standards. These hearings were attended by 158 people, and an additional 118 people completed an online survey. The feedback was 98% positive and enthusiastic in support of the Standards, with 2% of respondents suggesting minor rewording. In February and March 2015, feedback from public hearings, an online survey, national consultants, and EEC and DESE staff was incorporated into the final document. The final Standards were submitted to the EEC Policy, Research, and Communications Committee, EEC Board, the EEC Commissioner and Massachusetts state legislatures for review and were approved in June 2015.

The SEL Standards present competencies in five areas: Self-Awareness (emotional expression; self-perception; self-efficacy); Self-Management (impulse control; self-management); Social Awareness (empathy; respect for others; recognition of diversity); Relationship Skills (communication; relationship building; conflict management; seeking and offering help); and Responsible Decision Making (personal, social, and ethical responsibility; reflection and evaluation). The goals for the SEL standards are to support all children to develop and maintain trusting, healthy, and positive interactions and relationships with both adults and peers; develop a positive sense of self and self-efficacy; express a healthy range of emotions in socially and culturally appropriate ways; understand the role of social interactions; and develop the skills needed to regulate attention, impulses, and behavior.

The Standards for Approaches to Play and Learning (APL) present objectives in eight areas: Initiative, Curiosity, Persistence and Engagement, Creativity, Cooperation, Problem Solving, Organizational Skills, and Memory. APL are considered important factors in school readiness, including the ability to tackle and persist at challenging or frustrating tasks, follow directions, take risks and make mistakes, and work as part of a group. APL permeate every aspect of a child's educational experience. These characteristics and dispositions are the foundation of all future learning and are manifested differently in every child.

## Professional Development of Preschool and Kindergarten Standards in the Domains of Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) and Approaches to Play and Learning (APL)

In July 2015, EEC partnered with the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) and the Collaborative for Educational Services (CES) to develop professional development trainings for early educators, kindergarten teachers, family and community engagement practitioners, directors, principals and superintendents. This professional development includes:

- A research-based 10-hour introductory course on the SEL/APL Standards that provides Continuing Education Units (CEUs) and Professional Development Points (PDPs) to early educators and administrators from the mixed delivery system and public schools.
- Modules (available in Spanish, Brazilian Portuguese, Chinese, and Haitian Creole) that introduce the SEL/APL Standards to family engagement practitioners and to public school administrators and directors.
- An online version of the 10-hour course that provides CEUs and PDPs (to be developed in 2016).
- Three Train-the-Trainer sessions in different regions of the state for 50 teams of trainers - each team consisting of at least one early educator trainer from the mixed delivery system and one educator or trainer from a public preschool or Kindergarten. Teams are responsible for offering one free training to early educators from their local communities.

The professional development that is being created and provided through this grant raises awareness of the importance of social and emotional learning and approaches to play and learning for early educators and administrators, and offers strategies to improve educators' capacities to strengthen these essential life skills in young children in early education settings across Massachusetts.

2015 accomplishments include:

- Contracted with 5 national experts to review training modules and provide feedback: Sharon Lynn Kagan, Catherine Scott-Little, Linda Dusenbury, Greg Nelson, Betty Bardige.
- Contracted with the Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts (MCLA) to provide CEUs for course participants and the Collaborative for Educational Services (CES) to provide PDPs.
- Designed an initial draft of the 10-hour course and additional modules and conducted a pilot of the Course held in December 2015. 30 participants from public preschools and kindergartens, early intervention and family engagement programs, Head Start programs, and private early education programs completed the pilot course.
- Conducted December focus groups on the Family Engagement and Administrators/Directors modules that were attended by over 25 participants.
- Began planning dates, locations, and recruitment of participants for the Training of Trainers courses in 2016.

### **Early English Language Development Standards**

In Massachusetts, more than 1 in 4 children under age 6 live in households that speak a language other than English. In order to prepare children for school success, a focus on early learning for Dual Language Learners (DLLs) and meaningful engagement of their parents and communities is essential. EEC engaged with World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) from the University of Wisconsin to develop Early English Language Development Standards (E-ELDS).

In May 2015, EEC adopted the E-ELD Standards to support Dual Language Learners in three age groups: 2.5 -3.5 years old, 3.5 -4.5 years old, and 4.5 -5.5 years old. The standards include social emotional and physical development, and cover the domains of early literacy, math, social studies, and science. The E-ELDS are aligned with the State's Early Learning Standards, including the Head Start Child Development and Early Learning Framework, and WIDA's K-12 English Language Development Standards implemented by DESE. The E-ELD Standards have been designed for use by early education and care educators to:

- help guide lesson planning to ensure that the different linguistic needs of dual language learners are being met through their program day;

- support dual language learners to reach their next level of English Language Development;
- make programmatic decisions about class composition, staffing, curriculum, and assessment in programs that serve dual language learners; and
- advance within the Massachusetts QRIS.

Since 2014, through the implementation of its Dual Language Learners' School Readiness Initiative, EEC has partnered with WIDA to conduct series of professional development opportunities to support educators working with young DLLs and their families in the state. Over the past two years, approximately 3,400 individuals participated in various professional development opportunities, which included statewide conferences, series of webinars, E-ELD Standards and framework institutes, training of 72 Master-Cadre trainers, and regional focus groups with parents and families.

Additionally, EEC has worked closely with DESE in developing and implementing joint professional development institutes to support Pre-K teachers in public schools working with young DLLs. EEC is working with WIDA in developing online modules to support educators in accessing courses that provide online tools to strengthen their skills and knowledge in the implementation of the E-ELD Standards.

Furthermore, participants from the EEC/WIDA's Master Cadre, partnered with EEC's Educator and Provider (EPS) grantees, and EEC's Readiness Center to develop CEU courses, which are aligned with the E-ELD Standards framework and the MA QRIS.

In 2016, the Department will continue to conduct professional development institutes to expand opportunities for 200 individuals who are supporting programs implementing the WIDA E-ELD Standards Framework such as EPS grantees, coaches, mentors, Master Cadre trainers, public school partners (PreK-3), and higher education faculty.

## **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.

Below is a summary of the progress that was made in 2015 on various initiatives to measure child growth and development from birth through third grade, and support birth through third grade alignment and comprehensive assessment systems building.

### **Birth to Grade Three Alignment Grants**

Massachusetts has embraced Birth to Third Grade alignment as a comprehensive strategy that seeks to improve young children's access to high quality birth to grade three programs, and strengthens the capacity of elementary schools to sustain student learning gains in the early elementary school years. EEC has invested RTT-ELC funds to help support communities with the goal of improving child outcomes through building alignment among systems serving infants, young children, and their families.

In 2012, EEC awarded the Birth to Grade Three Community Implementation/Planning grants (B-3rd grade) to five communities: Lowell, Boston, Springfield, Somerville, and Pittsfield. In Spring 2014, EEC awarded additional funding to these five communities, and new funding to an additional seven communities to support their alignment building efforts: Cape Cod, Holyoke, Lawrence, New Bedford, North Adams, Northern Berkshires, and Worcester.

All grantees used the "Framework for Planning, Implementing, and Evaluating PreK-3rd Grade Approaches" created by Kristie Kauerz and Julia Hoffman to evaluate alignment in their community. While each grantee designed goals and projects to support the needs of their specific community, many of the communities chose to focus on common themes, including but not limited to: family engagement, improving alignment and transitions between/among early learning environments and public schools, improving 3rd grade literacy scores, professional development for educators and administrators, and school readiness. At the core of these communities' work is developing strong partnerships and increasing collaboration among partners serving young children and their families.

In 2015, there was tremendous momentum and growth among the B-3rd grantee communities. Several of the communities have established or expanded local governance structures and have gained the support of local leadership. There has also been significant gains at the state level that directly contributes to the work of the local grantees. In 2015, Massachusetts was awarded the federal Preschool Expansion Grant (PEG) funding. Five of the B-3rd grantee communities -- Boston, Holyoke, Lawrence, Lowell and Springfield -- received over \$14 million in PEG funding to support 45 new preschool classrooms. In the 2015-2016 school year, these classrooms will provide high-quality preschool for over 850 children. In addition to providing high quality preschool to four year olds, grantees will be working to strengthen their alignment efforts including the use of formative assessment as a tool to inform kindergarten transition.

Below are specific highlights of the alignment work happening across these twelve B-3rd grade communities in 2015:

#### *Building Local Leadership*

- **Cape Cod**, which is comprised of several diverse and geographically isolated communities and school districts, was able to engage leadership from all of the Cape's school districts in several full day professional development events over the Fall of 2015.
- **Pittsfield** began developing a plan to ensure that every high-risk child has access to programming within their early learning system. The first step of this process was to do a community assessment in order to determine the access and level of capacity needed for home visiting and early education programming. The next step will be to develop a mixed-delivery system to meet the needs of high-risk children that are not already in an early education and care setting. This system will consist of community-based programs that work within two age groups: prenatal to two years old, and three to four years old.

#### *Shared Professional Development*

- **New Bedford** sponsored an early literacy professional development pilot that began in September 2015. The pilot included pre-kindergarten teachers from community-based programs and the school district. As an outgrowth of this pilot, New Bedford reached out to other programs including community-based preschools, the Family Development and Resource Center, Reach Out and Read, and the New Bedford Housing Authority, to use some of the same books and unit themes that the district's preschool classes use.
- **Boston Public Schools (BPS)** continues to use RTT-ELC funds to support its K1DS initiative, a three-year demonstration project to expand the νατιοναλλη ρεχογιζεδ BPS πρε-Κ προγραμ to 14 community-based preschool classrooms in 10 community-based centers in high-needs areas. Boston K1DS focuses on aligning professional development by providing community based programs with instructional materials and support to integrate the BPS literacy and math curricula and assessments into the classroom, as well as one-on-one coaching, specializing in early childhood education and math, with community-based teachers to translate new knowledge into practice in the classroom.

#### *Aligning Standards, Curriculum and Assessments*

- **North Adams** formed peer groups focused on using GOLD™ by Teaching Strategies®, which is one of the tools used in the Massachusetts Kindergarten Entry Assessment (MKEA). They have focused their outreach efforts on family child care providers in addition to the public school and community-based educators to participate in the peer groups. North Adams is also working with schools and programs to help them develop internal support and choosing their own mentors to support other educators.
- **Springfield** piloted the use of a common curriculum between both community-based programs and Springfield public schools. To support this work, a peer learning community was convened with 65 participants representing 26 different community-based organizations. A formative survey of participants in the peer learning community showed that participants would continue their involvement in the new academic year and appreciated the alignment between community based preschool and the public school model, practices, and data sharing so they can work toward common goals.

#### *Using Common Data-Driven Indicators*

- **Lowell Public Schools** is using the CLASS as a measure of quality environment to develop a common framework for discussing quality across the B-3rd grade system. To date, they have collected data from 50 classrooms, which has been used to target quality improvements, such as training, coursework, coaching and individualized assistance to advance in the QRIS and to support the development of engaging learning environments.
- **Holyoke Public Schools** developed "On Track for Literacy Indicators" through their Holyoke Early Literacy Initiative (HELI). The indicators have been used in Holyoke's Pre-Kindergarten/Kindergarten Professional Learning Community and the HELI's Kindergarten Readiness (0 to 5) Workgroup has drafted a HELI pre-K for 4 year olds packet that includes: HELI's definition of Pre-K for 4 Year-Olds in Holyoke; a student-level assessment tool to track student progress on the On Track For Literacy Indicators; a programmatic alignment and collaboration assessment for HELI Partners; and the HELI Kindergarten Screening tool.
- After reviewing current kindergarten data, **Cambridge Public Schools** learned that approximately 81% of

children who enter kindergarten have participated some kind of formal preschool or early learning programming. In efforts to collect common data on children entering kindergarten, Cambridge has developed a common transition form to collect and include data on prior student experience in their student data system.

#### *Promoting Family Engagement*

- **Lowell and North Adams**, are using "Beyond the Bake Sale: the Essential Guide to Family and School Partnerships" framework to inform their family engagement strategies. These communities have held trainings and peer learning communities to support efforts to employ tactics outlined in the guide.
- In **Worcester**, the B-3rd Grant has supported the Worcester Reads initiative, a coalition committed to promoting early literacy and reading. Worcester Reads was invited by the Worcester Public Schools to be the community agency to support implementation of the school district's Literacy Plan to support family literacy.
- **Somerville** launched "Somerville Early Childhood Hub" website in November 2015 (<http://somervillehub.org/>). The website is a comprehensive, one-stop resource for families with young children, to assist them in learning about all of the programs, services, and opportunities to engage within the community. In addition to listing information about all child care and early education programs available in the city, the site has sections for parents and guardians to learn about such programs in their community, as well as information on child development.
- **Boston** has used RTT-ELC funds to increase the capacity of community based programs participating in the Boston K1DS initiative to support families using the Brazelton Touchpoints model on promoting positive child development, and is working to integrate the Brazelton Touchpoints model into the school district.

#### **Birth through Grade Three Advisory Group**

As part of Massachusetts' efforts to provide a birth to college and career education pathway for all its students, the state has several initiatives underway to promote coordination and alignment in early education from Birth to 3rd Grade. Several years ago, state education agencies (the Department of Early Education and Care, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and the Department of Higher Education) collaborated with local communities to look at the alignment of inclusive practices for children with disabilities between preschool and Kindergarten through Grade 3. Through funding provided by the federal Race to the Top -Early Learning Challenge grant, Massachusetts built on these early alignment efforts and supported local public school districts and community-based early education and care programs in collaborating to assess their current Birth to Grade 3 systems, using the [Framework for Planning, Implementing and Evaluating PreK-3rd Grade Approaches](#) designed by Kristie Kauerz and Julia Coffman. These "Birth to Grade 3 Alignment" grants provided the state's education agencies with a critical lens into the work of local communities to strengthen systems of services and supports for young children and their families.

Building off of this local work, Massachusetts convened a cross-sector team in 2013 to participate in the National Governor's Association (NGA) *Policy Academy on State Strategies to Improve Early Learning Outcomes*, which provided support in developing a comprehensive state Birth to Grade 3 Policy Framework, and formalized structures for collaboration and coordination of early learning policies and programs. Massachusetts' NGA team, which included representatives from the Department of Early Education, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, the Department of Higher Education, and the Executive Office of Education as well as an early childhood advocacy partner, developed guidance on the types of high quality learning experiences that support positive developmental outcomes for children Birth through Grade 3, across a range of early education settings. This resource document, [Building the Foundation of Future Success for Children from Birth through Grade 3](#), is grounded in the context of Massachusetts' [definition of college and career readiness](#).

In June 2015, Massachusetts expanded the original NGA state team as the state's Birth through Grade 3 Advisory Group, led by the Undersecretary of Education, and extended its membership to include the Head Start State Collaboration Office Director, a family engagement policy specialist, an early literacy specialist, a student assessment specialist, our Early Childhood Special Education Coordinator, our Preschool Expansion Grant Director and a professional development specialist, as well as representatives from the Executive Office of Health and Human Services, including Early Intervention, home visiting, and early childhood mental health.

Through diverse and inclusive membership, strong leadership and governance structure, and a commitment to early education among multiple stakeholders, Massachusetts has been able to increase alignment and coherence across the early education, K-12, higher education sectors, and health and human services in support of improving learning outcomes for children from Birth through Grade 3. The Birth through Grade 3 Advisory Group also collaborated on the development of new Preschool and Kindergarten standards for Social and Emotional Learning and Approaches to Play and Learning, and now serves as the Advisory Committee for the state's federally-funded Preschool Expansion Grant.

The work of the Birth through Grade 3 Advisory Group to date has resulted in the development of valuable partnerships among team members, an unequivocal commitment to the work and ensures that the comprehensive policy agenda is coordinated and aligned with the state's vision for Birth to Grade 3 systems as outlined in *Building the Foundations of Future Success for Children from Birth through Grade 3*. The primary factors that contribute to our progress are as follows:

- **Exceptional and Diverse State Team** - The passion and commitment on the part of all of the members of our state team plus the diversity of our perspectives and expertise enable us to accomplish our goals for the work.
- **Strong Leadership** - The commitment on the part of education leaders in our state (including our Secretary and Undersecretary of Education, and Commissioners of Early Education and Care, Elementary and Secondary Education, and Higher Education) to build a foundation for college and career success that is inclusive of the early years has been essential to our efforts.
- **Increasing Interest in and Commitment to Early Education** - Multiple stakeholders in Massachusetts are committed to working together to improve learning outcomes for children from Birth to Grade 3.
- **Strong Policy Foundation and Governance Structure** - A strong policy foundation along with the ongoing implementation of Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge Grant, K-12 Race to the Top strategies, Preschool Expansion Grant, home visiting, early childhood mental health, Early Intervention, Special Education and a public education governance system that was designed to increase alignment and coherence across the early education, K-12, and higher education sectors along with our health and human service partners have directly enabled the cross-sector and cross-agency collaboration that has been essential to our work.

### **Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) Screenings and Trainings**

Since January 2015, approximately 2,100 children have been screened using the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) and ASQ-SE (social emotional) developmental screening tool through the state's Coordinated Family and Community Engagement (CFCE) network. These 89 CFCE providers were trained in using the ASQ and have strengthened their skills in having meaningful conversation with families about their child's progress across the five developmental domains. For example, if the child's ASQ scores are below the cutoff, CFCE staff provide the family with information and referrals to other supports, such as developmental assessment and evaluation, Early Intervention, public preschool special education. Additionally, the ASQ kit includes activities that parents and families can do to support their child's progress in any of the developmental domains.

### **Massachusetts Kindergarten Entry Assessment (MKEA)**

More than 44,000 kindergarten children were assessed through the Massachusetts Kindergarten Entry Assessment (MKEA) in the Fall of 2015. Massachusetts supported school districts participating in the MKEA initiative with professional development and related supports. Below are a few highlights of the work done to further MKEA in the past year. Additional information can be found in the *Understanding Children's Learning and Development at Kindergarten Entry* section of this report.

- As of December 1, 2015, there were **168** school districts participating in MKEA: 146 school districts are utilizing *GOLD™* by Teaching Strategies®; four school districts are utilizing Work Sampling System®; and 18 school districts are utilizing an alternate observational tool/framework that addresses, at a minimum, the social-emotional and cognitive development domains for children.
- Between January 2015 and November 2015, there were 344 kindergarten educators and administrators from 16 school districts that participated in the two-day formative assessment training designed to

increase competency in using the formative assessment tool. To support alignment among early learning classrooms, some districts chose to have their preschool teachers attend the training with the kindergarten teachers.

- On-site technical assistance was available to all districts at no charge to the district. The technical assistance was district-directed and designed to respond to the specific needs of each individual group of educators and administrators. Between January 2015 and November 2015, there were 288 kindergarten educators from 28 school districts that received technical assistance.
- EEC provided additional funding to districts in support of educators learning to implement formative assessment. This funding provided substitutes or stipends to kindergarten teachers, allowing them time to attend professional development, learning communities, district level training, work with their colleagues, and become familiar and proficient with *GOLD*<sup>™</sup>.
- Six Readiness Centers across the state continued to provide regional support to districts ranging from on-site technical assistance to regional administrator meetings.

**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.

Not Applicable.

MASSACHUSETTS DID NOT ADDRESS FOCUS AREA C(3) IN ITS RTT-ELC APPLICATION )  
PAGES 48 of 124 AND 49 OF 124 HAVE BEEN DELETED)

## Engaging and Supporting Families (Section C(4) of Application)

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

- Establishing a progression of culturally and linguistically appropriate standards for family engagement across the levels of your Program Standards;
- Including information on activities that enhance the capacity of families to support their children's education and development;
- Increasing the number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators trained and supported to implement the family engagement strategies; and
- Promoting family support and engagement statewide, including by leveraging other existing resources.

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.

Under the RTT-ELC grant, Massachusetts is engaged in several key family and community engagement activities:

- Museums and Libraries Partnership for Parent, Family and Community Engagement: EEC continued partnering with Boston Children's Museum (BCM) to increase the capacity of museums and libraries to support the optimal development of all children through intentional family engagement activities and early learning opportunities. The partnership focuses on four areas: early literacy; school readiness, including preparation for kindergarten; interest and awareness of STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Math); and public awareness of the importance of early education and care through the state's Brain Building in Progress communications initiative.
- Financial Literacy Education: EEC partnered with the Massachusetts Community Action Programs (MASSCAP) to develop a Financial Literacy Education online course (with a training module) to support families in gaining long-term economic independence and self-sufficiency skills, so that they can provide stable and healthy learning environments for young children.
- Evidence Based Family Literacy: The Evidence Based Literacy grant provided support to existing Coordinated Family and Community Engagement (CFCE) grantees to enhance their implementation of evidence-based early literacy programming for children and families in their communities.
- Media-Based Literacy Support for Families and Educators: In partnership with the WGBH Educational Foundation, EEC created the *Resources for Early Learning* website ([www.resourcesforearlylearning.org](http://www.resourcesforearlylearning.org)). This new comprehensive digital hub features a media-based English Language Arts (ELA) and Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) preschool curriculum, professional development modules, online educational games, and other digital tools for educators and parents.
- Brain Building in Progress (BBIP): In partnership with United Way of Massachusetts Bay and Merrimack Valley, EEC launched the Brain Building in Progress (BBIP) campaign on the importance of investing in early childhood. It is focused on raising the public's awareness about the importance of investing in the early years, based on current research focused on how connections between early experiences and later educational outcomes directly relate to future economic prosperity.
- Interagency Partnerships: EEC has partnerships with multiple state agencies to support young children and their families. EEC has signed agreements with the following agencies to promote early childhood development policies and best practices: Department of Children and Families (DCF), Department of Mental Health (DMH), Department of Public Health (DPH), Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) and the Office of Refugees and Immigrants (ORI).

Below is a summary of the 2015 accomplishments in each of these activities.

## **Museums and Libraries Partnership for Parent, Family and Community Engagement**

In 2014, Boston Children's Museum (BCM) developed a "Passport to Kindergarten", a set of tools and resources for families to support children's readiness for kindergarten, and trained museums and libraries on how to use the "Passport" to offer quarterly activities. In 2015, BMC distributed 6,620 child Passports to 41 libraries, 13 museums and cultural institutions, and 14 Coordinated Family and Community Engagement (CFCE) grantees across Massachusetts. Bookmarks, fliers, posters and tip sheet templates were designed and made available online to the public at: <http://www.bostonchildrensmuseum.org/passport-kindergarten>

In November 2015, there was a statewide Story Walk day in honor of Family Literacy Month. BCM designed and produced a Literacy Story Walk as a way to engage young families in physical activity, family engagement, and literacy. Museums, libraries, CFCE grantees and other community partners worked together to offer many Story Walks across the state.

In 2015, BMC secured an Institute of Museums and Libraries Services (IMLS) grant to maintain and expand on the work of this project. EEC staff will participate on the advisory board for that grant to ensure the sustained engagement of the CFCE grantees with their museum and library partners.

As part of sustainability efforts, the USS Constitution Museum, a participant in the museums and libraries project, created a website of family engagement resources <http://engagefamilies.org/> to share with 119 libraries and 52 museums across the state.

## **Financial Literacy Education**

In FY2015, EEC's Financial Education Literacy Statewide Initiative focused on the expansion of professional development opportunities for the early education workforce, community partners, and other networks that **support families toward long-term economic independence and self-sufficiency**. In particular, this initiative focused on:

- Communities of Practice- From March to December 2015, approximately 100 individuals participated in communities of practice to increase their capacity to work with parents of young children in their journey towards greater financial stability.
- Financial Education Webinar Series- Between September and December 2015, over 391 individuals participated in webinars on the following topics: 1) best practices for implementing financial education with parents of young children, 2) integrating financial education into the early education classroom, and 3) developing partnerships to enhance financial education in communities.
- Public-Private Partnerships- In February 2015, the Massachusetts Community Action Programs (MASSCAP) invited the Head Start State Collaboration Office to participate in the Corporation for Enterprise Development (CFED) Community Financial Empowerment Learning Partnership grant opportunity. CFED, in partnership with JP Morgan Chase, requested applications from organizations interested in participating an 18 month Learning Partnerships to expand, improve, and align financial capacity service delivery with their organizations and communities. Massachusetts was selected for this grant and will participate in the Learning Partnership from July 2015 to July 2017.

## **Enhancing Evidence Based Family Literacy Practices**

As one of the core goals of EEC's family and community engagement strategy, the Coordinated Family and Community Engagement (CFCE) networks are required to incorporate the use of an evidence-based early literacy model/practice in their programs. Use of these models/practices enhances the capacity of CFCE grantees to bolster the ability of parents to promote early literacy skills and language development in their children. The evidence-based literacy models/practices include:

- Raising A Reader
- Every Child Ready to Read @ your Library
- CELL model (Center for Early Literacy Learning)
- Read and Rise (Scholastic model)

- Dialogic and Interactive reading models- using PEER and CROWD sequences

By focusing on a small number of effective literacy models/practices, EEC has created greater consistency in the strategies CFCE grantees share with families to cultivate their children's literacy skills and language before they enter kindergarten. RTT-ELC funds were used to augment CFCE literacy programming. In 2015, EEC funded nineteen CFCE grantees to integrate the use of these approved models/practices into their existing programming through ongoing/year round opportunities for parents and children to learn and practice early literacy skills together. During 2015, more than 1,000 literacy program opportunities happened for families of young children, supported through these CFCE grantees.

### **Resources for Early Learning**

*Resources for Early Learning*, a comprehensive, early childhood digital library featuring more than 2,500 free media-based tools for teaching and learning. With a strong focus on English Language Arts (ELA) and Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM), *Resources for Early Learning* features a comprehensive, digital preschool curriculum, video-centered professional development modules, and resources for parents. By developing, disseminating, and facilitating the use of a robust set of media-based curricular resources, the overarching goal was to build the capacity of preschool classroom teachers and family daycare providers to promote the growth of young children, and to support and engage parents in their role as their child's first teacher.

Specifically, *Resources for Early Learning* features the following:

- *Educator Activities (for caregivers of infants and toddlers)*: Quick, easy, and fun activities that provide exciting, focused learning experiences. Educators can use these activities to help children's developmental, physical, and social-emotional learning.
- *Early Learning Curriculum (for educators of preschoolers)*: This nine-unit, 30-week curriculum provides a media-based approach to help children develop their academic and social-emotional skills. The curriculum was created by a team of experts and is based, in large part, on two award-winning educational series: *PEEP and the Big Wide World* (STEM learning) and *Between the Lions* (ELA learning). Family child care, center-based, and school-based early childhood educators will find this innovative, standards-aligned curriculum useful in all settings.
- *Professional Development (for educators of children ages birth to 5 years)*: 17 video-based training modules explore essential best practices for early childhood education from *The Roots of Early Learning* and *Supporting Toddlers' Learning to Strategies for Individualizing Instruction* to *Leading Children in Hands-on Exploration*. Individual early childhood educators can access these modules as self-paced online tutorials, while trainers can use the comprehensive *Facilitators Guides* for group trainings.
- *Parent Activities*: Quick, easy, and fun activities for families provide exciting learning experiences designed to help parents support their child's development. Activities are organized in two age groups -- infants/toddlers and preschoolers --and feature fun, skill-building engagement for bathtime, bedtime, and more.
- *Parenting Videos (for parents of children ages birth to age 5 years)*: 10 short videos featuring real Massachusetts parents interacting their children while modeling simple parenting strategies that turn everyday moments into learning opportunities that help them learn and grow. Parents discover ways to support their child's development and learning styles, and find useful tips and great ideas to try at home, from talking and listening activities to harnessing the power of media and technology. Videos are appropriate for individual use and for facilitated groups.
- *Playlists for Children*: The site features a collection of playlists of videos and other media that correspond to curriculum units and themes. Included on each playlist are animated stories from *Between the Lions* and *PEEP*, interactive games and apps, and live-action segments that show children exploring language and the world around them.

In 2015, WGBH focused on the following activities related to *Resources for Early Learning*:

Trainings and Presentations: WGBH conducted in-person trainings, conference presentation, and online webinars on *Resources for Early Learning* to a variety of early childhood audiences, including the following: Coordinated Family and Community Engagement grantees; Educator and Provider Support grantees, MA Head

Start programs, Little Sprouts Early Childhood Centers, Imagine That, the Lawrence Public Schools, the Southeast Education Professionals Partnership (SEEP) Spring Enrichment Conference, Boston Family Engagement Network, Touch Tomorrow event in Worcester, the Massachusetts STEM Summit, PBS Learning Media, and WGBY (the public broadcaster in western Massachusetts).

At the trainings, WGBH distributed thousands of educational resources including new children's books, and PBS Kids branded items. The books were provided through a grant to WGBH from the Krueger Charitable Foundation. At several early childhood conference presentations, WGBH distributed fact sheets on *Resources for Early Learning*. In 2015, WGBH reached more than 750 early childhood trainers and educators with direct training and resources, and information about *Resources for Early Learning* through conference booths and presentations.

Text Message Campaign: WGBH continued to create and deploy weekly text messages for parents, in English and Spanish, with links to online educational resources. Each week, WGBH deployed four messages: two in English (one for parents of infants and toddlers and one for parents of preschoolers) and two in Spanish (one for parents of infants and toddlers and one for parents of preschoolers). Text featured developmentally appropriate information with a link to related content on *Resources for Early Learning*.

Awareness Campaign: WGBH developed and managed an awareness campaign for Resources for Early Learning, which significantly increased site use over the same period in the previous year. Specifically, the campaign contributed to:

- increases the number of sessions from 21,975 to 45,520 (increase of 107.14%)
- increases in the number of users from 12,510 to 31,510 (increase of 151.88%)
- increases in the number of pageviews from 121,273 to 158,904 (increase of 31.03%)

The campaign featured the design and content development of two posters --one for early childhood centers and another (translated into Spanish) for parents. Both designs feature photos of Massachusetts' teachers, parents and children and included QR codes that link to content on *Resources for Early Learning*. WGBH distributed more than 12,000 copies of these posters throughout the Commonwealth. The campaign also featured direct emails promoting the site, social media posts with links to the site, and banner ads in parenting publications.

The awareness campaign for *Resources for Early Learning* was created by WGBH to promote the digital library among early childhood educators, trainers, and parents throughout the Commonwealth, and to expand the audience for these high quality resources. Over the course of 11 months of implementation, the campaign has been highly successful, reaching 260,897 educators and parents and an average engagement rate of 1.75% (which industry experts rate as "good") through the following strategies:

#### Email Campaign

WGBH prepared periodic emails targeted EEC's existing database of potential users as well as a new list developed by WGBH to highlight resources on the site and encourage visits to the site and use of the activities (reach: 7,000).

#### Social Media

The social media campaign was comprised of three components: Facebook posts, Tweets, and Pinterest boards. For the Facebook posts, we highlighted resources on the site, mostly geared toward educators and included some parent posts. The Tweets highlighted resources on the site that were targeted more toward parents who use Twitter for information and news. Posts and Tweets were largely seasonally themed, featured a mix of English and Spanish (reach: 159,000).

WGBH also created a Pinterest board to create access for early educators who use Pinterest to search for curriculum and organizing ideas (reach: 6,000).

#### Banner Advertising

A banner advertising campaign was created with the goal of targeting parent users to introduce them to the site

and encourage them to try some of our easy-to-do enrichment activities with their children. Two publications were targeted--Baystate Parents and Boston Parents Paper --and digital banners were placed on their web sites and in email newsletters to encourage parents to visit the site and search for activities (reach: 76,872).

#### Posters

A print poster campaign was created in order to provide prominent visual reminders about the site and key developmental milestones in a child's health growth. A bilingual poster for early childhood centers used attractive photos and a lively design to display in public spaces in early childhood centers to encourage educators to visit the site. A growth chart, available in English and Spanish, featured important developmental milestones illustrated with engaging photos, activity teasers, and QR codes that link to age-specific activities and other content for parents to use with their young children (reach: 12,025).

#### **Brain Building in Progress Campaign**

Utilizing funds from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), EEC established in 2010 a partnership with the United Way of Massachusetts Bay and Merrimack Valley to launch the *Brain Building in Progress* campaign to communicate the importance of early learning in a child's development and to the overall prosperity of the Commonwealth. The *Brain Building in Progress* message is based on research which establishes connections on how positive and engaging interactions build children's brains, and provide them with a strong foundation for learning. *Brain Building in Progress* is a multi-faceted campaign that is comprised of targeted messages that align with the components of quality early learning experiences and programs, engagement of key stakeholders and communities and resources for families.

RTT-ELC funds were used to expand the reach of *Brain Building in Progress*<sup>SM</sup>, through efforts including: ad campaigns with state and local agencies, the development and dissemination of training on the science behind "brain building", and a complete redesign of the *Brain Building in Progress*<sup>SM</sup> website, which includes updates to the calendar of "brain building events" offered by EEC's CFCE grantees and the "brain building zone finder", additional tips on how to be a "brain builder", and featured campaign partners including Horizons for Homeless Children and Vroom. Additionally, EEC obtained a service mark in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for the *Brain Building in Progress*<sup>SM</sup> name and logo. United Way of Massachusetts Bay and Merrimack Valley is planning to continue to partner with EEC to maintain the *Brain Building in Progress*<sup>SM</sup> website and to continue to promote the use of the materials and messages within local organizations and partners.

#### **Interagency Partnerships**

EEC partnered with several state agencies to implement a variety of strategies to improve the physical and social emotional health of children and the stability of their families. These strategies target children and families that face multiple barriers including homelessness, mental illness, and involvement in child welfare.

#### **Department of Children and Families (DCF)**

An interagency partnership with the Department of Children and Families (DCF) was established in 2012 to promote early childhood and child development within the child welfare system. DCF is committed to incorporating research and best practices in early childhood development and education into and across all aspects of their work with children and families involved in the child welfare system. This multifaceted work includes, but is not limited to: revising existing policies and creating new policies and procedures for DCF social workers and other staff; enhancing training for new and current DCF staff; providing greater access to quality early education and care programs for DCF-involved families and foster parents; increasing awareness among all stakeholders (internal and external) about the importance of early childhood experiences and relationships, especially for children at risk of abuse and neglect; and providing concrete support and information for their parents/families to help them support their children's healthy, positive development. Below is a summary of progress made in 2015.

#### Trainings and Technical Assistance:

- The DCF Early Childhood Program Coordinator continued providing training on Early Childhood Development (including early childhood education, brain development, school readiness and success, and trauma informed care) at DCF's quarterly Foundations of Health and Wellbeing in Child Welfare meetings and at four in-service trainings for new DCF Social Workers, and provided training on Child

Development, Toxic Stress, Early Education and Supportive Child Care for new DCF Social Workers.

- The DCF Early Childhood Policy Analyst offered ongoing refresher trainings (in person and via webinars) to all 29 DCF Area Offices on the Supportive Child Care (SCC) Data Management Tool. The SCC data tool was created in 2014 to manage the utilization of SCC at the 29 DCF Area Offices. This tool captures each Area Office's waitlist, referrals and enrollments to supportive providers, as well as the demographical information for each child referred. The DCF Early Childhood Policy Analyst also revised the SCC Tool Guide (with screenshots and a set of Frequently Asked Questions) and created a "SCC Tool Cheat Sheet" that has quick tips on using the SCC Tool.
- Both the DCF Early Childhood Program Coordinator and the Policy Analyst planned and hosted three statewide and four regional DCF Child Care Coordinator meetings. These meetings focused on any new developments and ongoing issues with the Supportive Child Care program.

#### Projects and Collaborations:

- DCF has continued implementing the Welcome Baby project for DCF families with children from birth to 6 months. DCF has distributed 6,000 Welcome Baby bags that contain essential items for babies and important information about child development across the state.
- The DCF Early Childhood Program Coordinator continued to participate in the Head Start State Collaboration Office (HSSCO) Advisory meetings at EEC, the monthly inter-agency Fatherhood work group at DCF, as well as the statewide monthly Race, Ethnicity, Language, and Minorities Association (RELMA) meetings to increase cultural competence in DCF policies and practices.
- Both the DCF Early Childhood Program Coordinator and the Policy Analyst participated in monthly meetings with EEC/DCF staff for SCC Working Group as well as the monthly interagency/cross-agency training working group at EEC.
- The DCF Early Childhood Policy Analyst represented DCF as a member of the Early Intervention Program Planning (EIPP) Workgroup at the Department of Public Health (DPH). The purpose of the EIPP is to provide the early identification of maternal and infant risk, and linkage to services to prevent or mitigate poor health and/or developmental outcomes.
- The DCF Early Childhood Policy Analyst has been involved in efforts to revamp the DCF intranet site so that updated information on early childhood education is available to all employees at DCF.
- The Early Childhood Program Coordinator participated in the Essentials for Childhood Leadership Team. This is a group of state and community partners leading the effort to prevent maltreatment through a Center for Disease Control (CDC) grant.

#### Conferences:

- Both the DCF Early Childhood Program Coordinator and the Policy Analyst attended the National Association on the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) Early Childhood Professional Development Conference in New Orleans, LA from June 7-9, 2015.
- Both the DCF Early Childhood Program Coordinator and the Policy Analyst attended the 30<sup>th</sup> National Training Institute Zero to Three National conference in Seattle, WA from December 2-4, 2015. This conference brought together stakeholders in early childhood development to represent every discipline and setting in the growing field of early education and care: researchers, practitioners, clinicians, therapists, educators, policymakers, parents and more. The National Training Institute (NTI) is carefully developed to meet the learning and networking needs of those working with infants and toddlers in Early Childhood Education, Early Intervention, Mental Health, Early Head Start, Child Welfare, Parent Education, and Pediatrics.

#### ***Department of Mental Health (DMH)***

The partnership between DMH and EEC addresses the mental health needs of young children and their families and strengthens the comprehensive statewide system of mental health supports for children and families throughout the Commonwealth. Below is a summary of 2015 accomplishments:

- DMH provided follow-up monthly phone consultation to the 20 pediatricians in 42 practices across the state who completed the *Triple P (Positive Parenting Program)* in 2014., to support implementation of the practice. The project was implemented by the Massachusetts Child Psychiatry Access Project (MCPAP), a statewide system providing psychiatric consultation to 95% of primary pediatric practices in Massachusetts. DMH reported a 10% increase in the number of MCPAP encounters of young children during the first three quarters of FY16 as compared to FY15.
- DMH created and distributed the *Early Childhood Mental Guide for Early Childhood Educators*, a 60-page resource handbook in English and Spanish, to over 5,000 individuals *statewide*. The guide is also available online through the EEC, Child Behavioral Health Initiative (CBHI), and DMH websites. The guide is intended to increase the capacity of early childhood educational professional community to understand basic mental health issues and be knowledgeable of state-wide and community-based resources for children with challenging emotional and behavioral mental health.
- DMH provided training and coaching on meeting the needs of very young children and their families with significant behavioral health challenges to 28 clinical supervisors working in 8 behavioral health agencies that provide children's mental health services through the state's Medicaid children's mental health service system..
- DMH provided training on ways to understand classroom behaviors and use new strategies to help children with their challenging behaviors, using the Top of the Pyramid Skills /CSEFEL (Center on the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning) framework. CSEFEL is an evidence-based curriculum for early education professionals and early childhood mental health consultants. .
- EEC's Early Childhood Mental Health grantee program consultants participated in a two day workshop and acquired advanced classroom-focused skills through an evidenced based tool to increase their capacity to partner with teachers to implement evidence based classroom practices for children with challenging behaviors using the Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool (TPOT) curriculum.
- A DMH early childhood psychiatrist and the Massachusetts Immigration and Refugee Agency (MIRA) provided a workshop on understanding and identifying trauma experienced by very young children in refugee and immigrant families.
- DMH and EEC Commissioners met to address ways to sustain the partnership and continue to support positive mental health outcomes of children with the most challenging behavioral and emotional challenges, including children most at risk of expulsion and suspension.

### ***Department of Public Health (DPH)***

The partnership between DPH and EEC has focused on building and strengthening a system of health and mental health supports for young children and their families across early education and care and other child and family serving systems. To achieve this goal, DPH activities are distributed across four strategy areas: 1) health infrastructure and supports; 2) mental health infrastructure and supports; 3) program quality improvement and; 4) cross-systems training. Within these four areas, DPH provided training, technical assistance, and policy guidance to provide nurturing environments and relationships that promote the healthy development of young children, prevent risk factors from impacting children's well-being, and address children's challenging behaviors. The following is a description of progress made in 2015 with the interagency partnership between EEC and DPH.

#### Health Infrastructure and Supports:

##### *Early Childhood Health Specialist:*

- The RTT Early Childhood Health Specialist (ECHS) at DPH has served as the lead Child Care Health Consultant (CCHC) for the state and has partnered with EEC and the field to develop sustainable, consistent health and safety infrastructure and quality standards for early education and care. The ECHS activities included developing collaborations with state partners who are involved in the care of children from birth to 5 years old, including public school health departments, the DPH immunization unit, early childhood special education, and Head Start.
- In 2015, the ECHS provided technical assistance and guidance to EEC and child care programs on issues including medical marijuana policies, and response to the Enterovirus DV-68 outbreak. The ECHS partnered with EEC licensing staff to develop a Safe Sleep training for early educators that is aligned with DPH standards and guidelines from the American Academy of Pediatrics. The QRIS Health Advisors were trained as regional Safe Sleep trainers and provided on-going training and support to programs as needed.

- In order to expand and standardize the field of Child Care Health Consultants in Massachusetts, and connect more programs with qualified consultants, the ECHS partnered with the University of Massachusetts School of Nursing to develop an online continuing education course on child care health consultation. The training will provide current health consulting information, emphasizing inclusion of children with special needs. The goal of the training will be to align the CCHC role and responsibilities with QRIS standards and program improvement needs. In addition to the online CCHC training, the ECHS partnered with a QRIS Health Advisor to develop a Toolkit for CCHCs that includes resources that will support them in their role as consultants. Expanding the field of qualified health consultants in Massachusetts will support programs in achieving higher levels of quality within the QRIS and ensure safe education and care environments for children.

*Medication Administration Training for Child Care (MACC):*

- To support the safe care of children with chronic illness in early education settings, in 2015 the six DPH Regional Consultation Program Registered Nurse trainers provided a total of 474 Medication Administration Training for Child Care (MACC) trainings to 219 child care programs, reaching 3669 educators and staff. The MACC modules include: Asthma; Allergies & Anaphylaxis; Seizure Disorders; and Diabetes. The trainings have led programs to strengthen their practices related to Individualized Health Care Plans, emergency response, parent communication regarding health concerns, and appropriate use of medication equipment.
- In 2015, program enhancements included revision of the Diabetes, Asthma and Allergy modules to ensure consistency with current best practices and clinical guidelines. In addition to module revisions, the Early Childhood Mental Health Specialist developed scripted stories to accompany the Asthma, Allergy and Diabetes modules. These stories were distributed to child care programs and are tools educators can use to help young children understand what it means to have a peer with a chronic illness. RTT-ELC funds were also used to translate the stories into Spanish.

*Health Promotion and Wellness in Early Childhood:*

- In 2015, MA Children at Play (MCAP), a DPH early childhood obesity prevention initiative, was replicated with a second cohort of mentors and early education programs. Ten child care consultants were trained as mentors to support 15 programs in assessing and enhancing the practices and policies around physical activity and healthy eating using the Nutrition and Physical Activity Self Assessment Tool for Child Care (NAP SACC) tool and I am Moving I am Learning (IMIL) program.
- All MCAP programs demonstrated increased adoption of best practices, including creation of written nutrition policies, incorporating more fruits and vegetables into meals/snacks and embedding quality physical activity across program curriculum. In 2015, MCAP held an IMIL training that reached over 70 educators and staff. DPH also held Learning Communities for MCAP mentors to enhance practice on topics including healthy meals preparation, Farm to Preschool and including children with special health needs in physical activity.

Mental Health Infrastructure and Supports:

- The 2015 activities of the RTT ECMH Specialist were focused on expanding the CSEFEL Pyramid Model across systems. These activities included facilitation of the CSEFEL State Leadership Team, a CSEFEL Summit attracting over 100 attendees and featuring a keynote address by Congresswoman Katherine Clark, and customization of CSEFEL Pyramid Model professional development opportunities for public benefits workers, children's museum staff and Boston Public School teachers.
- There are increasing numbers of families with young children that are experiencing homelessness in Massachusetts. To support shelter staff in caring for these children and families, the ECMH Specialist partnered with the Department of Housing and Community Development and Horizons for Homeless Children to provide training on the CSEFEL Pyramid Model framework to teams from shelters across three regions of the state. Twenty three shelters sent teams comprised of floor staff, caseworkers, social workers, and administration that were matched with mentors. Eleven early childhood clinicians and shelter staff participated in a train the trainer for sustainability of the CSEFEL Pyramid Model framework.
- In 2015, DPH also provided a three-session training to staff working in the shelter system. The training addressed the topics of attachment, the effects of trauma on brain development, strategies to

support the parent-child relationship and family-informed practice. Early childhood mental health clinicians, trained in the Pyramid Model and trauma informed practice, provided coaching to shelter staff following each training session. A survey of shelter staff showed a decrease in referrals for outside children's mental health services, indicating that when responsive relationships and nurturing environments are in place, challenging behaviors decrease.

- In 2015, the ECMH Specialist also developed a training module on Trauma and Exposure to Violence that was used in 22 trainings with early educators across the state, two of which were provided in Spanish.

#### Program Quality Improvement

- In 2015, the Early Childhood Health Specialists (ECHS) developed new standards in the *Safe Healthy Indoor and Outdoor Environments* category of the state's QRIS for center-based and family child care programs. They are in the process of developing standards for public school pre-kindergarten. EEC developed an *Orientation to the Basics of Health and Safety* module and accompanying self-assessment tools. The module is mapped to priority health and safety needs identified by the field and covers: Individual Health Care Plans, Health Policy Development, Nutrition, Emergency Response and Safe Personal Care Routines. In the fall of 2015 a cohort of Registered Nurse Child Care Health Consultants, including the five QRIS Health Advisors, were trained as trainers in these modules and will provide the trainings to programs until the modules are uploaded on an online platform.
- Under the supervision of the ECHS, the four Registered Nurse Health Advisors provided technical assistance to EEC licensing staff and child care programs on a range of health and safety related topics, including infectious disease prevention, medication administration, safe sleep, immunization requirements, supporting children with special health care needs, access to child care health consultation, and safe cleaning practices. The Health Advisors provided immediate solutions for health and safety emergencies and served as a vehicle to enhance communication between families, educators and health care providers. The Health Advisors also continued to develop collaborative relationships with regional agencies to build health and safety capacity in child care programs, including outreach to health professionals to develop regional cadres of child care health consultants. In 2015, the Health Advisors provided 33 health consultation visits to child care programs to meet standards within Category 2, Safe Healthy Indoor and Outdoor Environments, of EEC's Quality Rating Improvement System.

#### Cross Systems Training

- In partnership with EEC's regional professional development agencies, DPH provided a training series in the spring of 2015 on "*Strength-based Approaches to Supporting Young Children and Families Facing Adversity*" to early educators in each of EEC's five regions of the state. Modules in the series include: 1) Trauma in Early Childhood; 2) Family Substance Use; 3) Parent Mental Health; 4) Exposure to Violence. The modules provide an overview of family and environmental risk factors on young children's development as well as effective strategies, including referral sources, for supporting families who are facing these challenges. Over 500 educators participated in the training series. To embed these modules in EEC's professional development system, as well as other systems that serve young children, DPH provided a train-the-trainer on the series to over 20 experienced early education and mental health professionals across the state. Using the new trainers, the series was replicated in the fall of 2015 through EEC's regional Educator and Provider Support (EPS) network and included two *Trauma in Early Childhood* trainings in Spanish.
- DPH also led a partnership with the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD), the Office of Refugees and Immigrants (ORI), and community agencies to provide training to cross-systems providers on *Motivational Interviewing and Helping Families Access Concrete Supports*. Motivational interviewing is a sensitive approach to connecting families with resources. The ECMH Specialist provided training on motivational interviewing to 63 Head Start providers, home visitors, EI providers, and child welfare case workers. They also created a community resource guide and learned from a panel of community providers who shared local resources on key areas including family substance use, housing insecurity/homelessness and refugee and undocumented families.

***Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD)***

The partnership between EEC and the DHCD focuses on aligning and improving access to early education and care services for children experiencing homelessness. Project goals include: increasing collaboration between DHCD, EEC, and community organizations that serve young children experiencing homelessness (ages birth to five); developing and implementing a system for screening all children, including a referral system for those children who need additional services; connecting families experiencing homelessness with local services; identifying service gaps for re-housed families and those experiencing homelessness and their children; and providing professional development on child development to staff working with these families.

Accomplishments in 2015 include:

- DHCD collaborated with DPH, EEC, and Horizons for the Homeless to implement the second and third round of the *Positive Solutions for Powerful Family Interactions (PSPFI)* training for direct care shelter staff and their immediate supervisors in Springfield and Framingham. PSPFI was adapted from the evidence based curriculum, *The Pyramid Model for Supporting Social Emotional Competence in Infants and Young Children*. The first round of this training was delivered in 2014.
- DHCD developed a "Train the Trainer" on the PSPFI training to ensure more staff at homeless shelters can receive access to PSPFI.
- DHCD disseminated information to over 60 shelters on trainings with content on trauma, substance abuse, mental illness, nutrition and impact of domestic violence on the young child. Over 50 shelter staff across the state participated in these trainings.
- DHCD made direct one-on-one contact with over 350 families to distribute resources related to healthy early childhood development, including information on social emotional development of young children, nutrition, promoting literacy in infants and toddlers, brain building activities and tips, activities to do with babies, information on immunizations and the Keep Me Safe While I Sleep brochure - part of a statewide safe sleep campaign for parents of infants.

### ***Office of Refugees and Immigrants (ORI)***

In Massachusetts, more than 1 in 4 children under the age of 6 live in households that speak a language other than English. In order to prepare children for school success in immigrant and refugee families, a focus on early learning for these children and meaningful engagement of their parents and communities is essential. EEC has partnered with ORI to support early learning and school readiness for immigrant and refugee children and their families by providing outreach to and engage immigrant and refugee communities to increase the awareness of early education benefits and services, and providing technical assistance regarding effective policies and programming for dual language learners. Accomplishments in 2015 included the following:

- New Start Trainings: In collaboration with the Massachusetts Immigrant and Refugee Advocacy Coalition (MIRA) and Tufts University, ORI sponsored four regional trainings entitled "*New Start: Supporting Multilingual Young Children and Immigrant and Refugee Families*". Participants included CFCE grantees, Child Care Resources and Referral Agencies, MASS 2-1-1, Family Child Care System Providers, Head Start and ORI's service providers. These trainings offered knowledge on immigration policy as it impacts children and families; cultural competency; child development; and educational principles in the context of multilingual homes and multicultural environments. 146 people participated in the four regional trainings held in 2015 in Taunton, Lowell, Worcester, and Holyoke.
- Community Dialogues: To create and support sustained dialogue about access issues for refugees and immigrants from the New Start trainings, ORI and EEC worked with MIRA to develop a process for regional stakeholders to continue discussions regarding dual language learners. These community dialogues were piloted with the Taunton/Brockton area in May 2015 and again in Worcester in June 2015. A total of 56 participants representing EEC providers, CFCEs, Early Intervention, Public Schools, DCF, DPH, and other stakeholders attended these community dialogues. An additional community dialogue was held in November 2015 at the Refugee and Immigrant Assistance Center in Jamaica Plain. This was a collaborative effort between EEC, ORI, and DMH, and brought together 30 refugee service providers across the state to discuss early childhood and how trauma affects refugee families' ability to reach out to and access supports for their young children. DMH Consulting Psychiatrist and Medical Director at Children's Services of Roxbury, Dr. Mathieu Bermingham, led the discussion and brought

unique perspectives on childhood trauma to the participants, who strongly urged ORI to have more dialogues on the topic.

- Support for Outreach to Ethnic Communities: Through contracts with ORI through the Race to the Top grant, two ethnic community-based organizations, the African Community Education (ACE) and the Southeast Asian Coalition (SEACMA), provided outreach to specific refugee and immigrant communities (Liberian, Congolese, Vietnamese, Burmese) to raise awareness of the brain building benefits of early education and early literacy. The goal of this outreach work is that family engagement and child participation in early education will increase, and the availability of quality, licensed bilingual-bicultural care will grow in the central MA region.
  - The Southeast Asian Coalition of Central MA (SEACMA) provided family literacy and family support programs to Southeast Asian immigrants, refugees and low-income long-term residents and their families. The purpose was to help clients and their families, especially those with children age 6 and younger, to access services and overcome the cultural and language barriers that also alleviate isolation, loneliness, depression and anxiety. Many of these parents are low-income, have no English language capacity, and cannot read in their own language. They have difficulty navigating the transportation, schools and health care systems. SEACMA provided ESL lessons to parents, and group and one-on-one reading programs to parents and their young children. The program has helped families use oral stories to strengthen their young children's communication skills, and to gain confidence to get out of their home and integrate in the larger community.
  - As part of their outreach program, the African Community Education (ACE)'s Family Education Program started an Early Literacy Playgroup and engaged 14 refugee and immigrant children and their parents in parent-child early literacy activities on Saturdays. ACE staff and the early literacy and ESOL teachers collaborated weekly to plan the joint parent-child literacy activity. The children's books were at an appropriate reading level for the children, as well as for parents, who were at a low English proficiency level. ACE staff (Outreach Workers, Liaison to the Worcester Public Schools and Family Education Staff) provided outreach services to families through home visits and regular communication, and sharing information about early education resources in Worcester. The ACE Family Education Staff referred families to Head Start, encouraged all parents to attend the Worcester Public Schools Parents/Guardians Expo to learn about summer opportunities for children, and enrolled young children in the school district's summer recreational and educational programs. A staff member from Ascentria Care Alliance, a refugee resettlement agency, visited ACE regularly to share information with parents about child care vouchers. Ascentria Care Alliance had a grant to work on refugee child care microenterprise, and worked with ethnic community-based organizations to do outreach to potential child care providers and assist families with vouchers. ACE reinforced this message and encouraged parents to apply for the vouchers.
  - During 2015, staff from the Edward Street Family Services, a multi-service non-profit in Worcester, trained ACE staff (Outreach Coordinator, a new Program Director and Family Education Assistants) about the developmental stages of young children, and provided strategies, activities and materials to work effectively with youth at different ages.
  - ACE is partnering with the Adult Learning Center at the Worcester Public Schools' Adult and Continuing Education Department, to provide an English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) teacher to run a class with the parents, and with the Worcester Family Partnership (who will provide playgroup instructors for a portion of the program). ACE staff will provide outreach services to families through home visits and regular communication, sharing information about early education resources in Worcester.

## 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.

Not Applicable.

MASSACHUSETTS DID NOT ADDRESS FOCUS AREA D(1) IN ITS RTT ELC APPLICATION

## 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.

Through the RTT-ELC, Massachusetts has made progress on several projects that aim to increase the competencies of its early education and care workforce. These projects listed below both inform the development workforce systems as well as directly increase workforce knowledge, skills and competencies in providing high quality early education services. Below is a description of progress made in 2015 to support the state's early education workforce.

### **Building and Enhancing Workforce Development Systems**

#### ***Alignment of Professional Qualifications: Mapping the requirements of the Department of Early Education and Care's QRIS and the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's educator licensure and professional development***

As part of the MA Department of Early Education and Care's (EEC) ongoing commitment to build and strengthen the Massachusetts QRIS through its QRIS Validation Study work, in the fall of 2015, the Department commissioned the University of Massachusetts Donahue Institute to conduct a review and map the alignment

between the EEC QRIS continuing education requirements, and the educator licensure and professional development requirements of the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE). The purpose of this review was to determine areas where educators and administrators who are licensed by DESE in public school-based preschool programs might already be meeting MA QRIS workforce qualifications and/or professional development standards.

### **Selected Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Licenses**

Three DESE Teacher licenses (with four subtypes each) and three DESE Administrator licenses (with three subtypes each) were identified for the current review and were mapped to the professional qualifications outlined by the Massachusetts QRIS.

**The DESE Teacher licenses included:** Early Childhood: Students with and without Disabilities, Pre-K-2; Moderate Disabilities, Pre-K-8, and Severe Disabilities, All Levels. For each of the three DESE Teacher licenses, the following subtypes were examined: Preliminary, Initial, Professional (General Requirements), and Professional (Educators Earning an Additional License in a New Field or at a New Level).

**The DESE Administrator licenses included:** Special Education Administrator, All Levels; Principal/Assistant Principal, Pre-K-6; and Supervisor/Director of Early Childhood, All Levels. For each of the three DESE Administrator licenses, the following subtypes were examined: Initial, Professional (General Requirements), and Professional (Educators Earning an Additional License in a New Field or at a New Level).

### **Mapping**

Each of the DESE licenses and subtypes was mapped to EEC's MA QRIS Workforce Qualifications and Professional Development criteria at QRIS Levels 2, 3, and 4 for both the QRIS identified "Staff Member with Primary Responsibility for Supervision of Educators" and "Lead Teachers." This process resulted in a final report with 68 pages of tables that detail the precise areas of overlap, or lack thereof, between the two systems. For each DESE license and subtype, several MA QRIS requirements were determined to be "met without further verification" meaning that it could be safely assumed that educators with the identified DESE license met the designated MA QRIS requirement, and it would not have to be further verified by an EEC program Quality Specialist.

### **Key Findings**

Several areas of alignment came up repeatedly between the MA QRIS professional qualifications requirements and DESE's educator licensure and professional development requirements.

#### Early Childhood subject matter test

Educators with an DESE preliminary, initial, or professional *Teacher, Early Childhood: Students with and without Disabilities, Pre-K -2* license are required to pass the Early Childhood subject matter test which has a heavy focus on knowledge in early childhood content areas. **Therefore, a passing score on this test was determined to be most closely aligned with completion of professional development in the Preschool Learning Experiences, as required by the MA QRIS.**

#### Coursework required through DESE-approved programs for initial and professional teacher license-types

For the DESE *Academic: Teacher* licenses reviewed for the current report, initial and professional licensure (general requirements) required the completion of an DESE-approved program in a corresponding area. Through review of programs of study at a sample of Massachusetts institutions offering degrees and/or credentials in these areas, **it was determined that the following MA QRIS criteria would be met without further verification:** Educators with an initial or professional (general requirements) *Teacher, Early Childhood: Students with and without Disabilities, Pre-K -2* license meet the MA QRIS criteria for credits in Early Childhood Education at all QRIS levels and meet the MA QRIS criteria for the completion of professional development in curriculum. Educators with an initial or professional (general requirements) *Teacher, Moderate Disabilities, Pre-K -8* license or an initial or professional (general requirements) *Teacher, Severe Disabilities, All Levels* meet the MA QRIS professional development criteria for positive guidance, observation and documentation, and assessment.

#### Administrator Experience

All of the DESE professional (general requirements) *Administrator* licenses reviewed for the current study required at least three years of employment in the role. As such, **educators with the selected professional (general requirements) *Administrator* licenses for the current study meet the MA QRIS experience requirements at QRIS Levels 1 and 2 for the “Staff Member with Primary Responsibility for Supervision of Educators”, without further verification.**

#### Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's Standards for Professional Development

DESE requires that educators with standard certificates engage in ongoing professional development that is individually-based, strengthens their professional knowledge and skills, and is focused on continuation improvement. Educators are required earn professional development points (PDPs) in order to be recertified every five years. PDPs can be earned in several ways: school districts can offer trainings that grant PDPs; they can be earned through advanced academic study; and through activities like mentoring, peer coaching, and publishing a book. Participation in DESE's Professional Development Standards aligns with the professional development criteria at Level 4 of the MA QRIS: active participation in coaching, mentoring, and/or ongoing professional development to improve practice. Therefore, **educators with any of the license-types included in this report will meet the QRIS professional development criteria for active participation in coaching, mentoring, and/or ongoing professional development to improve practice, without further verification.**

#### **Next Steps**

EEC has been engaged in a process of evaluation and revision of the MA QRIS. As part of this process EEC has engaged a group of representatives from the public schools. This mapping project will be of great value as EEC looks to develop a QRIS version that meets the unique needs of public pre-k programs.

#### ***Post Master's Certificate Program***

EEC funded the University of Massachusetts Boston (UMass Boston) to design and deliver an innovative 12-credit Post Master's Certificate (PMC) program that advances research, policy, leadership, and data-driven practice in early education and care. The purpose of the Post Master's Certificate in Early Education Research, Policy, and Leadership is to improve the knowledge, skills, and abilities of early childhood educators from public and private programs. The program includes four three-credit courses delivered in a blended format of both online and face-to-face sessions. Courses were highly demanding and offered through an accelerated model. The coursework designed for the PMC is in alignment with EEC's Core Competency Areas, QRIS Standards, the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) Advanced Standards (AS) within NAEYC's Six Professional Preparation Standards, and Division of Early Childhood Advanced Personnel Preparation Standards.

EEC supported a diverse group of educators across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts working in the mixed delivery system. Since 2013, four cohorts of 15 students (total of 53 students) each have participated in PMC. The success of the PMC and the demand for such a program prompted the creation of a doctoral program at UMass Boston, which will enroll its first class in September 2016.

UMass Boston is in the process of exploring other means to sustain early educator participation in the PMC program, including alumni of the program. UMass Boston and EEC are committed to leadership development and to supporting those that have completed the program. UMass Boston was recently approached by New Profit, Inc., to support entrepreneurial leadership development in early education and find philanthropic dollars to sustain the PMC program. New Profit will help UMass Boston look into the creation of an entrepreneurial leadership fellowship that would allow PMC alumni to further pursue their advocacy and/or goals for early childhood.

#### ***Peer Assistance and Coaching***

The Peer Assistance and Coaching (PAC) project utilizes the knowledge and experience of early childhood educators and directors to support one another's practices through coaching and feedback. In the PAC model educators review video recording of classroom practices to learn about effective strategies and receive feedback that can improve educators' competencies. The PAC projects promotes educators' knowledge of EEC's

workforce core competencies, supports improved educator practice, and helps to increase workforce retention through peer support. Over a two year period (FY14 and FY15), 38 pairs of coaches and mentees participated in the PAC project. The coaches received specialized training from the regional Educator and Provider Support network via monthly professional learning communities. The coaches received extensive training using the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) tool as their framework as well as relationship-based training. A pre-post evaluation of the model using the CLASS tool showed improvement in mentees' classroom practice across the three domains of Instructional Support, Emotional Support, and Classroom Organization.

The evaluations results from FY14 showed improvement in all domains and the FY15 results continued that trend. All three CLASS Domains increased in terms of quality of interactions and CLASS scores improved. The Instructional Support Domain, which advanced from a low quality to a medium quality score now exceeds the National average. In Spring 2014 and 2015, scores increased in the following domains:

- Emotional Support totals from 5.0 to 5.9
- Classroom Organization totals from 4.3 to 5.2
- Instructional Support totals from 2.6 to 3.4

(Scores of 1 and 2 are characteristic of "Low-Range" where little or no indicators of good practice are present; 3, 4 & 5 Middle Range; and 6 & 7 the High Range, where most or all indicators of good practice are present.)

In an effort to systematically embed the PAC coaching model and sustain it, there was a training of trainers (ToT) on the PAC model that occurred in 2015. The ToT consisted of a training series, evaluation and resources for participants. ToT participants included the Educator and Provider Support (EPS) Grantees (a network of statewide professional development providers) and the network of Family Child Care (FCC) providers and other large early education agencies. The PAC online platform will be extended through June 30, 2016. Along with the current PAC users, all five regional EPS grantees will add participants as a pilot to inform the use of the platform for future use in statewide coaching services.

### ***Higher Education for English Language Learners***

In 2014-2015, EEC contracted with the CAYL Institute to develop a roadmap for English Language Learners (ELLs) that informs higher education and EEC on how to support multi-lingual educators as they navigate entry to higher education institutions, matriculation and degree attainment. The main goals of this project were to:

- Create a system across higher education that helps bridge access to higher education for ELL educators;
- Prepare ELL educators for college level courses in English and matriculation in a degree program;
- Provide guidance on addressing the high needs of bilingual early education and care professionals serving the growing numbers of linguistically diverse young children and families;
- Address the needs of ELL educators in achieving higher academic coursework and credentials; and
- Ensure that ELL educators receive content knowledge needed to work effectively with children and families.

The following outcomes were met for this project:

- The CAYL Institute held two Higher Education Leadership Institutes with college deans and administrators on the topic of higher education for ELLs in the early education field in January 2015.
- CAYL conducted research and a literature review drawing from national trends on workforce development, early childhood education and care, adult learners and ELLs in higher education, and post secondary access and persistence among nontraditional students of supporting ELL students entering into a college career pathway.
- CAYL held six separate focus groups across the state in November 2014 and April 2015 with early education stakeholders from Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) and community-based organizations engaged in early childhood education workforce development. This group provided information to enhance the literature review and to share their expertise on working with ELL educators.
- CAYL held three information sessions in June 2015 to gather guidance into developing the ELL career lattice, and held three webinars in September 2015 to share the career lattice with various stakeholders who support ELL educators.
- In December 2015, CAYL finalized a proposed Career Lattice for ELL early educators that provides guidance

for coaches, supervisors, directors and higher education faculty to understand the steps that are critical to support the career pathway of an English Language Learner.

CAYL made recommendations to EEC and DHE on supporting the needs of English Language Learners as they navigate the higher education system. CAYL's report highlights ways the state can address the ever increasing needs of English Language Learner Educators in the field of early childhood, as well as strategies and resources that are critical for ELLs educators to be successful in obtaining degrees.

This project will be sustained through discussions already occurring with EEC and DHE around credentials and the educational needs of the early childhood field. In addition, as the state continues to develop requirements as part of the QRIS, Massachusetts will need to continue to provide supports and resources for this population to obtain degrees.

### **Expanding Access to Competency Based Professional Development**

#### ***Online Business Planning Courses***

In 2015, the Department continued its support to early educators to increase their business planning skills, recognizing that programs that are able to implement sound business practices are better positioned to retain talented staff that can provide high- quality early education for young children. The Department developed a business planning course that helps programs perform effectively on the Program Administration Scale (PAS) and Business Administration Scale (BAS) so that they can meet higher level criteria on the QRIS to demonstrate improved program quality. EEC is working with the Educator and Provider Support networks, Readiness Centers, and Family Child Care systems to offer the business planning course to early educators in both center-based and family child care across the state to support their program operation and business planning practices.

#### ***Early Educators Fellowship Initiative (EEFI)***

The Early Educators Fellowship Initiative (EEFI) is a community-based leadership series for early education and care providers in public and private programs serving children from birth to grade three. The purpose of EEFI was to organize, equip and empower Massachusetts educators who will then build high-quality learning environments for young children, in partnership with families and communities. This Fellowship facilitated:

- System building among early educators for the benefit of all young children
- Working relationships among early educators
- A shared knowledge base among early educators
- Bridges that deepen educators' understanding of the needs of young learners
- Action in local communities

EEFI's goal in 2015 was to support a cohort of leaders from school districts, community-based organizations, and family child care systems in building cross-cutting partnerships that will lead to improved school readiness, school success, and life-long opportunity for the children of Massachusetts. The Institute consisted of four day-long workshops with each workshop featuring an engaging combination of lively presentations, case studies, interactive discussions and small group work. Workshop topics included:

- Embracing the Birth through Grade Three Early Learning Continuum (February 2015)
- Building and Sustaining Birth through Grade three Systems (March 2015)
- Constructing a Comprehensive and Cohesive Birth Through Grade Three System (April 2015)
- Leading Communicating and Driving the Instructional Agenda (May 2015)

The framework of the 2015 EEFI was intentionally aligned with existing Massachusetts Birth through Grade Three initiatives including the RTTT-ELC funded Birth to Third Grade Grantee communities, the Preschool Expansion Grant (PEG) Communities, Massachusetts Kindergarten Entry Assessment (MKEA), QRIS, and the policy work done through the state's Birth through Grade Three Advisory Group that was created as part of Massachusetts involvement in the National Governor Association's Birth to Third Grade Policy Academy.

EEFI participants were asked to complete a pre and post survey identify the level of their knowledge and skill/ experience in 15 different aspects of Birth through Grade Three system building on a Scale of 1 (minimal) to 5

(high). While participant respondents made gains in each of the 15 areas, the largest gains were made in the following eight areas:

- Knowledge of the research and policies that drive the Birth to Grade Three agenda
- Understanding of the various initiatives in Massachusetts that support Birth to Grade Three systems building
- Understanding of the roles they can play in moving the Birth to Grade Three leadership agenda forward in my community
- Knowledge of the quality indicators and organizational structures that drive high quality Birth to Grade Three learning
- Experience/skill in supporting cross-sector collaborative mechanisms that formalize Birth to Grade Three efforts
- Experience in Birth to Grade Three strategic planning
- Experience/skill involving families in the Birth to Grade Three efforts and as full partners in helping children develop, learn and achieve
- Experience/skill in building systems of shared accountability between early learning programs and public schools, parents and the community to ensure that all children read and do math at grade level by end of Grade Three

**Performance Measures (D)(2)(d)(1):**

In the tables below, indicate State progress toward meeting 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.

**Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1): Increasing the number of Early Childhood Educators receiving credentials from postsecondary institutions and professional development providers with programs that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.**

<b>Baseline and Annual Targets</b>					
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year One</b>	<b>Year Two</b>	<b>Year Three</b>	<b>Year Four</b>
<b>Total number of "aligned" institutions and providers</b>	26	32	38	49	58
<b>Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider</b>	1,017	1,098	1,179	1,260	1,341

**Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1): Increasing the number of Early Childhood Educators receiving credentials from postsecondary institutions and professional development providers with programs that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.**

<b>Actuals</b>					
	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year One</b>	<b>Year Two</b>	<b>Year Three</b>	<b>Year Four</b>
<b>Total number of "aligned" institutions and providers</b>	26	37	36	47	48
<b>Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider</b>	1,017	1,670	2,100	2,296	2,295

**Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1) Data Notes**

EEC's Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) Grant application listed 58 institutions of higher education in Massachusetts with degrees in education. Further refinement of that list of colleges and universities has found that there are only 52 colleges and universities in Massachusetts that will issue credentials to the early education workforce in 2015. Although some of the Massachusetts early education bachelor's degree programs align with EEC's Core Competency Areas, the majority of bachelor degree granting programs in Massachusetts issue degrees to individuals looking to work in the Massachusetts' public school system.

In table (D)(2)(d)(1) there are 39 Institutions of Higher Education (IHE) that are aligned with EEC's Core Competencies, and 9 institutions that are only aligned with the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's (DESE) PreK-2 licensure requirements making for a total of 48 IHEs aligned with DESE. There are only 52 IHEs in Massachusetts that offer degree programs suitable for early educators, including the EEC and DESE preschool workforce.

The Massachusetts Department of Higher Education has confirmed the number of graduates for the 2013 -2014

academic year through the USDOE, Integrated Postsecondary Education Database (IPED). The data included in table D2D1 for Year Three has been revised, this information includes data from 41 public and private Institutes of Higher Education (IHE) in Massachusetts serving early educators. Since data for the 2014 - 2015 academic year is not yet available through IPED EEC has requested preliminary graduation rate data from the individual IHE. EEC received 35 responses.

The total number of IHE in Massachusetts that award credentials to early childhood educators has reduced since the RTT-ELC grant application was written. All institutions of higher education in Massachusetts that award credentials to educators intending to work in an EEC licensed program align with EEC's Core Competencies. All IHE in Massachusetts that award credentials to individuals looking to work in the Massachusetts public school system, including at the preschool level are aligned with the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Teacher Licensure.

In year one, 1670 early childhood educators graduated from an aligned institution in academic year 2011-2012.

In year two, 2100 early childhood educators graduated from an aligned institution in academic year 2012-2013.

In year three, 2296 early childhood educators graduated from an aligned institution in academic year 2013-2014.

In year four, 2295 early childhood educators graduated from an aligned institution in academic year 2014-2015.

**Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(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.

**Performance Measures (D)(2)(d)(2):**

In the tables below, indicate State progress toward meeting ambitious yet achievable targets for: 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.

<b>Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2): Increasing number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who are progressing to higher levels of credentials that align with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.</b>										
<b>Baseline and Annual Targets</b>										
Progression of credentials (Aligned to Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework)	<i>Number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who have moved up the progression of credentials, aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, in the prior year</i>									
	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
<Select Progression>	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
<b>Credential Type 1</b>	4,001	10%	4,076	10%	4,226	10%	4,451	11%	4,751	11%
<i>Specify:</i>	Child Development Associate/ ECE Certificate									
<b>Credential Type 2</b>	1,020	2%	1,270	3%	1,570	4%	1,920	5%	2,320	6%
<i>Specify:</i>	Associate's Degree in ECE									
<b>Credential Type 3</b>	557	1%	657	2%	832	2%	1,057	3%	1,357	3%
<i>Specify:</i>	Bachelor's Degree in ECE									
<b>Credential Type 4</b>	103	0.2%	153	0.4%	203	0.5%	253	1%	303	1%
<i>Specify:</i>	Post Graduate Degree in ECE (MEd & PhD)									
<b>Credential Type 5</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 6</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 7</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 8</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 9</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 10</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 11</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 12</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 13</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										

**Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2): Increasing number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who are progressing to higher levels of credentials that align with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.**

**Actuals**

Progression of credentials (Aligned to Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework)	<i>Number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who have moved up the progression of credentials, aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, in the prior year</i>									
	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
<Select Progression>	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
<b>Credential Type 1</b>	4,001	10%	4,639	10%	4,748	13%	5,476	13%	6,341	7%
<i>Specify:</i>	Child Development Associate/ ECE Certificate									
<b>Credential Type 2</b>	1,020	2%	1,224	0.5%	1,503	21%	1,628	40%	581	0.6%
<i>Specify:</i>	Associate's Degree in ECE									
<b>Credential Type 3</b>	557	1%	784	0.5%	1,023	30%	250	1%	1,049	1%
<i>Specify:</i>	Bachelor's Degree in ECE									
<b>Credential Type 4</b>	103	0.2%	1,089	2%	1,340	23%	187	0.5%	482	0.5%
<i>Specify:</i>	Post Graduate Degree in ECE (MEd & PhD)									
<b>Credential Type 5</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 6</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 7</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 8</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 9</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 10</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 11</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 12</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										
<b>Credential Type 13</b>										
<i>Specify:</i>										

**Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2) Data Notes**

Please describe the methodology used to collect the data, including any error or data quality information.

The data tables above include the number of individuals in Massachusetts that were awarded a credential in the given year. In Massachusetts there are two entities that are responsible for the knowledge and competency framework for early childhood educators: EEC and the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE). EEC issues certification to educators working in EEC licensed center-based infant/toddler and preschool programs; these certifications are aligned with EEC Core Competencies and include Teacher (infant/toddler or preschool), Lead Teacher (infant/toddler or preschool), Director I and Director II certifications. DESE issues licensure for educators working in the MA public school sector. DESE's PreK-2 licensure is intended for educators working in MA public schools in grades preschool through grade 2. DESE has their own workforce and competency framework that does not necessarily align with EEC Core Competencies.

The data for Credential Type I: *Child Development Associate/ ECE Certificate* includes data from EEC's Professional Qualifications which issued 6,157 certificates ranging from teacher to director II between January 1, 2015 and December 31, 2015. EEC is awaiting data from The Council for Professional Recognition which issues the Child Development Associate (CDA) regarding the number of Massachusetts educators that were awarded the CDA this past year. Percentages included for Year 3 and Year 4 are based on the MA early childhood education workforce as of October 2015 which included 91,717 registrants in EEC's Registry.

**Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(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.

## 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.

The state continued to use two research based, reliable and valid formative assessment tools in the Massachusetts Kindergarten Entry Assessment (MKEA) initiative: *GOLD™* by Teaching Strategies® (*GOLD™*) and Work Sampling System® (*WSS®*). The majority of school districts participating in the MKEA used *GOLD™* and only four school districts used *WSS®* for their assessment tool. In 2015, a total of 165 school districts (out of 318 districts) participated in the MKEA.

To ensure that the assessment tools used in MKEA were aligned with our early learning and development standards while reducing the burden on classroom staff administering the assessments, Massachusetts contracted with RMC Research Corporation (RMC) to identify key indicators in each domain of *GOLD™* and *WSS®* to customize the tools for Massachusetts. This work included a review of existing prekindergarten and kindergarten learning standards and guidelines as well as competencies outlined in the *Building the Foundation of Future Success for Children from Birth through Grade 3*, commissioned reports related to the alignment of the Massachusetts early learning standards, and the objectives, dimensions and indicators in the formative assessment tools that are being used as part of MKEA. RMC used these foundational materials to develop a comprehensive working framework to link and align Massachusetts learning standards to the selected formative assessments.

After selecting key Massachusetts learning standards, RMC conducted an alignment analysis with formative assessment tools used in MKEA. This process resulted in a set of recommendations of select learning standards aligned to key indicators of the assessment tools that are most predictive of children's positive educational outcomes. These recommendations were then shared with key stakeholders across the state for input and comment. The final result was a customized version of the tools used in MKEA that reduces the suggested indicators within the selected key domain areas from a possible 60 objectives and dimensions to 41.

Observation and documentation of children for MKEA begins early in the kindergarten year and continues throughout the course of the academic year. Each school district completes a minimum of two checkpoints

each year. The checkpoints provide teachers with an opportunity to finalize a decision on levels for each item based on the student information that a teacher observed and collected during that time period. Massachusetts set the first mandatory checkpoint deadline for December 4, 2015 to capture data about school readiness. The second checkpoint deadline is set for June 3, 2016. School districts have the option of adding an additional checkpoint mid-year should they deem it necessary.

Massachusetts provided additional flexibility to districts participating in the MKEA during the 2015-16 school year. These adjustments included the option to choose an alternate observational tool other than GOLD™ or WSS® by submitting a plan that described the tool, how it is used to understand children's development and learning, as well as how the observational data will be used to inform instruction. Another adjustment was delaying the assessment of all Essential Domains of School Readiness until the 2016-2017 school year (during the 2015-2016 school year, districts are still required to assess in the domains of social emotional development and approaches to learning to maintain focus of these two areas that are often not included in other kindergarten assessment practices). Increasing the flexibility to school districts helps them to focus on best practices in using formative assessments and in using observational data to inform individualized classroom practice. Massachusetts will continue to implement activities that will increase the understanding of the value of using formative assessment as a kindergarten entry assessment to support student achievement.

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.

Progress in the MKEA initiative during 2015 included the following:

- Massachusetts continued to expand the number of school districts participating in MKEA in 2015. Currently, there are 165 school districts participating in MKEA which resulted in more than 44,000 kindergarten students being assessed in the Fall of 2015. There were ten (10) school districts that elected to not apply for the FY16 Full Day Kindergarten (FDK) Grant, which requires MKEA participation as part of the grant requirements.
- There are 146 school districts utilizing GOLD™; there are four (4) school districts utilizing WSS®; and there are eighteen (18) school districts utilizing an alternate observational tool/framework that addresses, at a minimum, the social-emotional and cognitive development domains for children.
- The state elected to sustain MKEA beyond the RTT-ELC grant term through a no-cost extension. The state will work with a nationally renowned expert in early childhood assessment to develop webinars and vignettes to illustrate best practices of formative assessment that will be available the RTT-ELC funding ends.
- Starting in January of 2015, EEC and DESE worked with Public Consulting Group (PCG), to inform the future implementation of MKEA after RTT-ELC. PCG has gathered information about best practices used in other states implementing a KEA and have conducted key informant interviews with regional and school districts stakeholders to learn inform a set of recommendations for the future of MKEA in Massachusetts.
- As mentioned above, EEC and DESE have worked with a research firm and Teaching Strategies®, to develop a customized, abbreviated version of GOLD™ that will save teachers time while continuing to give them the necessary information to understand where their children's skills, knowledge, and behaviors are at the beginning of the school year. The customized tool offers programs insight into the items that are most correlated with kindergarten readiness.

The state's work in implementing MKEA continues to further align formative assessment among the early learning environments, both vertically and horizontally. Formative assessment has been used in many early learning environments across the state and Massachusetts continues to support the use of formative assessment through ongoing trainings and support. EEC has partnered with the Collaborative for Educational Services (CES) to provide training and technical assistance to public school kindergarten teachers participating in

the MKEA, as well as training and technical assistance on screening and assessment to early educators in EEC-licensed programs. Accomplishments in this area include the following:

- Between January 2015 and November 2015, 344 kindergarten educators and administrators from 16 school districts that participated in the two-day formative assessment training designed to increase competency in using the formative assessment tool. To support alignment among early learning classrooms, some districts chose to have their preschool teachers attend the training with the kindergarten teachers. Additionally, CES provided formative assessment training and materials (including licenses/portfolios) to a total of 1,548 educators from the state's early education mixed delivery system.
- CES made on-site technical assistance available to all districts at no charge to the district. The technical assistance was district-directed and designed to respond to the specific needs of each individual group of educators and administrators. Between January 2015 and November 2015, 288 kindergarten educators from 28 school districts received technical assistance.

## 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.

### Early Childhood Information System (ECIS)

Massachusetts has developed an Early Childhood Information System (ECIS) to create a single, high-quality source of data platform for reporting which reduces the time required to generate reports; and support outside agencies, such as the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's Longitudinal Data System (LDS) in providing between data on child outcomes ensuring compliance with existing federal and state privacy laws.

The following describes the ongoing progress made with ECIS in 2015:

- The ECIS team conducted trainings for department leadership, program quality and workforce staff on the ECIS reports and how to utilize the data to inform policy.
- More comprehensive reporting on family income and demographics was developed including over 50 new reports.

### Licensing and Education Analytic Database (LEAD)

Since late January 2015 the Department has been working with the Executive Office of Education's Information Technology division to build a new licensing data system. The Licensing Education Analytic Database (LEAD) will provide a single system for licensing and investigation information, replacing the two existing licensing data systems: Licensing Manager and Complaint Tracking System. LEAD will be a more robust system that follows the licensing process from beginning to end and houses all information related to the licensing process. LEAD will ultimately contain the following elements:

- A cloud based interface on the *Salesforce* platform to house all of EEC's licensing business processes. The interface can be accessed by EEC staff people either at the office or remotely.
- A mobile tablet visit mode to allow for all visit results to be immediately captured and communicated to providers.
- Reports and dashboards for EEC executives, managers, supervisors, investigators and licensors to easily monitor the status of the licensing work.
- A provider portal, which will allow providers to interact with EEC electronically. They will be able to

conduct licensing transactions such as applying for a license, filing required reports with EEC, reporting incidents, and responding to visit or investigation findings.

- A parent portal, which will provide information about licensed early education and care programs to parents and allow parents to share concerns with EEC.
- Program quality and workforce certification information from EEC's Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) and Professional Qualifications systems.

LEAD is being built in sections and will be rolled out as functionality is completed. EEC licensing staff have played a major role in overseeing the development of the LEAD system from a business process perspective. Functionality has been developed on the licensing visit process, the licensing investigation process, and the provider portal. Phase one of the LEAD roll out began in January 2016 and included licensing investigations, mobile licensing visits and limited provider portal functionality. Phase two roll out will include the family child care licensing application processes and differential licensing processes across all of licensing. Phase three will contain the rest of the licensing processes. Dates for phase two and three have yet to be determined, but will occur in summer 2016.

## 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).

	<b>Number of children from Low-Income families in the State</b>	<b>Children from Low-Income families as a percentage of all children in the State</b>
<b>Infants under age 1</b>	64,857	32%
<b>Toddlers ages 1 through 2</b>	64,857	32%
<b>Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry</b>	73,775	33%
<b>Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families</b>	138,632	32%

<sup>1</sup> 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.

This data comes from the National Center for Children in Poverty [http://www.nccp.org/profiles/MA\\_profile\\_8.html](http://www.nccp.org/profiles/MA_profile_8.html). NCCP indicates that there are a total of 64,857 low income children under the age of 3 in Massachusetts.

**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 <sup>1</sup>	53,793	12%
Are English learners <sup>2</sup>	6,811	1.5%
Reside on "Indian Lands"	0	0%
Are migrant <sup>3</sup>	134	0.02%
Are homeless <sup>4</sup>	7,347	1.6%
Are in foster care	3,363	0.76%
Other 1 as identified by the State		
<i>Describe:</i>		
Other 2 as identified by the State		
<i>Describe:</i>		

<sup>1</sup>For 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).

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

<sup>3</sup>For 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).

<sup>4</sup>The 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.

**Have disabilities or developmental delays:** In School year 2015-2016, the Dept. of Elementary & Secondary Education reported that there were 15,315 children ages 3 to 5 years old with disabilities who had an Individual Education Plan (IEP). In 2015, the Dept. of Public Health reported that there were 38,478 children receiving Early Intervention services funded by IDEA Part C. The total number of children with disabilities or developmental delays is 53,793. The percentage was calculated from a base of 442,592 (2010 Census data of children in MA who are 0-5 years old).

**Foster care:** Info from the Dept of Children and Families. There were 3,363 children (age 0-5) in foster care at the end of Nov. 2015. Percentage was calculated from a base of 442,592 (from CY2010 Census) children in MA who are 0-5 years old.

**English Language Learners:** This data is from the FY 2014-2015 Massachusetts Head Start Program Information Report. 6,811 children in HS programs are from a family home in which the primary language is not English. Percentage was calculated from a base of 442,592 (from CY2010 Census) children in MA who are 0-5 years old.

**Migrant:** This data is from the FY 2014-2015 Massachusetts Head Start Program Information Report. There were 134 migrant children reported. Percentage was calculated from a base of 442,592 (from CY2010 Census)

children in MA who are 0-5 years old.

**Homeless:** This data is from the Dept of Housing and Community Development. During calendar year 2015, there were 7,347 children (ages 0-5) who were in an emergency assistance shelter or hotel/motel. The percentage was calculated with a base of 442,592 (2010 Census data of children in MA who are 0-5 years old).

**Indian Lands:** The tribal nations function as a separate entity from the state. Massachusetts does not report on children age 0-5 on Indian Lands for the RTT grant.

**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.

<b>Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age</b>				
<b>Type of Early Learning and Development Program</b>	<b>Infants under age 1</b>	<b>Toddlers ages 1 through 2</b>	<b>Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>State-funded preschool</b>			6,693	6,693
<i>Specify:</i>	UPK and Inclusive Preschool Learning Environments			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	FY2015 UPK Program Report from grantees and FY16 Site Survey for IPLE grantees			
<b>Early Head Start and Head Start<sup>1</sup></b>	688	2,707	13,979	15,566
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	FY 2014-2015 Massachusetts Head Start Program Information Report			
<b>Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619</b>	3,365	16,144	15,898	54,376
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Infant and toddler data is from Dept. of Public Health (Early Intervention, 2015). Presc			
<b>Programs funded under Title I of ESEA</b>			23,418	23,418
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Preschool data is from Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Education (school year 20			
<b>Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program</b>	3,909	18,938	32,115	54,956
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	ECIS 2015: January to July 2015 data only *			
<b>Other 1</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
<b>Other 2</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
<b>Other 3</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
<b>Other 4</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
<b>Other 5</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
<b>Other 6</b>				
<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
<b>Other 7</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
<b>Other 8</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				

<sup>1</sup> 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.

**State Funded Preschool (UPK and IPLE):** UPK data is from the FY2015 UPK Program Report from grantees. There are 4,267 high needs preschool children in UPK programs. IPLE data is from the FY16 Site Survey for IPLE grantees. There are 2,426 high needs children served in IPLE funded programs.

**Head Start:** Data is from the FY 2014-2015 Massachusetts Head Start Program Information Report. There are a total of 15,566 high needs children in Early Head Start and Head Start programs.

**IDEA Part C and Part B:** Year 4: The total number of high needs children in programs funded by IDEA Part C and Part B is 54,376. According to the Dept of Public Health, there were 38,478 high needs children in Early Intervention programs funded by IDEA Part C in 2015. According to the Dept of Elementary and Secondary Education (school year 2015-2016), there were 15,898 high needs children in public preschool programs funded by IDEA Part B.

**Title I:** Data is from the Dept of Elementary and Secondary Education (School Year 2015-2016). There are 23,418 high needs children (preschool age) in schools receiving school wide Title I funding.

**CCDF:** The data source is the Early Childhood Information System (ECIS). In 2015, there were 54,956 (from January to June 2015\*) high needs children in CCDF funded programs.

\* EEC rolled out a new Child Care Financial Assistance (CCFA) System on July 1, 2015. The CCFA was designed as a single platform for managing subsidy awards, replacing the two separate systems for vouchers in the Child Care Information Management System (CCIMS) and contracted slots in the Electronic Child Care Information Management System (eCCIMS). CCFA is the tool through which child care providers and intermediaries document family eligibility for financial assistance, track child attendance for billing purposes, and request reimbursement from EEC for their services. Due to some unexpected challenges, use of the billing module was delayed. As a result of these challenges, EEC developed an interim alternative payment method for services beginning in July 2005. Since an alternative payment method was in use during July through December 2015, billing data is not available for reporting at this time. For calendar year 2015, data for January to June 2015 is available from the legacy financial assistance systems. Data presented in the tables for CCDF children and programs are based off of billing data and in this report only represents data from January to June 2015. EEC will provide the July-December 2015 data as soon as the CCFA technical challenges are resolved in 2016.

--

**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	2,075	11	424	1,052	33	803	3,142
<i>Specify:</i>	UPK						
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	6,742	385	777	2,904	23	1,653	5,604
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C							
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	13,829	117	3,357	5,179	35	1,628	17,654
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	11,053	53	1,699	4,004	13	856	5,740
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	13,717	158	970	8,130	47	27,920	9,574
Other 1	915	16	283	463	14	213	3,852
<i>Describe:</i>	Inclusive Preschool Learning Environments (IPLE)						
Other 2							
<i>Describe:</i>							

<sup>1</sup> 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
<b>Other 3</b>							
<i>Describe:</i>							
<b>Other 4</b>							
<i>Describe:</i>							
<b>Other 5</b>							
<i>Describe:</i>							
<b>Other 6</b>							
<i>Describe:</i>							
<b>Other 7</b>							
<i>Describe:</i>							
<b>Other 8</b>							
<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.

**UPK:** Data is from the FY2015 UPK Program Report from grantees.

**Head Start:** Data is from the FY 2014-2015 Massachusetts Head Start Program Information Report.

**IDEA Part C:** The state's QRIS does not include EI programs funded under Part C of IDEA thus info is not collected for this data table.

**IDEA Part B:** Data is from the Dept of Elementary and Secondary Education (IDEA Part B), School Year 2015-2016.

**Title I:** Data is from the Dept of Elementary and Secondary Education (School Year 2015-2016).

**CCDF:** The data is from the Early Childhood Information System (ECIS), January-July 2015\*.

\* EEC rolled out a new Child Care Financial Assistance (CCFA) System on July 1, 2015. The CCFA was designed as a single platform for managing subsidy awards, replacing the two separate systems for vouchers in the Child Care Information Management System (CCIMS) and contracted slots in the Electronic Child Care Information Management System (eCCIMS). CCFA is the tool through which child care providers and intermediaries

document family eligibility for financial assistance, track child attendance for billing purposes, and request reimbursement from EEC for their services. Due to some unexpected challenges, use of the billing module was delayed. As a result of these challenges, EEC developed an interim alternative payment method for services beginning in July 2005. Since an alternative payment method was in use during July through December 2015, billing data is not available for reporting at this time. For calendar year 2015, data for January to June 2015 is available from the legacy financial assistance systems. Data presented in the tables for CCDF children and programs are based off of billing data and in this report only represents data from January to June 2015. EEC will provide the July-December 2015 data as soon as the CCFA technical challenges are resolved in 2016.

**IPLE:** Data is from the FY16 Site Survey for IPLE grantees.

**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
<b>Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start and Head Start<sup>1</sup></b>	\$7,499,998	\$7,500,000	\$7,500,000	\$8,100,000	\$8,100,000
<b>State-funded preschool</b>	\$7,424,449	\$7,500,000	\$7,432,383	\$7,500,000	\$7,400,000
<i>Specify:</i>	UPK				
<b>State contributions to IDEA Part C</b>	\$29,450,081	\$31,144,420	\$28,025,623	\$27,241,537	\$27,597,436
<b>State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry</b>	\$8,997,920	\$9,019,276	\$9,019,276	\$9,019,276	\$9,019,276
<b>Total State contributions to CCDF<sup>2</sup></b>	\$77,052,705	\$76,863,988	\$76,526,436	\$76,179,788	\$76,863,341
<b>State match to CCDF Exceeded / Met / Not Met</b>	Met	Exceeded	Exceeded	Exceeded	Exceeded
<i>If exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded</i>		\$31,890,620	\$31,553,068	\$31,206,420	\$31,889,973
<b>TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs<sup>3</sup></b>	\$290,409,712	\$287,953,485	\$283,202,984	\$279,097,990	\$299,052,414
<b>Other State contributions 1</b>	\$47,500,000	\$53,200,000	\$53,400,000	\$63,300,000	\$77,300,000
<i>Specify:</i>	DPH part C- MassHealth				
<b>Other State contributions 2</b>	\$40,200,000	\$41,700,000	\$45,000,000	\$44,900,000	\$56,400,000
<i>Specify:</i>	DPH part C- Private Insurance				
<b>Other State contributions 3</b>					
<i>Specify:</i>					
<b>Other State contributions 4</b>					
<i>Specify:</i>					
<b>Other State contributions 5</b>					
<i>Specify:</i>					
<b>Other State contributions 6</b>					
<i>Specify:</i>					

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

**Funding for each Fiscal Year**

<b>Type of investment</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year One</b>	<b>Year Two</b>	<b>Year Three</b>	<b>Year Four</b>
<b>Other State contributions 7</b>					
<i>Specify:</i>					
<b>Other State contributions 8</b>					
<i>Specify:</i>					
<b>Total State contributions:</b>	<b>\$540,000,000</b>	<b>\$546,820,988</b>	<b>\$542,242,504</b>	<b>\$546,545,011</b>	<b>\$593,622,440</b>

<sup>1</sup> Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.

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

<sup>3</sup> 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.

Head Start and UPK: State Fiscal Year 2015 General Appropriation Act.

IDEA Part C: Dept of Public Health.

Special Education: State Fiscal Year 2015 General Appropriation Act.

CCDF: CCDF Federal Fiscal Year 2015 Final Award.

TANF: State Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Allocation Internal Budget.

Other State Contributions: Dept of Public Health.

**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.

<b>Total number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program<sup>1</sup></b>					
<b>Type of Early Learning and Development Program</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Year One</b>	<b>Year Two</b>	<b>Year Three</b>	<b>Year Four</b>
<b>State-funded preschool</b> <i>(annual census count; e.g., October 1 count)</i>	14,221	14,071	6,638	7,905	6,693
<i>Specify:</i>	UPK and Inclusive Preschool Learning Environments grants				
<b>Early Head Start and Head Start<sup>2</sup></b> <i>(funded enrollment)</i>	16,540	15,963	15,888	14,199	15,566
<b>Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619</b> <i>(annual December 1 count)</i>	30,044	45,521	48,320	52,501	54,376
<b>Programs funded under Title I of ESEA</b> <i>(total number of children who receive Title I services annually, as reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report )</i>	10,710	11,167	6,591	26,246	23,418
<b>Programs receiving CCDF funds</b> <i>(average monthly served)</i>	62,742	60,583	61,655	67,637	58,956
<b>Other 1</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 2</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 3</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 4</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 5</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 6</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 7</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 8</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					

<sup>1</sup> Include all Children with High Needs served with both Federal dollars and State supplemental dollars.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

**UPK and IPLE:** Data is from the FY2015 UPK Program Report from grantees and FY16 Site Survey for IPLE grantees. The total number of high needs children in state funded preschool is 6,693. There are 4,267 high needs children in UPK programs and 2,426 high needs children in IPLE programs.

**Head Start:** Data is from the FY 2014-2015 Massachusetts Head Start Program Information Report.

**IDEA Part C and Part B:** Year 4: The total number of high needs children in programs funded by IDEA Part C and Part B is 54,376. According to the Dept of Public Health, there were 38,478 high needs children in Early Intervention programs funded by IDEA Part C in 2015. According to the Dept of Elementary and Secondary Education (school year 2015-2016), there were 15,898 high needs children in public preschool programs funded by IDEA Part B.

The numbers for Years 1, 2, 3 and 4 were revised to reflect a more accurate total number of high needs children in both IDEA Part C and Part B funded programs. In the previous reporting years, the state only reported on IDEA Part C information (not Part B) because the info was more easily accessible. For the current reporting year, info on high needs children in IDEA Part B is included in the totals for Years 1, 2, 3 and 4. The breakdown of the total number of high needs children are as follows:

Year 1: There were 30,693 high needs children in IDEA Part C funded programs and 14,828 high needs children in IDEA Part B funded programs for a total of **45,521**.

Year 2: There were 32,345 high needs children in IDEA Part C funded programs and 15,975 high needs children in IDEA Part B funded programs for a total of **48,320**.

Year 3: There were 36,092 high needs children in IDEA Part C funded programs and 16,409 high needs children in IDEA Part B funded programs for a total of **52,501**.

Year 4: There were 38,478 high needs children in IDEA Part C funded programs and 15,898 high needs children in IDEA Part B funded programs for a total of **54,376**.

**Title I:** Data is from the Dept of Elementary and Secondary Education (School Year 2015-2016).

**CCDF:** The data source is the Early Childhood Information System (ECIS). In 2015, there were 54,956 (from January to June 2015\*) high needs children in CCDF funded programs.

\* EEC rolled out a new Child Care Financial Assistance (CCFA) System on July 1, 2015. The CCFA was designed as a single platform for managing subsidy awards, replacing the two separate systems for vouchers in the Child Care Information Management System (CCIMS) and contracted slots in the Electronic Child Care Information Management System (eCCIMS). CCFA is the tool through which child care providers and intermediaries document family eligibility for financial assistance, track child attendance for billing purposes, and request reimbursement from EEC for their services. Due to some unexpected challenges, use of the billing module was delayed. As a result of these challenges, EEC developed an interim alternative payment method for services beginning in July 2005. Since an alternative payment method was in use during July through December 2015, billing data is not available for reporting at this time. For calendar year 2015, data for January to June 2015 is available from the legacy financial assistance systems. Data presented in the tables for CCDF children and programs are based off of billing data and in this report only represents data from January to June 2015. EEC will provide the July-December 2015 data as soon as the CCFA technical challenges are resolved in 2016.

**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.

**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>	UPK				
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	X	X	X	X	
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	X	X			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	X	X			X
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	X	X			
Programs receiving CCDF funds					X
Current Quality Rating and Improvement System requirements (Specify by tier)					
Tier 1					
Tier 2	X	X	X	X	
Tier 3	X	X	X	X	
Tier 4	X	X	X	X	
Tier 5					
State licensing requirements					X
Other 1					
<i>Describe:</i>	Progress Reports				
Other 2					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 3					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 4					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 5					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<sup>1</sup> 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
<b>Other 6</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 7</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					
<b>Other 8</b>					
<i>Describe:</i>					

**Data Table A(1)-7 Notes**

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

## 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.

Overall in Year 4 the state spent \$15.9M. There was \$837K in unspent funds budgeted for Year 4. The majority of the unspent funds came from Project 10.

### Budget Summary Table Explanation of Changes

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

The state plans to reallocate the \$837K in unspent Year 4 funds to Project 3 and Project 10 in the no cost extension year.

## Project Budget 1

**Project Name:** Systems Infrastructure Activity: EEC Budget

---

### 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.

Spending in Project 1 for Year 4 was about \$11K higher than what was budgeted. This was primarily due to a greater need for indirect cost expenses than anticipated.

### 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.

We do not anticipate any changes to Project 1 in 2016 (the no cost extension year).

## **Project Budget 2**

**Project Name: QRIS Program Quality Supports**

---

### **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.

At the end of Year 4 Project 2 under spent by a total of \$8K. This is due to Activity 2.4, who had personnel leave earlier than anticipated. There are no changes to the other project activities.

### **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.

Originally we had planned on extending Activity 2.7 in the no cost extension year. However we will no longer continue Activity 2.7 in 2016 due to ongoing changes with QRIS. The state is not ready to brand QRIS given that it is still being revised. The state will submit a formal amendment to request this change.

## Project Budget 3

**Project Name:** Measuring Growth Through the Massachusetts Early Learning and Development

### 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.

Overall Project 3 under spent \$155K in Year 4. This is primarily due to surplus funds in Activities 3.2 (\$117K) and 3.8 (\$37K).

### 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.

Activity 3.2 and 3.8 are included in the no cost extension year. In 2016, Activity 3.2 is budgeted for \$224K and Activity 3.8 is budgeted for \$170K.

## **Project Budget 4**

**Project Name:** Family Engagement Evidence Based Practice

---

### **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.

There are no changes to Project 4's budgets since our last approved amendment.

### **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.

Project 4 is complete, no revisions needed.

## **Project Budget 5**

**Project Name:** Sustaining Program Effects in the Early Elementary 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.

Overall Project 5 under spent \$34K at the end of Year 4. This is primarily due to surplus funds in Activity 5.3 (\$28K).

### **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.

Project 5 is complete, no revisions needed.

## Project Budget 6

**Project Name: Standards Validation and Alignment**

---

### 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.

Overall Project 6 under spent \$10K at the end of Year 4. This is due to \$10K surplus funds in Activity 6.1.

### 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.

Project 6 is included in the no cost extension year. In 2016, Activity 6.2 is budgeted for \$234K, Activity 6.3 is budgeted for \$54K and Activity 6.4 is budgeted for \$50K.

## Project Budget 7

**Project Name:** Interagency Partnerships

---

### 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.

Overall Project 7 spent \$43K greater than the approved Year 4 total budget. This discrepancy is due to the fact that DPH's two project activities (Activities 2.4 and 7.4). Activity 7.4 spent \$70K greater than expected while Activity 2.4 spent \$86K less than expected.

Unspent funds from other interagency partnerships (DHCD, DMH, DPH and ORI) was \$26K; this was primarily from Activity 7.2 that had a surplus of \$16K.

### 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.

Project 7 is complete, no revisions needed.

## Project Budget 8

**Project Name:** Ensuring Competency through Workforce Knowledge, Skills and Practice-Ba

### 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.

Activity 8.7 spent \$15K more than initially budgeted for Year 4. All other Project 8 activities completed Year 4 according to the costs budgeted.

### 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.

Project 8 is included in the no cost extension year. In 2016, Activity 8.6 is budgeted for \$50K and Activity 8.7 is budgeted for \$105K.

## Project Budget 9

**Project Name:** Measuring Growth by Developing a Common Measure for Kindergarten Entry

### 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.

There are only 2 activities in Project 9 and both were completed in Year 2.

### 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.

Project 9 is complete, no revisions needed.

## Project Budget 10

**Project Name:** Implementing the Early Childhood Information System (ECIS)

### 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.

Overall Project 10 under spent by \$615K in the Year 4 approved 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.

Project 10 is included in the no cost extension year. In 2016, Project 10 is budgeted to spend \$2.2M.

## **Project Budget 11**

**Project Name:** Pre-K to Three Alignment for Educational Success: Communications

### **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.

There were no changes in Project 11's 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.

Project 11 is complete, no revisions needed.

## Project Budget 12

**Project Name:** Pre-K to Grade Three Alignment for Educational Success: Content Based Me

### 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 12 under spent by \$5K from the Year 4 approved 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.

Project 12 is complete, no revisions needed.

**Project Budget 13**

**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 MASSACHUSETTS RTT-ELC APPLICATION INCLUDED 12 PROJECTS.  
PAGES 108-124 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**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$292,737.45	\$687,116.23	\$837,198.57	\$865,768.02	\$2,682,820.27
2. Fringe Benefits	\$77,937.36	\$180,912.81	\$227,655.36	\$250,456.53	\$736,962.06
3. Travel	\$5,425.60	\$26,662.12	\$23,131.43	\$39,198.65	\$94,417.80
4. Equipment	\$625.00	\$1,775.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,400.00
5. Supplies	\$4,474.97	\$11,441.36	\$1,908.84	\$10,985.00	\$28,810.17
6. Contractual	\$3,023,812.69	\$6,973,961.04	\$8,715,318.64	\$7,903,270.93	\$26,616,363.30
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$17,811.00	\$105,581.04	\$77,215.29	\$24,648.48	\$225,255.81
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$3,422,824.07	\$7,987,449.60	\$9,882,428.13	\$9,094,327.61	\$30,387,029.41
10. Indirect Costs*	\$169,065.65	\$330,506.61	\$451,048.21	\$540,834.95	\$1,491,455.42
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$796,214.03	\$2,571,523.57	\$4,875,803.48	\$6,210,063.79	\$14,453,604.87
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$86.23	\$0.00	\$36,428.90	\$159,611.91	\$196,127.04
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$4,388,189.98	\$10,889,479.78	\$15,245,708.72	\$16,004,838.26	\$46,528,216.74
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$46,954,903.10	\$672,507.02	\$319,585.02	\$204,950.39	\$48,151,945.53
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$51,343,093.08	\$11,561,986.80	\$15,565,293.74	\$16,209,788.65	\$94,680,162.27

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**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$66,402.36	\$164,153.81	\$210,311.68	\$235,070.24	\$675,938.09
2. Fringe Benefits	\$5,175.60	\$20,680.83	\$20,082.59	\$33,816.16	\$79,755.18
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$4,474.97	\$4,674.36	\$213.84	\$0.00	\$9,363.17
5. Supplies	\$40,772.20	\$84,937.28	\$2,500.00	\$0.00	\$128,209.48
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	\$354,870.58	\$867,487.51	\$993,103.05	\$1,060,355.56	\$3,275,816.70
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$161,844.65	\$307,843.97	\$431,559.93	\$522,322.07	\$1,423,570.62
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.	\$86.23	\$0.00	\$36,428.90	\$159,611.91	\$196,127.04
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$516,801.46	\$1,175,331.48	\$1,461,091.88	\$1,742,289.54	\$4,895,514.36
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$179,374.02	\$179,374.02	\$179,374.02	\$179,374.02	\$717,496.08
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$696,175.48	\$1,354,705.50	\$1,640,465.90	\$1,921,663.56	\$5,613,010.44
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (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 - Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS): Program Quality Supports**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
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	\$928,883.45	\$2,652,597.66	\$4,570,991.02	\$3,399,557.31	\$11,552,029.44
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	\$928,883.45	\$2,652,597.66	\$4,570,991.02	\$3,399,557.31	\$11,552,029.44
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	\$928,883.45	\$2,652,597.66	\$4,570,991.02	\$3,399,557.31	\$11,552,029.44
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$5,062,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,062,000.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$5,990,883.45	\$2,652,597.66	\$4,570,991.02	\$3,399,557.31	\$16,614,029.44
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (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 - Measuring Growth Through the MA Early Learning Development Assessment System (MELD)**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
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	\$524,511.71	\$175,280.87	\$666,182.38	\$864,999.74	\$2,230,974.70
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	\$524,511.71	\$175,280.87	\$666,182.38	\$864,999.74	\$2,230,974.70
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$431,941.98	\$144,740.20	\$831,573.40	\$294,335.66	\$1,702,591.24
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	\$956,453.69	\$320,021.07	\$1,497,755.78	\$1,159,335.40	\$3,933,565.94
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$13,849,530.29	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$13,849,530.29
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$14,805,983.98	\$320,021.07	\$1,497,755.78	\$1,159,335.40	\$17,783,096.23
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (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 - Family Engagement with Evidence Based Practice**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
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	\$243,921.30	\$854,255.25	\$682,756.30	\$474,442.93	\$2,255,375.78
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	\$243,921.30	\$854,255.25	\$682,756.30	\$474,442.93	\$2,255,375.78
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$5,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,000.00
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	\$243,921.30	\$859,255.25	\$682,756.30	\$474,442.93	\$2,260,375.78
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$14,649,530.29	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$14,649,530.29
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$14,893,451.59	\$859,255.25	\$682,756.30	\$474,442.93	\$16,909,906.07
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (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 - Sustaining Program Effects in the Early Elementary Grades**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$1,640.00	\$3,880.00	\$8,310.00	\$8,618.00	\$22,448.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$5,700.00	\$2,172.00	\$5,000.00	\$12,872.00
3. Travel	\$625.00	\$1,775.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,400.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$6,767.00	\$1,695.00	\$10,985.00	\$19,447.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$20,007.00	\$42,943.79	\$45,720.00	\$108,670.79
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$20,000.00	\$6,800.00	\$0.00	\$26,800.00
8. Other	\$22,765.00	\$106,629.00	\$109,409.76	\$115,680.37	\$354,484.13
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$2,235.00	\$10,311.85	\$9,047.45	\$9,253.63	\$30,847.93
10. Indirect Costs*	\$215,758.90	\$1,129,413.01	\$1,637,272.38	\$2,081,308.12	\$5,063,752.41
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	\$240,758.90	\$1,246,353.86	\$1,755,729.59	\$2,206,242.12	\$5,449,084.47
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$3,367,219.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,367,219.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$3,607,977.90	\$1,246,353.86	\$1,755,729.59	\$2,206,242.12	\$8,816,303.47
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (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 - Standards: Validation and Alignment**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
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	\$538,772.79	\$677,545.73	\$742,147.90	\$1,235,230.47	\$3,193,696.89
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	\$538,772.79	\$677,545.73	\$742,147.90	\$1,235,230.47	\$3,193,696.89
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	\$538,772.79	\$677,545.73	\$742,147.90	\$1,235,230.47	\$3,193,696.89
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$125,000.00	\$0.00	\$125,000.00	\$0.00	\$250,000.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$663,772.79	\$677,545.73	\$867,147.90	\$1,235,230.47	\$3,443,696.89
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (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 - Interagency Partnerships**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
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*	\$143,020.23	\$1,039,078.20	\$1,695,189.74	\$1,847,934.23	\$4,725,222.40
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	\$143,020.23	\$1,039,078.20	\$1,695,189.74	\$1,847,934.23	\$4,725,222.40
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (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	\$143,020.23	\$1,039,078.20	\$1,695,189.74	\$1,847,934.23	\$4,725,222.40
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (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 - Ensuring Competency through Workforce Knowledge, Skills and Practice-Based Support**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
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	\$322,895.83	\$1,383,366.18	\$1,477,151.25	\$1,647,133.48	\$4,830,546.74
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	\$322,895.83	\$1,383,366.18	\$1,477,151.25	\$1,647,133.48	\$4,830,546.74
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	\$322,895.83	\$1,383,366.18	\$1,477,151.25	\$1,647,133.48	\$4,830,546.74
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$9,503,997.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$9,503,997.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$9,826,892.83	\$1,383,366.18	\$1,477,151.25	\$1,647,133.48	\$14,334,543.74
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (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 - Measuring Growth by Developing a Common Measure for Kindergarten Entry Assessment (KEA)**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
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	\$157,659.41	\$74,867.49	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$232,526.90
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	\$157,659.41	\$74,867.49	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$232,526.90
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	\$157,659.41	\$74,867.49	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$232,526.90
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (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	\$157,659.41	\$74,867.49	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$232,526.90
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (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 - Early Childhood Information System (ECIS)**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
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*	\$5,492.92	\$253,292.16	\$711,767.96	\$1,986,485.78	\$2,957,038.82
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	\$5,492.92	\$253,292.16	\$711,767.96	\$1,986,485.78	\$2,957,038.82
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$218,252.50	\$447,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$665,752.50
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$223,745.42	\$700,792.16	\$711,767.96	\$1,986,485.78	\$3,622,791.32
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (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 - Pre-K to Three Alignment for Educational Success: Communication**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$9,895.00	\$12,879.00	\$9,033.68	\$6,768.29	\$38,575.97
2. Fringe Benefits	\$250.00	\$281.29	\$876.84	\$382.49	\$1,790.62
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	\$188.00	\$10,059.58	\$20,470.00	\$55,000.00	\$85,717.58
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7. Training Stipends	\$17,811.00	\$85,581.04	\$70,415.29	\$24,648.48	\$198,455.81
8. Other	\$62,336.00	\$154,375.91	\$130,510.47	\$115,740.75	\$462,963.13
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$4,986.00	\$12,350.79	\$10,440.83	\$9,259.25	\$37,036.87
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	\$67,322.00	\$166,726.70	\$140,951.30	\$125,000.00	\$500,000.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$45,633.00	\$15,211.00	\$25,576.37	\$86,420.37
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$67,322.00	\$212,359.70	\$156,162.30	\$150,576.37	\$586,420.37
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 - Pre-K to Three Alignment for Educational Success: Content Based Media Partnership**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
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	\$266,208.00	\$1,041,044.00	\$510,176.00	\$181,187.00	\$1,998,615.00
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	\$266,208.00	\$1,041,044.00	\$510,176.00	\$181,187.00	\$1,998,615.00
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	\$266,208.00	\$1,041,044.00	\$510,176.00	\$181,187.00	\$1,998,615.00
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (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	\$266,208.00	\$1,041,044.00	\$510,176.00	\$181,187.00	\$1,998,615.00
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (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.