Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge
Annual Performance Report

CFDA Number: 84.412

Maryland
2012

Due: February 15, 2013

Race to the Top
Early Learning Challenge

Performance Report: Cover Sheet

General Information

1. PR/Award #: S412A120016
2. Grantee Name *(Block 1 of the Grant Award Notification.):* Office of the Governor, State of Maryland
3. Grantee Address 200 West Baltimore Street, Baltimore, MD 21201
4. Project Director Name: Dr. Rolf Grafwallner Title: Assistant Superintendent for the Division of Early Childhood Development

Ph #: (410) 767- 0342 Fax #: (410) 333-6226

Email Address: rgrafwal@msde.state.md.us

Reporting Period Information

5. Reporting Period: From: 01/ 01/2012 To: 12/31/2012

Indirect Cost Information

6. Indirect Costs

a. Are you claiming indirect costs under this grant? X Yes ☐No

b. If yes, do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s) approved by the Federal Government? X Yes ☐No

c. If yes, provide the following information:

Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s):
From: 07/01/2012 To: 06/30/2013 (mm/dd/yyyy)
Approving Federal agency: X ED ☐HHS ☐Other *(Please specify)*:
(Attach current indirect cost rate agreement to this report.)

Certification

7. The Grantee certifies that the state is currently participating in:

The Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting program (see section 511 of Title V of the Social Security Act, as added by section 2951 of the Affordable Care Act of 2010 (P.L. 111-148));

✓ Yes
☐ No

Programs authorized under section 619 of part B and part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA);

✓ Yes
☐ No

The Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) program

✓ Yes
☐ No

To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data in this performance report are true and correct and the report fully discloses all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data.

Lillian M. Lowery, Ed.D. Title: State Superintendent of Schools
Name of Authorized Representative:

_____ Date: _____/ _____/_____
Signature:

Executive Summary

Please provide a brief summary of accomplishments, challenges, and lessons learned across the reform areas.

Maryland has received one of nine Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge Fund Grant (RTTT-ELC) award for a total of $50 million over four years. MSDE has been designated as the lead agency to coordinate a multi-agency approach to submitting Maryland's state plan. The current Governor's State Advisory Council on Early Care and Education, functioned as the lead team for this project, established a core working group, and worked with staff at MSDE, namely the Division of Early Childhood Development (DECD) and the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS), to coordinate all aspects of submitting a competitive State Plan.

Maryland's application included 10 thematic projects, designed to improve the school readiness results from 81 percent in 2010 to 92 percent in 2015, the last year of the grant. In addition, it strives to reduce the readiness gap for low income children, English language learners, and young children with disabilities.

OVERVIEW OF PROGRESS

Both lead divisions, the Divisions of Early Childhood and Special Education/Early Intervention Services, have embarked on implementing the ten projects which are broken down into 698 specific tasks which have been outlined in Maryland's approved Scope of Work (SOW). As of December 2012, after 12 months of implementation, 42 percent of all tasks have been completed or have been initiated on time. The majority of the tasks will commence in 2013 or later.

In terms of project accountability, MSDE submitted the following documents as required by the USDOE:

- Scope of Work for each of the 10 Projects;
- Monitoring Plan of Subgrants, including a monitoring instrument;
- Draft Validation Study for Maryland EXCELS, the state's Quality Rating and Improvement System;
- Preliminary Report on the Progress of Performance Measures.

A detailed accounting of the progress for each of the ten projects (ATTACHMENT A) indicates the progress of scheduled project activities that have been initiated and were underway toward meeting the first set of milestones and deliverables by December 31 of last year.

CHALLENGES

MSDE faced one major challenge during the first year of implementation:

- Delays in ramping up the personnel, grants, and Memorandi of Agreement (MOA) due to internal capacity issues;
- Communication internally and externally about the RTT-ELC

The delays in ramping up the implementation of the RTT-ELC were hampered by the increased need for administrative support in terms of recruitment of personnel and procurement of services

as a result of the second year implementation of the RTTT Round II (K-12). The Department's administrative services were tailored toward operational support for the standard Federal and state programs administered by MSDE. The new responsibilities of RTTT-Round II and the RTT-ELC caused backlogs in hiring personnel and procuring services through contracts or grants. A more streamlined process for recruitment and procurement resolved the backlog by mid-summer of 2012.

The communication about the progress of the RTT-ELC within MSDE and among its stakeholders has gradually improved throughout the year, but during the first six months of the year, MSDE lacked a coherent communication strategy. The initial focus on completing the required Scope of Work (SOW) and the challenges in recruitment and grant/contract procurement, inadvertently caused a communication vacuum which had to be remedied by mid 2012.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The major accomplishments are related to the RTT-ELC team's ability to solve problems regarding the two major anchors to Maryland's RTT-ELC plan:

- Establishment of a TQRIS, i.e., Maryland EXCELS;
- Revision of an existing Comprehensive Assessment System (CAS) and a Kindergarten Assessment.

Maryland's TQRIS, named Maryland EXCELS, had a successful pilot and recruitment for its field test. More than the targeted number of programs expressed interest in joining EXCELS. The development team resolved the inclusion of public school prekindergarten programs by adjusting the standards to align with the Charlotte Danielson model which has been adopted by 22 of the 24 local school systems. In addition, the pilot test revealed a number of design flaws which were redesigned to strengthen the viability of the system.

The revision of the CAS and the Kindergarten Assessment is a joint project between the States of Ohio and Maryland. The states are joined by two partners – Johns Hopkins University – Center for Technology in Education and WestEd. The project has a number of procedural as well design challenges.

The procedural challenges, which were overcome, include (1) the fund arrangements between the two states with Maryland being the fiscal agent for both states, (2) the coordination of assessment development on an aggressive timetable, and (3) the nature of collaboration between two states of different size, governance, and early childhood policies.

The design challenges are rooted in taking on the development of an assessment system which, in its format, is new and innovative. It required ongoing communication, resolutions to design issues, and the states' ability to establish a governance structure for the assessment project. Both states consider it an accomplishment that the governance structure was established within the first 9 months of implementation, including MOAs, state advisory council, a national advisory council, facilitated by CCSSO, and the drafting of an assessment framework.

LESSONS LEARNED
Maryland entered the "Race" with all of its early care and education programs within the department of education. This has proven to be critical in proceeding with the development of the Scope of Work (SOW) and setting the infrastructure for the projects. Working from a consolidated governance structure reduced the level of effort in terms of getting organized at the state level, including the related administrative processes required to manage such a large project.

Maryland also benefitted from prior reform efforts in early childhood education and had the capacity to quickly move to the next level. The approved state plan built on the existing infrastructure which allowed for existing staff to begin the preliminary planning while the SOW still had to be worked out.
The management of the RTT-ELC had many "firsts" for Maryland. They are:

- Establishment of formally chartered local early childhood advisory councils;
- Establishing a new infrastructure for continuous program improvement (i.e., Maryland EXCELS);
- Establishing a new model of capacity building beyond the typical child care resource and referral work through the technical assistance provided by Early Childhood Breakthrough Centers;
- Development of prekindergarten Common Core standards, including research-based Executive Functioning standards as part of the domain Social Foundation;
- Collaboration with another state on developing a new comprehensive assessment system;
- Formal mechanisms to coordinate early childhood services with pediatricians and family practitioners;
- Creating a Maryland specific framework on family engagement;
- Developing a comprehensive data system.

All these new developments will shape the infrastructure of Maryland's early childhood education system significantly.

The RTT-ELC award raised the profile of early learning in Maryland. While MSDE had strong support from the state's legislature, other critical stakeholders expressed their support and interest in the projects, including the business and investment community. MSDE has been approached by a number of private investors to explore effective investment options in early childhood education programs. In addition, the legislature has responded by introducing legislation which builds on the RTT-ELC infrastructure, i.e., legislation to create a competitive grant program for local early childhood councils that resembles the principals of the Federal Race to the Top reform initiative.

Successful State Systems

Aligning and coordinating early learning and development across the State.

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).

Managing the grant

MSDE's Division of Early Childhood Development (DECD) is charged with managing all aspects of the RTT-ELC grant. The Governor's State Advisory Council on Early Care and Education is overseeing the implementation of the grant on behalf of the Maryland State Board of Education. DECD works closely with other divisions within MSDE as well as other agencies, namely the Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene and the Maryland Department of Human Resources. A breakdown of the grant's scope of collaboration for Year 1 is outlined in Table A in the Appendix.

Governance-related Roles

In addition to the existing governance structure (Maryland RTT-ELC application, p. 74), the grant enabled the establishment of 24 local early childhood advisory councils (Project #1). The councils were established by the local county executives in collaboration with local school superintendents. Table B, in the Appendix, provides a breakdown of the governance structure at the local levels.

The Annie E. Casey Foundation, Division of Strategic Planning, developed a leadership curriculum as a result of the RTT-ELC grant. The curriculum includes modules for:

- Results-Based Accountability
- Results-Based Facilitation
- Strategic Planning (Cohort Training)

Up to five (5) members of each Council participate in the leadership program. DECD issued planning grants to each local council and established a formula-drive allocation for each eligible jurisdiction after submission of an approved action plan.

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.

In order to support the implementation of the RTT-ELC, DECD established a broad-based involvement of stakeholders, i.e., subject matter experts, representing all constituency groups of early childhood education. Table C, in the Appendix, provides a listing of committees, councils, and workgroups by project.

DECD has been working on a communications plan that ensures transparency and regular update on the progress of the RTT-ELC implementation. The major communication tools are:

- Partners Newsletter (published quarterly) which is disseminated to 13,000 subscribers including licensed child care, nursery schools, public schools, Head Start, and policymakers.
- Race to the Top (K-12) electronic newsletter (issued monthly by MSDE) which includes general updates of the RTT-ELC.
- DECD Website provides regular updates and project specific information.

In addition, periodic presentations were scheduled with major stakeholder groups, such as Maryland State Board of Education, Public School Superintendents' Association of Maryland, LEA Assistant Superintendents of Instruction, LEA Early Childhood Supervisors, LEA Local Accountability Coordinators, Maryland Head Start Association, Maryland State Child Care Association, Maryland Family Child Care Association, Maryland Association of the Education of Young Children, as well as various committees at the Maryland General Assembly.

Proposed Legislation, Policies, or Executive Orders

Describe any changes or proposed changes to state legislation, budgets, policies, executive orders and the like that may have/had an impact on the RTT-ELC State Plan.

MSDE has proposed the following legislation which would directly impact the implementation of the RTT-ELC:
Task Force on Teacher Education in Early Childhood Education

This draft legislation was submitted as a departmental bill to the Governor for the legislative session of 2013. The Governor returned it with the instruction to have the Task Force established by the State Superintendent.

State Advisory Council on Early Care and Education

This draft legislation was submitted as a departmental bill to the Governor for the legislative session of 2013. However, the Governor returned it with the instructions to write a Governor's Executive Order to continue the State Advisory Council in lieu of legislation.

The Maryland Early Learning Challenge and School Readiness Act (Race to the Tots)

In addition, the Maryland General Assembly drafted the above titled bill. This draft legislation is scheduled to be posted in late January. It includes a fiscal note of $30 million for three years. The bill would establish funding for Local Early Childhood Councils.

Participating State Agencies

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

No changes.

High-Quality, Accountable Programs

Developing and adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS).

During this 1st year of RTT-ELC implementation, has the State made progress in ***developing*** a TQRIS that is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards that include--

(1) Early Learning and Development Standards
- ☐ No
- ✓ Yes

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

(2) A Comprehensive Assessment System

☐ No

✓ Yes

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

(3) Early Childhood Educator qualifications

☐ No

✓ Yes

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

(4) Family engagement strategies

☐ No

✓ Yes

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

(5) Health promotion practices

☐ No

✓ Yes

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

(6) Effective data practices

☐ No

✓ Yes

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

Describe progress made in ***developing*** a TQRIS that is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards.

The development of the current Maryland EXCELS TQRIS standards included several steps toward validating the underlying key concepts of the QRIS. This included reviewing the empirical literature base and vetting the standards through a State-level QRIS workgroup. The process of developing the finalized standards for EXCELS began with a thorough review of the literature on QRIS and other early child care quality initiatives. Draft standards for center-based, family and school-age providers were developed and examined internally by MSDE and externally through the QRIS workgroup. This workgroup included key stakeholders from MSDE, the Maryland Disabilities Council, the early intervention community, federal technical assistance providers from the National Child Care Information Center (NCCIC), local leadership from private and corporately owned child care centers, and family and school-age child care providers. Additionally, MSDE developed a comparative matrix of existing state QRIS and examined critical elements identified by Tout et al (2010) such as family and center-based standards, pilot programs, overall structure, funding sources and incentives, technical assistance models, evaluation efforts and reports, assessment protocols, and administrative policies and procedures.

From the literature review, a list of key early care and education quality concepts or components consistent with OPRE's *Compendium of Quality Rating Systems and Evaluations* (Tout et al, 2010) was developed. This included: licensing compliance, ratio and group size, curriculum, teacher-child interactions, environment, child assessment, staff qualifications, parent involvement and community partnerships, administration and management, cultural and linguistic diversity, accreditation, and provisions for children with special needs.

A partnership was established with the Johns Hopkins University Center for Technology in Education, to create the web tool and online system originating from the tiered Program Standards. The system was tested with a pilot group comprised of child care centers, family child care providers and school-age care providers representing diverse geographic and socio-economic regions of the state. The pilot was comprised of 46 programs divided into three cohorts that began in November 2011 (Cohort 1), January 2012 (Cohort 2) and March 2012 (Cohort 3). Pilot participants used the web tool to register, apply and upload documents with support from the program coordinator at JHU/CTE. Subsequent to the conclusion of the pilot in June 2012, focus groups were held with pilot participants to gain their feedback on the TQRIS standards, the web tool and the online processes.

The field test of Maryland EXCELS TQRIS Program Standards began in November 2012 and will continue through May 2013. Currently, 319* field test participants representing center-based child care, family child care homes, Public Pre-Kindergarten and school-age child care are testing the online system and providing feedback to their assigned program coordinators.

*Participation in EXCELS totals 333 as 14 programs transferred from Bonus Tiered Reimbursement and are not participating in the field test.

Is the state in the process of ***revising*** tiered Program Standards in any of the following categories? (If yes, 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

For those Program Standards that have not been revised during this 1st year of implementation, is there a ***plan to revise*** the tiered Program Standards in the upcoming year (if yes, 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.

Please describe progress made in ***revising*** TQRIS Program Standards.

Revisions to the TQRIS Program Standards were made based upon feedback from the pilot participants, the child care provider and early education communities and early childhood stakeholders. The Program Standards have been through several iterations in Year One and the current draft standards, now in the field test phase, are posted on the MSDE website at http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/divisions/child_care/announce

Where progress has not been made, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in these areas by the end of the grant period.

NA

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c)

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

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c): Increasing the number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the statewide TQRIS.											
Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	**Number of programs in the State**	*Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS*									
		Baseline		**2012 (Target)** **Actual**		**2013 (Target)** **Actual**		**2014 (Target)-** **Actual**		**2015 (Target)** **Actual**	
		#	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
State-funded preschool *Specify*:	729	0	0	(8) 1	(1.2) 0.1	(24)	(3.8)	(45)	(7.2)	(80)	(12.8)
Early Head Start and Head Start[1]	260	48	0.4	(9) 5	(3.4) 1.9	(21)	(8.0)	(42)	(16.0)	(50)	(19.2)
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	NA Explanation *See below										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	NA Explanation *See below										
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	NA Explanation **See below										
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	4,259	35	0.7	(173) 57	(3.4) 1.3	(411)	(8.0)	(820)	(16.0)	(983)	(19.2)
Other NA *Describe:*											

Explanation: *Children served by IDEA funding are enrolled in diverse early childhood programs (Head Start, childcare, PreK). **LEAs use Title I funds for extended hours of mandated PreK services. In this chart, the targets stated for 2012 – 2015 therefore already incorporate IDEA and Title I programs.

All baseline data are actual. All Early Head Start/Head Start entries refer to the number of program sites.

TQRIS data are collected in an Excel spreadsheet by the MSDE Office of Child Care, Credentialing Branch, on a continuing basis. Data entry into this spreadsheet is done manually, so it is possible that occasional user-entry errors have occurred (for example, transposing the letters of a program's name or the digits of the program's start-participation date). Enhancements to CCATS are currently in progress

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

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c): Increasing the number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the statewide TQRIS.											
Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	**Number of programs in the State**	*Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS*									
		Baseline		**2012 (Target) Actual**		**2013 (Target) Actual**		**2014 (Target)- Actual**		**2015 (Target) Actual**	
		#	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
that will allow all participation data to be captured directly in, and reported directly from, the CCATS database. All "Numbers of Programs" figures are derived from 2012 data.											

Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in increasing the number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the State's TQRIS System by the end of the grant period.

The State's revised TQRIS, known as Maryland EXCELS, is currently in final field test and will roll out for statewide participation in July 2013. The State's focus for ensuring progress to increase the number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the TQRIS is to focus resources on identifying and reaching programs serving children with high needs and those receiving Child Care Subsidy in Title I attendance areas. Targeted technical assistance and recruitment efforts are provided by a network of Quality Assurance Specialists, located in Regional Licensing offices. Child Care Resource and Referral staff provide information on Maryland EXCELS to programs, providers and the public. Local Early Childhood Councils, Breakthrough Centers and Community Hubs coordinate efforts in Title I attendance areas to recruit programs and publicize the benefits of QRIS to the community.

An information and marketing campaign with promotional materials, a website with online resources and a mobile app for families searching for high quality child care will identify and publicize programs participating in Maryland EXCELS. The Maryland EXCELS website at www.marylandexcels.org is developed with our partners at Johns Hopkins University/Center for Technology in Education. Publicity, news and updated regarding the progress of Maryland EXCELS and the availability of Quality Assurance Specialists to provide information and support is featured in the statewide newsletter *Partners*, mailed to every licensed program and provider in the state, and posted online quarterly at http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/divisions/child_care/licensing_branch/news.htm and to the Division of Early Childhood ListServe.

Program awards, bonuses, grants, funds and supports to programs participating in Maryland EXCELS TQRIS have been published online and include incentives for Family Child Care, Child Care Center and Large Family Child Care Home. An example follows for Child Care

Center.

Center-based Programs

Program Awards for Attainment of Check Level Rating:
$50 - $4,500 – based upon Check Level Rating and Capacity

Credential Bonuses - paid to the individual, based upon Credential level (one-time bonus at lower levels, paid annually at higher levels)
$200 - $1,500

Accreditation Support Fund
Curriculum Fund
Child Care Quality Incentive Grants
Credential Bonuses and Support
Training Vouchers and Reimbursement
Child Care Career and Professional Development Fund
Increased Subsidy Reimbursement Rates by Check Level (Levels 3, 4 and 5)
Infant Toddler Expansion Grants

Rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs.

Has the State 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 in developing and enhancing a system for rating and monitoring the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs that participate in the TQRIS.

Progress in enhancing a system for rating programs participating in the TQRIS:

- Johns Hopkins University/Center for Technology in Education (JHU/CTE) developed the web-based system for Maryland EXCELS (TQRIS) www.marylandexcels.org. The online system leads participants through the steps of submitting (uploading) documentation of required evidence not captured in data feeds from the existing Child Care Administrative Data System or the Electronic Licensing Inspection System www.checkccmd.org. Program coordinators are assigned to each facility or provider registering to participate in Maryland EXCELS and are the points of contact for questions; also providing coaching and initiating referrals for specified technical assistance. Program coordinators review evidence submitted for the check levels and verify that documentation submitted meets requirements

Progress for monitoring the quality of programs participating in the TQRIS has focused on:

- Hiring and training six (6) Year One Quality Assurance Specialists (QAS) with early childhood education backgrounds who are located in Regional Licensing offices and represent all areas of the state. The Year One Quality Assurance Specialists work closely with licensing staff, visiting local child care programs to become acquainted with the early education community and presenting information to individuals and groups about Maryland EXCELS and the benefits of participating.

- Nine (9) additional Quality Assurance Specialists will be hired in Year Two of the grant and these individuals, along with the six Year One specialists, will provide on-site, randomly-sampled monitoring of programs to verify their check level rating.

- An online checklist is in development by JHU/CTE that will enable monitoring of TQRIS programs during site-visits conducted by Licensing Specialists, Quality Assurance Specialists, Environment Rating Scales Assessors and MSDE Accreditation Validators.

Where progress has not been made, please 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.

NA

Promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs.

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

Maryland is transitioning from its current TQRIS to the Revised TQRIS known as Maryland EXCELS. Maryland EXCELS is in Field Test from November 2012 – May 2013 and Tiered Reimbursement programs will be moved into the new system when it rolls out for statewide participation in July 2013.

Number of tiers/levels in the State TQRIS 4

How many programs moved up at least one level within the TQRIS over the last fiscal year?

- State-funded preschool programs ____
- Early Head Start
- 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 ___

Data is not available. Maryland is transitioning from its current TQRIS to the Revised TQRIS known as Maryland EXCELS. Maryland EXCELS is in Field Test from November 2012 – May 2013 and Tiered Reimbursement programs will be moved into the new system when it rolls out for statewide participation in July 2013.

How many programs moved down at least one level within the TQRIS over the last fiscal year?

- State-funded preschool programs ____
- Early Head Start
- 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 ___

Data is not available. Maryland is transitioning from its current TQRIS to the Revised TQRIS known as Maryland EXCELS. Maryland EXCELS is in Field Test from November

2012 – May 2013 and Tiered Reimbursement programs will be moved into the new system when it rolls out for statewide participation in July 2013.

Has the State made progress in developing high-quality benchmarks at the highest level(s) of the TQRIS in the following areas? (If yes, check all that apply.)

- ✓ Standards alignment or reciprocity with Early Learning and Development Programs that meet State preschool standards (e.g., content of the standards is the same, or there is a reciprocal agreement between State preschool and the TQRIS)
- ✓ Standards alignment or reciprocity with Early Learning and Development Programs that meet Federal Head Start Performance Standards (e.g., content of the standards is the same, there is a reciprocal agreement between Head Start and the TQRIS, or there is an alternative pathway to meeting the standards)
- ✓ Standards alignment or reciprocity with Early Learning and Development Programs that meet national accreditation standards (e.g., content of the standards is the same, or an alternative pathway to meeting the standards)
- ✓ Early Learning and Development Standards
- ✓ A Comprehensive Assessment System
- ✓ Early Childhood Educator qualifications
- ✓ Family engagement strategies
- ✓ Health promotion practices
- ✓ Effective data practices
- ✓ Program quality assessments

Please provide more detail on your development of high-quality benchmarks at the highest level(s) of the TQRIS.

For programs accredited by recognized national organizations, at the highest levels of the TQRIS, alternatives to meeting the Environment Rating Scale (ERS) requirement for an outside evaluation is waived for the 12-month period during which the program was accredited or re-accredited. In the following 12-month period, the program conducts a self-assessment using the appropriate ERS and an improvement plan is created and implemented by the program, based upon the subscale scores and the TQRIS quality level. In the next 12-month period, an outside ERS assessment is conducted and implemented by the program based upon the TQRIS level and subscale score.

The Public Pre-Kindergarten Standards are developed for the highest levels of the TQRIS, recognizing established school facility approvals and Code of Maryland requirements for teacher certification and renewal.

Alternatives are provided for programs ineligible to participate in the Child and Adult Care Food Program (required for all programs at Level 3 and higher) to serve fresh fruits and vegetables at least twice weekly and to ensure nutritious and balanced meals are served to children by supplementing foods brought from home when necessary.

For those areas where progress has not been made, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in developing high-quality benchmarks at the highest level(s) of the TQRIS by the end of the grant period.

Standards Alignment/Reciprocity for programs that meet Federal Head Start Performance Standards – meetings were held to investigate the alignment and reciprocity for Head Start programs. Programs are unable to document what performance standards were met in order to create reciprocity with the TQRIS standards. Further investigation will be needed to determine how alignment/reciprocity can be developed between the two sets of standards. Head Start programs are included in the Child Care Center Standards at this time.

Performance Measures (B)(4)(c)(1) and (2)

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

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1): Increasing the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS.					
	Baseline	**2012 (Target)**	**2013 (Target)**	**2014 (Target)**	**2015 (Target)**

		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual
Total number of programs covered by the TQRIS	71	(117) 333*	(567)	(1,372)	(3,097)
Number of programs in Tier 1 (= MD EXCELs level 1)	NA	(17) 11*	(85)	(138)	(310)
Number of programs in Tier 2 1 (= MD EXCELs level 1)	4	(47) 16*	(227)	(480)	(929)
Number of programs in Tier 3 1 (= MD EXCELs level 1)	11	(29) 9*	(142)	(412)	(929)
Number of programs in Tier 4 1 (= MD EXCELs level 1)	25	(12) 9*	(56)	(205)	(620)
Number of programs in Tier 5 1 (= MD EXCELs level 1)	NA	(12) 8*	(57)	(137)	(309)

*Of the 333 programs currently participating in Maryland EXCELS, 222 programs have not yet been assigned a quality rating level. Also, 14 of these programs were transferred from the Bonus Tiered Reimbursement Program to EXCELS, but they are not participating in the field test. These assignments will be complete by June 30, 2013. Therefore, the 2012 actual number of programs at each level as displayed above should be considered as only preliminary. When the quality rating level assignments of the 222 programs is finished, it is expected that the final tally at each level will rise substantially from the numbers shown above. The adjusted final tallies for 2012 will be noted in the 2013 RTT-ELC Annual Performance Report.

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

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2): Increasing the number and percentage of Children with High Needs who are enrolled in Early Learning and Development Programs that are in the top tiers of the TQRIS.											
Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	**Number of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State**	*Baseline and Annual Targets -- Number and percent of Children with High Needs Participating in Programs that are in the top tiers of the TQRIS*									
		Baseline		**2012 (Target)** **Actual**		**2013 (Target)** **Actual**		**2014 (Target)** **Actual**		**2015 (Target)** **Actual**	
		#	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
State-funded preschool *Specify*:	27,443	0	0	(344) 148	(1.3) 0.5	(1,032	(3.8)	(2,279)	(8.4)	(5,719)	(21.1)
Early Head Start and Head Start[2]	12,731	48	0.4	(245) 567	(1.9) 4.4	(343)	(2.7)	(588)	(4.6)	(980)	(7.7)
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C –* See explanation below	8,406										
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619 - *See explanation below	9,063										
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA -* See explanation below	15,272										
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	6,682	145	0.7	(715) 1,066	(3.4) 16	(2,423)	(11.4)	(5,832)	(27.4)	(12,188)	(57.2)
Other *Describe:*											

* The figure reported for State-funded Pre-K includes children with high needs who are also separately reported in this table for IDEA and Title I programs. However, while the number of children with high needs who are served by IDEA and Title I programs can be separately determined, it is not possible under MSDE's current data tracking and reporting systems to determine how many of those children are included within the stated number of children served by State-funded Pre-K programs. Therefore the CY 2013 – CY 2015 projections shown for State-funded Pre-K include children with high needs served by IDEA and Title I programs, but separate projections for IDEA and Title I program children as sub-groups of the Pre-K population cannot currently be made.

[2] Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

For those areas where progress has not been made, describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs by the end of the grant period.

NA

Validating the effectiveness of the State TQRIS.

Has your State made progress in validating the effectiveness of the TQRIS?

- ✓ Yes
- ☐ No

Describe progress made in validating the effectiveness of the TQRIS, or, if progress has not been made, describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made by the end of the grant period.

The Plan for the Validation of Maryland EXCELS was submitted to the regional RTT-ELC contact in December 2012 and is being reviewed by the U.S. Departments of Education and health and Human Services. The EXCELS validation study is based upon the framework outlined in the brief, *Validation of Quality Rating and Improvement Systems for Early Care and Education and School-Age Care* published by the Office of Planning Research, and Evaluation (OPRE) in the Administration for Children and Families at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (Zellman & Fiene, 2012). Prior to submission of this report, both Federal agencies responded with additional questions to Maryland's validation study and a conference call has been set up to discuss the issues. Maryland plans to revise its draft by March 15, 2013.

Please describe the State's strategies for determining whether TQRIS tiers accurately reflect differential levels of program quality.

As described above, Maryland will tailor its strategies in accordance with the response provided by both Federal agencies. In its original draft Maryland proposed the following research questions to examine the measurement strategies and psychometric properties of the measures used to assess quality across the tiers:

- Is there variability across programs on each quality criterion (item-level of EXCELS) of EXCELS?
- How are the EXCELS quality criteria related to each other? Do measures of similar components relate more closely to each other than to other measures?
- What is the reliability of the EXCELS criteria assessed through the EXCELS Program

Coordinators and Quality Assurance Monitors?

- What is the reliability of the administration of the ERS measure?
- Do different cut scores for the EXCELS criteria produce better rating distributions (e.g., programs across all levels rather than programs at only one or two levels) or more meaningful distinctions among programs on the EXCELS standards?

Please describe the State's strategies, challenges, and progress toward assessing the extent to which changes in quality ratings are related to progress in children's learning, development, and school readiness.

The Plan for Validation of Maryland EXCELS TQRIS uses the validation approach to relate ratings to children's development and addresses the following research questions:

- Is there a relationship between the quality of programs children are exposed to, as assessed by EXCELS, and children's school readiness in the fall of kindergarten?
- Are certain EXCELS content areas more strongly related to children's school readiness outcomes than others?
- Are quality ratings related to growth in children's skills across prekindergarten and into kindergarten?
- Are there subgroups of children for whom the links between quality standards and/or criteria and child outcomes are stronger? Are relationships between quality ratings and child outcomes consistent by high need category?
- Are relationships between quality ratings and child outcomes consistent by child care setting?

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

Check 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 o 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 those sections that correspond with the focused investment areas outlined in the grantee's RTT-ELC application and State Plan.

Early Learning and Development Standards

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, where applicable. In addition, describe any 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.

The current alignment documents- *Working Off the Same Page* and the *Maryland and Ohio Standards Alignment* continue to be revised to reflect ongoing updates to the Maryland curriculum standards in P-12. Prekindergarten standards have been aligned to the Maryland STEM instructional guides. The Maryland Social Studies Curricular Framework for P-12 is currently being written based on the C3 work. Work on the Maryland Science Standards P-12 will begin after the final review of the Next Generation Science Standards. The completed Maryland standards are available on line and are being shared with various constituent groups. Professional development will be provided August 2012 for administrators in Title I school areas that will focus on improving their knowledge of early learning development and standards.

Where progress has not been made, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in these areas by the end of the grant period.

NA

Comprehensive Assessment Systems

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.

The progress made in common assessment is based on activities related to the current Maryland Model for School Readiness (MMSR) framework which includes professional development related to assessment and early learning to support Maryland's P-8 State curriculum.

Describe the progress made, where applicable.

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) and the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) are committed to developing the Early Childhood Comprehensive Assessment System for all children from birth through age six and to **statewide** implementation of the system in 2014-15. The following components of EC-CAS were during 2012:

- Project management of all development activities by WestEd contractors.
- Review and feedback on all assessment items.
- Coordinating cohesion and information between MSDE, Ohio, WestEd ASDS, WestEd CFS, and all CTE teams.

- Organizing and facilitating cognitive interviews, assessment focus groups, ad hoc committees, and leadership meetings.
- Participating in, developing materials for, and presenting at local advisory committees, Technical Advisory Committees, and requested other stakeholder presentations.
- Development and update of Conceptual Design Document Versions 1.0 and 2.0; publication of version 3.0; and maintaining of updates for version 4.0 and 5.0.
- Printing and distribution of 100 copies of Conceptual Design Document Version 3.0.
- Creation of RFP responses and participation in concept demos to other potential state partners.
- Continuous research on appropriate early childhood assessment techniques, including the interconnection between formative and summative assessment; developmental versus curricular expectations, and observational versus on-demand assessments.
- Review and feedback on all prototype assessment items and learning progressions.

CTE supported the process for identifying 28 common learning progressions based on aligned standards and domains between Maryland and Ohio. This process involved nominal ranking of critical standards by sponsors, examination of the literature of which skills are most predictive of later success, and direct alignment of required standards between states.

These common standards were then the basis for WestEd's Child and Family Studies unit to create learning progressions, ranging from 5 to 7 levels of distinctive developmental phases, per progression. The progressions form the backbone of the CAS, with assessment items being designed to plot a child's current functioning level in relation to a given progression.

Currently, 7 prototype progressions have been created and reviewed by sponsors and experts with feedback provided to WestEd. An additional 10 progressions are in process and expected by early February.

Focus groups have been conducted with Ohio and Maryland teachers and administrators as to their perception on the progressions. Stakeholders overwhelmingly value these over the KEA items, and note that the progressions offer the most utility to their day to day work.

The CTE PD Team developed a PD plan and it is part of the Conceptual Design Document. The PD Team conducted stakeholder meetings to determine audience needs, content topics, effective delivery methods, input on transitioning from face-to-face to online training, and training logistics. Stakeholder meetings included discussions with State Advisory members, State Agency representatives, local agency representatives, Technical Advisory Committee members, and early learning and professional development specialists. Additionally, the PD Team has developed a focus group protocol to be implemented in the cognitive interviews which will further influence the PD. The team has developed a road map for content development around the stages of assessment, as well as a PD model based on feedback from stakeholders and input from State Agency representatives. This PD model includes a train-the-trainer approach with ongoing technical assistance and coaching, with resources and communications accessed through an online learning community for CAS users. As part of an official subgroup that meets monthly, the PD team is working closely with State representatives for PD planning and messaging/communications for stakeholder buy-in and consistency of messaging across projects. The team has also focused efforts on supporting a successful transition from an existing statewide assessment to a new assessment, and gathering lessons learned from past statewide professional development initiatives. The PD team has worked closely with the internal CTE Technology and Assessment teams to provide input and feedback and technical requirement development, bringing the stakeholder perspective

and to ensure PD needs are considered. The PD Team has also created a plan for the pilot.

A PD plan for the approved and recommended developmental screening tools has been identified. The CTE PD Team has begun development of online PD modules for the Best Beginnings screening tools and introductory content about the purpose, process, and best practices of developmental screening.

Technology updates include:

- Extensive research and product review of appropriate technology practices for young children, technology and assessment practices and future of tech delivery.
- Focus groups and requirements gathering sessions in Ohio and Maryland with stakeholders at the a) teacher level, b) administrator level, c) state level as to key desired functionality, perceptions and concerns over technology use, barriers and challenges.
- Design and development of technology use cases and requirements - key targets to address the concerns by stakeholders that technology for the assessment needed to be integrated into their regular instruction, that the assessment system needed to feel more natural and engaging for the children, and needed to be intuitive.
- Extensive research and interviews with known developers of comparable systems of early childhood technology, including those being deployed currently in Maryland and Ohio at the classroom level, to identify targeted developers to be invited to bid on the build requirements.
- Data systems analysis conducted with MD and OH IT personnel.
- Meetings with hardware manufacturers as to state-wide implementation plans they could support for each state.
- Updating of the Conceptual Design Document to include status updates of the technology development process.
- Design of wireframes of functionality for the Observational Rating System, Virtual Performance Assessment system, and the system dashboards.

Where progress has not been made, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in these areas by the end of the grant period.

NA

Health Promotion

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, where applicable.

1. Maryland has established a progression of standards to ensure children's health and safety. Compliance with the state's licensing regulations forms the foundation for ensuring health and safety for children in regulated programs. The state's revised Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS), known as Maryland EXCELS, imbeds best practices for health and wellness and child safety throughout the standards for all 5 check levels. The TQRIS includes requirements for programs to participate in the Child and Adult Care Food Program when eligible, to serve fresh fruits and/or vegetables at least twice weekly, to establish and practice emergency preparation plans and to include health and safety information in program handbooks for families and staff. Programs participating in the TQRIS will receive additional recognitions as an Asthma Friendly Child Care program and for participating in health and wellness. Physical activity best practices to promote health and prevent childhood obesity are included in the standards in the requirements for daily schedule and curriculum within the Developmentally Appropriate Learning and Practice standard. The Maryland EXCELS system is a progression of check level ratings from 1 to 5 that define the pathway to quality for program improvement. The system is currently in field test with 319 programs and will be available for statewide participation in July 2013.
2. Ensuring the health and behavioral screening and follow-up will occur in the following ways: Maryland promotes the Social Emotional Foundations for Early Learning in Early Learning (SEFEL) and development classrooms and also encourages providers to take the SEFEL training in the Maryland EXCELS. SEFEL, through its implementation, screens children's behavioral health. Maryland is also in the process of finalizing the framework of statewide developmental screening for all licensed early learning and development programs to ensure early identification of children who have delayed development and connecting them and their families to the appropriate services.
3. The promotion of children's physical, social and emotional development across the levels of the Md EXCELS Program Standards included embedded requirements for SEFEL training as well as other professional development training to enhance the quality of the programs and promote health and wellness of children.
4. Maryland has increased the number of early childhood educators who are trained in SEFEL (22 of 24 jurisdictions are implementing SEFEL in Maryland) and each year approximately 300 providers receive training sponsored by the state, and more through

approved training consultants.

5. Maryland leveraged existing resources that include the SEFEL Master Cadre of Trainers and Coaches to promote social emotional training as well as funding through the Governor's Early Childhood Advisory Council which supported SEFEL training for child care providers across the state of Maryland.
6. Maryland promotes healthy eating habits and improved nutrition and physical activity through accreditation, the Judy Center Partnerships, and Maryland's Take 15 for the Health of It Initiative which provides calendars of snack recipes that include fresh fruits and vegetables paired with a physical activity that takes 15 minutes.

Where progress has not been made, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in these areas by the end of the grant period.

NA

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d)

In the table, provide data on leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable statewide targets. Targets must be consistent with those in the State's application unless a change has been approved.

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d): Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual statewide targets.					
	Baseline and annual targets				
	Baseline (from application)	**2012 (Target)** **Actual**	**2013 (Target)** **Actual**	**2014 (Target)** **Actual**	**2015 (Target)** **Actual**
Number of Children with High Needs screened	47,344 (see explanation below)	(47,344 – see explanation below)	(47,344 – see explanation below)	(47,344 – see explanation below)	(47,344 – see explanation below)
Number of Children with High Needs referred for services who received follow-up/treatment	3,571 (see explanation below)	(3,571 – see explanation below)	(3,571 – see explanation below)	(3,571 – see explanation below)	(3,571 – see explanation below)
Number of Children with High Needs who participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well child care	Data not available in format required (see explanation)				
Of these participating children, the number or percentage of children who are up-to-date in a schedule	Data not available in format required (see explanation)				

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d): Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual statewide targets.					
	Baseline and annual targets				
	Baseline (from application)	**2012 (Target)** **Actual**	**2013 (Target)** **Actual**	**2014 (Target)** **Actual**	**2015 (Target)** **Actual**
of well child care					

Baseline figures are estimated.

Health-related screenings and service referrals for children with high needs are performed through Maryland's statewide network of Judith P. Hoyer Centers ("Judy Centers"), each of which is located in a public elementary school. The figures reported here are not unduplicated counts – many of the children receiving one type of screening or service referral may also have received another screening or referral. Every Judy Center must make these screening and referral services available to any child enrolled in, or receiving services through, the following early learning and support programs:

- Kindergarten
- Pre-kindergarten
- Infant and Toddlers Program
- Pre-school Special Education
- Licensed child care

In addition, each Judy Center may provide screenings and referrals to children with high needs who are enrolled in, or receiving services through, local partnership agencies such as (but not limited to) Family Support Centers, Head Start/Early Head Start, Healthy Families, and Parents as Teachers.

The screenings and referrals cover the following health areas:

- Immunizations
- Dental
- Hearing
- Vision (including amblyopia)
- Mental health
- Physical growth and Nutrition
- Blood lead levels

Targets for CY 2012 – CY 2015:
The targets for these years are the same as the baseline figures because Judy Center populations stay relatively stable. Judy Centers serve certain school zones where housing and population data do not change significantly from year to year. For this reason, the out-year service and referral numbers are expected to be similar to the baseline numbers.

Participation in a Schedule of Well Child Care:
Well child care data are maintained by Maryland's Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (DHMH). These data are currently in a format that is not accessible to MSDE. However, as a Participating State Agency, DHMH is being requested to modify its data collection and reporting format to meet RTTT-ELC reporting requirements.

Describe strategies for moving forward on meeting the targets for performance measure **(C)(3)(d).**

Judy Centers continue to successfully serve high needs children in Maryland. We envision the population numbers to remain stable. Screening and appropriate referral, when indicated, are required for children receiving Judy Center services. Children that are served by Judy Centers are counted by the programs in which they participate. As noted above, the well child care data maintained by DHMH is not accessible to MSDE, but DHMH is being requested to modify its data collection and reporting format to meet RTT-ELC reporting requirements.

Engaging and Supporting Families

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, where applicable.

The Maryland Family Engagement Coalition was established in 2012. Representatives of many child and family serving agencies, organizations, and programs are working together to develop culturally and linguistically appropriate Maryland specific strategies for improving the quality of family engagement based on the Head Start Parent, Family, and Community Family Engagement Framework. A survey of Maryland child and family serving agencies, organizations, and programs was conducted to identify local resources and gaps in services. A draft that includes the purpose of the Framework; a definition of "family engagement"; the principles that will guide the drafting of the document; and a format for presenting the goals, strategies and resources has been completed and shared with the Coalition for comment. By December 2012, 8 of 12 planning meetings were held. In addition, several focus groups (called Parent Cafes) informed the Coalition. The Coalition is working on a draft framework for family engagement.

Where progress has not been made, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in these areas by the end of the grant period.

An open meeting will be held on February 25th to discuss the draft framework. The Coalition will work to finalize the strategies, provide guidance, and design dissemination and training plans using designated RTT ELC funds and other existing federal, state, and local resources.

Early Childhood Education Workforce

Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and progression of credentials.

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, where applicable.

A committee has been formed to review and align the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework with the Core of Knowledge, which outlines the specific knowledge and skills that are essential to work with young children. The committee is working to ensure that competencies and skills are aligned; and will be supported by additional resources to promote children's learning and development and improve child outcomes.

The State currently has a progression of six credential levels based upon education and training; and includes degrees. The credential levels are determined in part by the number of Core of Knowledge training hours received. The Core of Knowledge content, which is currently being aligned with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, provides the foundation of knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to support progress through the State's six credential levels.

Describe State progress in engaging postsecondary institutions and other professional development providers in aligning professional development opportunities with the State Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

After the alignment of the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and Core of Knowledge is complete, the information will be shared with postsecondary institutions, professional development providers, and MSDE approved trainers. This alignment document will ultimately inform approved training, professional development course outcomes, and other relevant credit and non-credit bearing training opportunities.

Where progress has not been made, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in any or all of these workforce areas by the end of the grant period.

The State is making progress towards supporting education, on-going training, and progress of the early childhood workforce. The Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework in addition to other resources to promote children's learning and development are being reviewed,

developed, and/or revised during the grant period. The State will ensure that all resources are aligned, accessible to the workforce, and opportunities for progress through education and credential attainment are available. In addition, the State will monitor progress each year of the grant period to determine if the resources and support provided are effective in advancing the workforce and improving outcomes for children.

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

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
- ✓ Publically 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, where applicable.

Progress is being made in the alignment of the Workforce Competency Framework and Core of Knowledge content areas and indicators. The Core of Knowledge content areas and indicators are used in the development of effective professional development for early childhood educators. MSDE staff and early childhood stakeholders are working together to identify areas of alignment between the Workforce Competency Framework and Core of Knowledge content areas. This document when completed will assist early care and education professionals with the knowledge required to be successful in an early childhood career.

Through the Maryland Child Care Credential Program, providers who meet established qualifications can participate in program incentives that support professional development and

degree completion. Training Voucher/Reimbursement and Child Care Career and Professional Development Fund are programs available to assist Credentialed child care providers with the cost of approved professional development and obtaining an associate and/or bachelor degree. Training Voucher/Reimbursement has provided $70,000 in support since July 2012. Credentialed child care providers can access approved training and attend professional conferences to enhance their knowledge and skills. The Child Care Career and Professional Development Fund assist with the cost of college. There are currently 237 Credentialed child care providers attending community colleges and/or universities throughout Maryland.

The baseline information for the total number of "aligned" institutions (1267) had a 2012 target of 1263. During 2012 the Maryland State Department of Education approved 43 trainers/training organization, 12 of those trainers have competed the Center for Social Emotional Foundations of Learning Training of Trainers program.

Where progress has not been made, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in these areas by the end of the grant period.

The State will make progress in these areas by continuing to provide incentives including training reimbursements and higher education scholarships to early childhood professionals who participate in the Child Care Credential Program. Maryland EXCELS, a RTT ELC project, is another vehicle that will ensure continued participation in the Maryland Child Care Credential Program by maintaining standards that require participating programs to ensure that at least 60% of lead staff hold a current Maryland Child Care Credential. The state will also continue to report aggregated data for participation in the Child Care Credential Program for public viewing. The Early Learning Data System, another RTT ELC project, will enhance the existing early childhood data system with dashboards and reports constructed for public view to show data in real-time. In addition, the State will develop an overall plan to align teacher education in early childhood education with common core standards, comprehensive assessment systems, program standards associated with Maryland EXCELS, etc. This plan also includes strengthening the AAT- ECE and alternative pathways to obtaining a teacher licensure in early childhood through the Maryland Approved Alternative Preparation Program (MAAPP); and updating the current articulation agreement with MSDE/DECD and community colleges for required training and coursework. To ensure that progress is made by the end of the grant period, the State will continue to collaborate and coordinate efforts among RTT ELC projects and other existing State systems.

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

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

(1) 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

(2) 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.

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.					
	Baseline (From Application)	**2012 (Target)** **Actual**	**2013 (Target)** **Actual**	**2014 (Target)** **Actual**	**2015 (Target)** **Actual**
Total number of "aligned" institutions and providers	1,267	(1,286) 1,523	(1,305)	(1,324)	(1,343)
Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider	17,215	(17,301) 18,347	(17,388)	(17,475)	(17,562)

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.										
Progression of credentials (Aligned to Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework)	*Baseline and Annual Targets -- 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*									
	Baseline (From Application)		**2012 (Target)** **Actual**		**2013 (Target)** **Actual**		**2014 (Target)** **Actual**		**2015 (Target)** **Actual**	
	#	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
Maryland Child Care Credentialing Program (MCCCP) Credential Level 1 *(Lowest Level)*	1,463	-2	(1,739) 1,386	(+19) -5	(2,101)	(+21)	(2,582)	(+23)	(3,233)	(+25)
MCCCP Credential Level 2	806	+18	(958) 901	(+19) +12	(1,157)	(+21)	(1.423)	(+23)	(1,781)	(+25)

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.										
Progression of credentials (Aligned to Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework)	*Baseline and Annual Targets -- 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*									
	Baseline (From Application)		**2012 (Target)** **Actual**		**2013 (Target)** **Actual**		**2014 (Target)** **Actual**		**2015 (Target)** **Actual**	
	#	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
MCCCP Credential Level 3	2,017	+19	(2,398) 2,289	(+19) +13	(2,897)	(+21)	(3,561)	(+23)	(4,458)	(+25)
MCCCP Credential Level 4	625	+37	(743) 756	(+19) +21	(898)	(+21)	(1,103)	(+23)	(1,382)	(+25)
MCCCP Credential Level 4+	169	+46	(201) 187	(+19) +11	(243)	(+21)	(299)	(+23)	(374)	(+25)
MCCCP Credential Level 5	450	+30	(535) 525	(+19) +17	(646)	(+21)	(794)	(+23)	(994)	(+25)
MCCCP Credential Level 6 (*Highest Level*)	665	+32	(790) 828	(+19) +25	(955)	(+21)	(1,173)	(+23)	(1,469)	(+25)

Include a row for each credential in the State's proposed progression of credentials, customize the labeling of the credentials, and indicate the highest and lowest credential.

[Please describe the methodology used to collect the data, including any error or data quality information.]
MCCCP participation data by credentialing level are maintained by the program administrator in an Excel spreadsheet. The entry of all data into this spreadsheet is done manually, so it is possible for occasional user-entry errors to occur (for example, transposing the letters of a program participant's name or the digits of the participant's entry date into the MCCCP). Enhancements to CCATS are currently in progress that will allow all participation data to be captured directly in, and reported directly from, the CCATS database. The figures in the percentage columns show the annual plus/minus percentage change for each level. All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.

Describe the State's challenges, lessons learned, and strategies for moving forward on meeting the targets for performance measures (D)(2)(d)(1) and (D)(2)(d)(2).

The State will continue to provide resources, incentives, and support that will allow the work force to progress in education and professional development. The state has recently re-opened the Child Care Career and Professional Development Fund to provide tuition assistance for child care professionals to obtain or continue their pursuit of a college education. In addition, a

timeline has been determined for 2 cohorts of the Maryland Approved Alternative Preparation Program (MAAPP-ECE) which provides a bridge to an Early Childhood Education certification for non-public teachers. The State is planning to review/revise the articulation agreement with MSDE/DECD and higher education in order to increase access and opportunities. The State has seen an increase in the number of professionals with level 4 and level 6 credentials over the past year. Through continued support of the aforementioned programs, the state will increase the number of professionals currently in levels 2, 3, and 4 to progress to levels 5 and 6, which includes degree attainment. The State will monitor progress meeting targets for performance measures for each year of the grant period and considerations for sustainability and continued progress in the future.

Kindergarten Entry Assessment

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 school year 2014-2015 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.

Aligned to both Maryland and Ohio's guidelines and standards for young children, birth through age six, including the Common Core Standards, Maryland's KEA covers seven domains: physical well-being and motor development, mathematics, language and literacy, science, social foundations, and fine arts. The identification of the standards and essential skills and knowledge in each domain that will be measured has been completed in partnership with Ohio. Learning progressions for each essential skill and knowledge being measured are currently being

developed by WestEd.

The KEA is being systematically developed within a framework grounded in theory, research, and best practice to ensure its validity and reliability. Validity and reliability of the KEA will consist of benchmarking and small-scale piloting of item/task prototypes, review by ad hoc groups and a national technical advisory committee comprised of developmental psychologists, early childhood experts, and psychometricians, formal pilot testing, field testing, and operational, statewide implementation. Cognitive interviews to test item prototypes were conducted in early January 2013. A small scale pilot for pre-K and kindergarten populations is in the sample selection phase and will occur in April 2013. A more representative sample will participate in a field test in the fall of 2013 and statewide implementation of the system will occur in 2014-2015. Thereafter, yearly administration and scoring of the KEA will occur in the fall of the kindergarten year.

Describe the data the State collects or will collect using the Kindergarten Entry Assessment to assess children's learning and developmental progress as they enter kindergarten.

Currently, Kindergarten teachers are using the MMSR Kindergarten Assessment (modified work sampling system) through school year 2013-2014. The new KEA will be administered statewide to all children who enter public school kindergarten during the fall of the 2014-2015 school year. Teachers will gather student KEA data during the first six weeks of the kindergarten school year and will be required to enter all data into Maryland's online data system. Through this system, the Maryland State Department of Education will have access to data on school readiness indicators within each of seven developmental domains described previously. Through administration by kindergarten teachers, data will be collected on the evidence of students' performance through checklists, observations, and artifacts. Students will complete performance tasks through virtual or hands-on tasks. This data will show what children know and can do as they transition into kindergarten, help determine if entering students are ready to engage in and benefit from the kindergarten curriculum, and assist teachers to meet students' individual needs through targeted intervention.

Where progress has not been made, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in these areas by the end of the grant period.

NA

Early Learning Data Systems

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.

If applicable, describe the State's progress in building or enhancing a Statewide Longitudinal Data System in the State that meets the criteria described above.

Integration of various data systems into the Early Childhood Data Warehouse (ECDW), is an integral component of the Longitudinal Data System:

The MSDE Division of Early Childhood's (MSDE/DECD's) CCATS database includes all child care provider data, provider staff credentialing data, program accreditation data, and child care subsidy program data. The MSDE/DECD's Electronic Licensing Inspection System (ELIS) database provides detailed compliance data from child care provider licensing inspections. Maryland's annual MMSR Kindergarten Assessment datasets provide individual performance scores for children enrolled in public kindergarten. Other MSDE data sources include the Division of Special Education and Early Intervention Services' Infants and Toddlers Program, public Pre-K site and enrollment files, and the Child Food and Nutrition Program.
Non-MSDE data sources include the MarylandEXCELS quality rating improvement system for child care and public pre-K programs that is maintained for MSDE/DECD by the Johns Hopkins University's Center for Technology in Education, and the Early Childhood Mental Health (ECMH) program that is maintained for MSDE/DECD by the University of Maryland. The interfaces with the MarylandEXCELS and ECMH databases are expected to be operational by February 2013. Discussions are also underway to develop interfaces with Maryland Department of Health data sources pertaining to child immunizations and health screenings, and with Maryland Department of Human Resources data sources on foster care and child adoption data. In addition, new data sources for the ECDW are being developed in connection with other Division RTT-ELC projects such as Breakthrough Centers and family support programs.

Establishment of the Child Enrollment and Attendance Record System (EARS) within the ECDW.

The EARS application is in the final stages of development and is expected to be ready for piloting by selected child care centers by April 2013. These child care centers are participants in the MarylandEXCELS program. The EARS system will capture continuing, real-time child enrollment and attendance data and staff-child assignment data from licensed child care programs. The system is housed directly within the ECDW as a special application of the

ECDW's Oracle database, and it will interface with the MSDE Division of Accountability and Assessment's computer system that generates and maintains the 10-digit unique student identifiers used for public Pre-K and K-12 programs. This interface will permit unique student identifiers to be assigned to all children identified within EARS so that their status and performance can be tracked throughout Maryland's early care system and later in K-12.

Building/Enhancing an Early Learning Data System

A project plan for the design of the Child Care Subsidy Program point-of-service (POS) system has been developed. The first task under the plan is to develop a functional requirements document that identifies essential system functions and defines the relationships between those functions. To accomplish this, joint application design sessions have been conducted. These have focused on the type of system-user interface to be used and related security issues, and the development of basic business rules for the system's child enrollment/disenrollment and voucher issuance/tracking processes. It was noted that the system will also need to interface with the Child Enrollment and Attendance Record System being developed within the Early Childhood Data Warehouse so that child enrollment/disenrollment data can be shared and validated for Subsidy Program purposes.

If applicable, please describe 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.

NA

Where progress has not been made, please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in these areas by the end of the grant period.

NA

Invitational Priorities

Grantee should include a narrative for those invitational priority areas that were addressed in your RTT-ELC application.

Sustaining Program Effects in the Early Elementary Grades. (Invitational Priority 4)

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

- ✓ Enhancing your current standards for kindergarten through grade 3 to align them with the Early Learning and Development Standards across all Essential Domains of School Readiness;

- ✓ Ensuring that transition planning occurs for children moving from Early Learning and Development Programs to elementary schools;
- ✓ Promoting health and family engagement, including in the early grades;
- ✓ Increasing the percentage of children who are able to read and do mathematics at grade level by the end of the third grade; and
- ✓ Leveraging existing Federal, State, and local resources.

Describe the progress made, if applicable.

- MSDE's Division of Instruction and Division of Early Childhood have worked collaboratively on the curriculum alignment for the Common Core areas of English Language Arts and Literacy and Mathematics, as well as in Social Studies, Science, STEM, Physical Development, and the Fine Arts. Although the State does not currently have curriculum developed in the Social Foundations domain beyond Kindergarten, LEAs are encouraged to implement the Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports program (PBIS) that focuses on the Social Foundations' indicators.

- Transition planning continues to be supported through funding time for teachers to meet and plan with teachers of students in Head Start programs and public Pre-kindergartens. The Judy Centers in Title I school areas also support transition planning in a variety of ways.

- A number of partnerships with pediatricians, family practice physicians, and mental health providers are being developed to support the use of developmental screening instruments as well as early detection and intervention in mental health. The Maryland Coalition for Family Engagement has been created and is currently developing Maryland strategies to increase family involvement that align with the DOE framework on family engagement and the Head Start Parent, Family, and Community Framework.

- As shown in the charts in the Appendix (Table D and E), the number of third graders who are proficient in reading and mathematics in all groups as well as subgroups continues to increase each year.

- Leveraging existing Federal, state, and local resources, such as federal grants (i.e. Project LAUNCH, Promise Neighborhoods) and state policy to reopen income brackets for eligibility of the Maryland Child Care Subsidy Program.

See Tables D and E in the Appendix.

Encouraging Private-Sector Support (Invitational Priority 5)

Describe State's progress in engaging the private sector in supporting the implementation of the State Plan, if applicable.

NA

Additional Information

Please provide any additional information regarding progress, challenges, and lessons learned that is not addressed elsewhere in this report.

NA

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.

- Data on the status of children at kindergarten entry (across Essential Domains of School Readiness, if available), including data on the readiness gap between Children with High Needs and their peers.
- Data on program quality across different types of Early Learning and Development Programs.
- The number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program.
- Data on funding for early learning and development in the State.
- Data on the number and percentage of Children with High Needs from special populations in the State.
- Data on the current status of the State's early learning and development standards.
- Data on the Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State.

Table 1: Children from Low-Income families, by age

*In the table below, provide data **for the current and previous grant years** on the number and percentage of children from Low-Income families in the State, by age. [Low-Income is defined as having an income of up to 200% of the Federal poverty rate.]*

Table 1: Children from Low-Income families, by age (Application Table (A)(1)-1). Provide the number of low-income families in the State and the number of children from low-income families as a percentage of all children in the state.										
	2011*		**2012****		**2013**		**2014**		**2015**	
	Number of children from Low-Income families in the State	**Children from Low-Income families as a percentage of all children in the State**	**# of low-income children in the state**	**# of low-income children as a % of all children in the state**	**# of low-income children in the state**	**# of low-income children as a % of all children in the state**	**# of low-income children in the state**	**# of low-income children as a % of all children in the state**	**# of low-income children in the state**	**# of low-income children as a % of all children in the state**
Infants under age 1	20,307	5.6%***	21,660	2.2%						
Toddlers ages 1 through 2	41,621	11.4% ***	44,226	4.5%						
Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry	41,874	11.5%***	44,496	4.5%						
Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families.	103,802	28.5%***	110,383	11.2%						

* Data Source: 2010 Census Data

(1) Total Maryland Population < 5yo = 364,488; by age group, 71,523 birth-to-ones, 72,035 one-year-olds, 74,002 two-year-olds, 74,034 three-year-olds, and 72,894 four-year-olds.

(2) Percentage of low-income children, 28.5% plus or minus 3.1% from ASEC of CPS 2009 - related children 5-17 yrs old at or below 200% of poverty level.

** Data Source: 2011 ACS Data on number of children under 5 (updated annually, using the 1 yr estimates), combined with an updated measurement of the % children under 18 and under 200% of poverty from AEC Kids Count (based on ACS).

*** The 2011 percentages presented in the original application were miscalculated. Corrected percentages are supplied for 2012. The corrected percentages for 2011 would be as follows: Infants under age 1, 1.8%; Toddlers ages 1 through 2, 3.7%; Preschoolers ages 3 to K entry, 3.8%; total number of children, birth to K entry from low income families, 9.3%.

Table 2: Special populations of Children with High Needs

In the table below, provide data ***for the current and previous grant years*** *on the number and percentage of Children with High Needs from special populations in the State.*

Table 2: Special populations of Children (from birth to kindergarten entry) with High Needs. (Application Table (A)(1)-2).										
	2011		**2012**		**2013**		**2014**		**2015**	
Special populations: Children who . .*	**Number of children in the State who…**	**Percentage of children in the State who…**	**# of children in the State who…**	**% of children in the State who…**	**# of children in the State who…**	**% of children in the State who…**	**# of children in the State who…**	**% of children in the State who…**	**# of children in the State who…**	**% of children in the State who…**
Have disabilities or developmental delays[3]	17,628	4.8%	17,469	4.8%						
Are English learners[4]	12,450	3.4%	12,915	3.5%						
Reside on "Indian Lands"	Not applicable		Not applicable							
Are migrant[5]	146	0.04%	112	0.03%						

[3] For purposes of this 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).

[4] For purposes of this report, children who are English learners are children birth through kindergarten entry that has home languages other than English.

[5] For purposes of this report, children who are migrant are children birth through kindergarten entry who meets the definition of "migratory child" in ESEA section 1309(2).

* **Data Sources:**

Number of Children < 5 years old (= basis for calculation of special population percentages):
The percentage for 2011 is calculated on the basis of the 2010 US Census figure for children < 5 y/o in Maryland, which = 364,488. The percentage for 2012 is calculated on the basis of the 2011 ACS update for children < 5 y/o, which = 363,121.
Have Disabilities/Developmental Delays:
Data source is the MSDE Attendance Data Collection for the specified year.
Are English Learners:
Data source is the MSDE Attendance Data Collection for the specified year.
Are Migrant:
Data source for eligible migrant children is Maryland's Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for the specified year. The numbers shown are the numbers of eligible migrant children birth through5 who are not in kindergarten.

Table 3: Participation of Children with High Needs in different types of Early Learning and Development Programs, by age

*In the table below, provide data **for the current and previous grant years** on the number of Children with High Needs in the State who are enrolled in Early Learning and Development Programs, by age.*

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

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

Type of Early Learning and Development Program	**Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age**																			
	2011				**2012**				**2013**				**2014**				**2015**			
	Infants < 1	Toddlers ages 1 - 2	Children ages 3to K-entry	Total	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.

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

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

Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age																			
	2011				2012				2013				2014				2015			
	Infants < 1	Toddlers ages 1 - 2	Children ages 3to K-entry	Total	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.
State-funded preschool *Specify:* Students participating in public prekindergarten and Judy Center Preschool Programs *Data Source and Year:* MSDE Division of Accountability and Assessment pre-K enrollment data as of 9/30 of the	0	0	27,071	27,071	0	0	27,443	27,443												

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

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

Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age																			
	2011				2012				2013				2014				2015			
	Infants < 1	Toddlers ages 1 - 2	Children ages 3to K-entry	Total	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.
Early Head Start and Head Start[6] *Data Source and Year:* PIR for the specified year (FFY)	387	1,248	11,041	12,676	614	1,389	10,573	12,731												
Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619 *	1,083	6,297	10,248	17,628	1,113	6,365	9,991	17,469												

[6] Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.

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

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

Type of Early Learning and Development Program	**Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age**																			
	2011				**2012**				**2013**				**2014**				**2015**			
	Infants < 1	Toddlers ages 1 - 2	Children ages 3to K-entry	Total	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.
Data Source and Year: MSDE Enrollment Snapshot as of 10/31 of the specified year.																				

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

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

Type of Early Learning and Development Program	**Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age**																			
	2011				**2012**				**2013**				**2014**				**2015**			
	Infants < 1	Toddlers ages 1 - 2	Children ages 3to K-entry	Total	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA																				
Even Start Family Literacy	(see explanation**)	31	120	151	(see explanation**)	10	43	53												
Title I Part A		5	14,919	14,924		0	15,219	15,219												
Data Source and Year: Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for Maryland for the specified School Year.																				

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

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

Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age																			
	2011				2012				2013				2014				2015			
	Infants < 1	Toddlers ages 1 - 2	Children ages 3to K-entry	Total	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.
Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program *Data Source and Year:* Unduplicated counts of children served at age birth—5 years old from CCATS	1,438	9,392	10,463	21,293	739	6,766	9,245	16,750												

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

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

Type of Early Learning and Development Program	**Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age**																			
	2011				**2012**				**2013**				**2014**				**2015**			
	Infants < 1	Toddlers ages 1 - 2	Children ages 3to K-entry	Total	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.
database, July through June of the specified year (child ages are calculated as of 6/30 of the specified year).																				

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

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

Type of Early Learning and Development Program	**Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age**																			
	2011				**2012**				**2013**				**2014**				**2015**			
	Infants < 1	Toddlers ages 1 - 2	Children ages 3to K-entry	Total	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.
Other *Specify:* Maryland Pre-K Pilot Sites *Data Source and Year:* LEA and early care provider (including Head Start) grantee attendance data for the specified year (SFY).	Not applicable	Not applicable	250	250	Not applicable	Not applicable	301	301												

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

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

Type of Early Learning and Development Program	**Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age**																			
	2011				**2012**				**2013**				**2014**				**2015**			
	Infants < 1	Toddlers ages 1 - 2	Children ages 3to K-entry	Total	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.
Other *Specify:* Family Support Centers *** *Data Source and Year:* Family Support Center MIS System, data for the specified year (SFY).	328	1,273	755	2,356	269	1,256	857	2,382												
Add additional rows as needed.																				

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

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

Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age																			
	2011				2012				2013				2014				2015			
	Infants < 1	Toddlers ages 1 - 2	Children ages 3to K-entry	Total	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.

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

* **Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619:** Data are collected according to the setting reporting categories required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA): Home, Community-Based Setting, Service Provider Location, Early Childhood Program (unspecified), Separate Class, School or Residential Facility, Hospital. Data are not collected or reported by the specific program, such as Early Head Start, Head Start, Private Nursery School, and Public Prekindergarten. The following table shows child participation during 2011 and 2012 according to IDEA reporting categories:

Type of Early Learning & Development Program	Number of Children with High Needs Participating in Each Type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age							
	2011				2012			
	Birth-3	3	4	5	Birth-3	3	4	5
Home	6,086	15	43	31	6,156	569	43	21

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

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

Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age																			
	2011				2012				2013				2014				2015			
	Infants < 1	Toddlers ages 1 - 2	Children ages 3to K-entry	Total	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.
Community-Based Setting*		1,076		324		120		N/A		1,139		864		N/A		N/A				
Service Provider Location		23		356		573		369		38		331		503		301				
Separate Class, School, Residential Setting		188		877		988		712		145		995		1,011		617				
Hospital		0		0		0		1		0		0		1		1				
Early Childhood Program (unspecified)**		N/A		2,032		2,914		4,213		N/A		1,171		2,830		4,296				

* IFSP Only
** IEP Only

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

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

Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age																			
	2011				2012				2013				2014				2015			
	Infants < 1	Toddlers ages 1 - 2	Children ages 3to K-entry	Total	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.	< 1	1 - 2	3 to K-entry	Tot.

** **Programs funded under Title I of ESEA:** A disaggregated number for infants under age 1 is not available for 2011 & 2012.

*** **Family Support Centers:** The figures reported for 2012 are based on the period July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012 with 21 Centers reporting for 12 months, and 1 Center reporting for 9 months. Age calculations are based on the dates of first service at Family Support Centers.

Table 4: Data on funding for Early Learning and Development

In the table below, provide data on the funding for Early Learning and Development in the State.

Note: For those 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.

Table 4: Data on funding for Early Learning and Development (Application Table (A)(1)-4).					
Type of investment	**Funding for each Fiscal Year**				
	2011	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**
Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start and Head Start[7]	$1,800,000	$1,800,000	$1,800,000		
State-funded preschool *Specify:* Pre-K programs located in public elementary schools *	$99,048,693	$84,791,740			
State contributions to IDEA Part C **	$54,706,114	$75,241,171			
State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry	$0	$0			
Total State contributions to CCDF[8]	$66,667,874	$62,612,472	$62,612,472 (preliminary)		
State match to CCDF *Exceeded/Met/Not Met (if exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded)*	$43,366,467 ($12,782,732 exceeded)	$39,311,065 ($9,044,080 exceeded)	$39,311,065 (preliminary) ($9,044,080 exceeded)		

[7] Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.
[8] Total State contributions to CCDF must include Maintenance of Effort (MOE), State Match, and any State contributions exceeding State MOE or Match.

Table 4: Data on funding for Early Learning and Development (Application Table (A)(1)-4).					
Type of investment	**Funding for each Fiscal Year**				
	2011	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**
TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs[9]	TANF transfer to CCDF of $10,285,667 Home Visiting Program: $4,642,102	$0	$0	$0	
Other State contributions *Specify:*	not applicable				
Total State contributions:	$280,516,917	$263,756,448			

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

* **State-funded preschool**: The mandate to provide services also requires local spending as necessary to serve enrolled children. The figures provided in this row are estimates. They do not include CCDF match amounts.

**** State contributions to IDEA Part C**: State contributions include local funding sources.

Table 5: Deleted per APR Instruction 12-19-2012

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

Table 6: Data on the Current status of the State's Early Learning and Development Standards

In the table below, update the data provided in the State's application regarding the current status of Early Learning and Development Standards.

Table 6: Current status of the State's Early Learning and Development Standards (Application Table (A)(1)-6) *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
[Enter text to explain or clarify information as needed]			

Table 7: Data on the Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State

Table 7: Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State (Application Table (A)(1)-7). *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 *Specify:* Pre-K programs located in public elementary schools	X (required at the discretion of local school systems)	X	X (included in State standards, which are applied by local school systems)	X (included in teacher evaluations, which are conducted by local school systems)	
Early Head Start and Head Start[10]	X	X	X	X	X
Programs funded under IDEA Part C	X (see explanation below)	X (see explanation below)	X (see explanation below)	(see explanation below)	(see explanation below)
Programs funded under IDEA Part B, section 619	X	X			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	X (see explanation below)		X (see explanation below)	X (see explanation below)	
Programs receiving CCDF funds	(see explanation below)	X (see explanation below)	X (see explanation below)	X (see explanation below)	
Current Quality Rating and Improvement System requirements *Specify by tier (add rows if needed):* Maryland EXCELS: "Developmentally Appropriate Learning and Practice/Child Assessment" module (Family Child Care QRIS Standards, Child Care Center QRIS Standards, School-Age Program QRIS Standards, and Public Pre-K Program QRIS Standards).	X Levels 3, 4 (see explanation below)	X Levels 2, 3, 4, 5 (see explanation below)	X Levels 3, 4, 5 (see explanation below)	X Level 5 (see explanation below)	

[10] Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

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

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 licensing requirements	X (see explanation below)				
Other *Describe:* Judith P. Hoyer Centers ("Judy Centers")	X (see explanation below)	X (see explanation below)	X (see explanation below)	X (see explanation below)	X (see explanation below)

<u>Programs funded under IDEA Part C:</u>
Screening Measures: Tools include but are not limited to: Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ-III) Best Beginnings Developmental Screening (BBDS), Battelle Developmental Inventory (BDI-2) Screening, Modified Checklist for Autism in Toddlers (M-CHAT).
Formative Assessments: Evaluations/Assessments are completed initially and updated on an annual basis as part of the Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) "Present Levels of Development." In addition, outcomes progress review occurs every 6 months on the "Child and Family Outcomes" page of the IFSP. Multiple sources of information are utilized, both quantitative and qualitative.
Measures of Environmental Quality: The majority of services are provided in the home and/or community. Each Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) includes "Routines in the Natural Environment."
Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions: These measures are optional, not required. The information is gathered as part of the IFSP process using Routines Based Interview (RBI), ASQ, and/or locally developed family interview tools.
Other (Measures): Additional information collected as appropriate and as part of the IFSP process include: targeted specialized assessments, general health information, medical reports, child's strengths and needs summary.

<u>Programs funded under Title I of ESEA</u>:
Screening Measures: USDE requires state administered local projects to use and measure academic gains of child and adult participants enrolled in the program. For children, MSDE is required to report data on the PPVT-3 and PALS screening tools to measure alphabet knowledge and receptive language development. For adults, projects are required to measure reading and math gains using the CASAS. For adult-child interactions, the Parent Education Profile (PEP) tool is utilized.
Measures of Environmental Quality: Some of the environmental measures used by local projects are integrated into the chosen early childhood curriculum such as, High Scope and the Creative Curriculum.
Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions: MSDE's Even Start program recommends that local projects use only assessment tools that are recommended and approved by the State and the LEA. These assessment measures include measures recommended for children birth – school-age (age 8); Dept of Labor, Adult Literacy program requires the CASAS, & BEST. Other adult-child assessments approved by MSDE's Even Start program consists of the Bowdoin, Nurturing Program, Parents As Teachers, Systematic Training for Effective Parenting, Ounce, Ages & Stages.

<u>Programs Receiving CCDF Funds</u>:
Maryland's current tiered reimbursement system requires participating programs at Levels 5 and 6 to meet ERS (ITERS/ECERS/SACERS) standards applicable to formative assessments, measures of environmental quality, and measures of the quality of adult-child interactions. Screening measures are not currently required, but they are planned for future inclusion.

<u>Current Quality Rating and Improvement System Requirements</u>:
<u>Screening Measures</u>:
<u>Level 3</u>:

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

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**

Children are observed for developmental progress using developmental checklists.

Level 4:

- Program has a policy regarding child assessment using developmental checklists.
- Program has a policy for sharing assessment results with families.

Level 5:

- Program has a written policy regarding child assessment using formal and informal assessment measures, including developmental checklists, portfolio development, and observation/anecdotal records.
- Program has a written policy that describes their practices for sharing assessment results with families and/or agencies that may be working with the family, including early intervention or special education services.

Formative Assessments:

Level 2:

- MSDE Healthy Beginnings, MMSR, or approved curriculum guides the development of a written daily schedule that is predictable, yet flexible and responsive to the individual needs of all children.
- The program has a method for curriculum planning that includes planning from children's interests and skills.
- Children are observed for developmental progress.

Level 3:

- Same as Level 2, plus:
- The program's method for curriculum planning includes multiple literacy, language, science, art, health and wellness, physical fitness, and numeracy activities.
- Observations of children for developmental progress use developmental checklists.

Level 4:

- Implementation of a curriculum that is aligned with the MMSR and/or state curriculum and guides the development of a daily schedule.
- The program has a method for curriculum planning that incorporates children's interests and skills, and includes multiple literacy, language, science, art, health and wellness, physical fitness, and numeracy activities on a daily basis.
- Evidence of differentiated instruction for each age group, children with disabilities, special health care needs and/or English-language learners.

Level 5:

- Same as Level 4, plus:
- Evidence of use of an IFSP/IEP for individualized planning for children with disabilities (if applicable). Also, the program has a written policy regarding child assessment using formal and informal assessment measures, including developmental checklists, portfolio development, and observational and anecdotal records.

Measures of Environmental Quality:

Level 3:

- Self-assessment conducted using the appropriate rating scale, such as ERS or CLASS™, for at least one of each age grouping.
- Improvement plan created for any subscale score below 4.0

Level 4:

- A recommended rating scale conducted for random sample including at least one classroom from

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

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**

all age groups.

- Improvement plan created for any subscale score below 4.5.

Level 5:

- A recommended rating scale conducted for random sample including at least one classroom from all age groups.
- Improvement plan created for any subscale score below 5.0.

Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions:

Level 5:

For Level 5 public pre-K programs *only*, use of the Classroom Assessment Scoring System™ (CLASS™ – see explanation below) is required. It is optional for other child care programs. The instrument is administered locally by Maryland EXCELS performance monitors. CLASS™ is a reliable, validated observational tool that assesses classroom quality in pre-K—3 based on teacher–student interactions in the classroom rather than evaluation of the physical environment or a specific curriculum. The complete set of Maryland EXCELS standards at all participant levels for Family Child Care Homes, Child Care Centers, School-Age Programs, and Public Pre-K Programs is posted on the MSDE Division of Early Childhood Development website.

State Licensing Requirements:

Maryland child care licensing regulations require that a health inventory signed by a physician must be submitted for each child at the time of admission to care. This inventory must include a review of the child in the following areas: general physical health, physical illness or impairment, vision, hearing, speech/language, allergies, disabilities, modified diet or special feeding needs, mental/emotional/behavioral, and any other condition that might limit the child's participation in child care program activities. The inventory also asks if the child has received any evaluations that could help the child care provider or teacher to meet the child's health or educational needs. MSDE plans to amend State licensing regulations within the next 2 years to explicitly require programs to ensure that each child receives screenings for developmental and learning needs, behavioral health, and oral health.

Other: Judy Centers

- Early Identification and Intervention is a required component standard of all Judy Centers. There is a plan in place to identify all children ages birth through five years of age. This includes those who are enrolled in state or federally regulated programs. Children receive age-appropriate developmental screenings, evaluations and interventions when appropriate.
- Judy Centers do not directly screen and assess children but, rather, screenings and assessments are performed by members of the Judy Center Partnerships. Judy Centers may refer children to its community partners when there are concerns about a particular child. It is up to the community partner to determine the appropriate screening and follow up assessment, if required, that should be done.
- Families are requested to sign a release form so that results of the screenings and assessments and any necessary interventions may be shared with the Judy Center. This allows the Judy Center to respond appropriately when including the child and their family in all Judy Center activities and events. All children ages birth through five years, regardless of abilities, are fully included and have access to all programs and services.

Additional Performance Measures Tables

Update any additional performance measure, if applicable.

Performance Measures – Other *NA*					
[*Insert title here****]***					
Project Goals/Desired Outcomes:					
Narrative: *[Briefly describe…]*					
Annual Targets for Key Performance Measures: **Performance Measures for (other):**					
[Customize performance measure tables as appropriate]					
	Baseline (from Application)	**2012 (Target)** **Actual**	**2013 (Target)** **Actual**	**2014 (Target)** **Actual**	**2015 (Target)** **Actual**

Budget Information

Please describe what activities and mechanisms (e.g., contracts, MOUs, etc.) the State is using to distribute funds from the RTT-ELC budget to local programs, early learning intermediary organizations, participating programs, individuals (including scholars), and other partners.

Projects 2 to 10 have established MOAs, discretionary grants and contracts to fund organizations assisting with implementation of the ELC grant. Certain partners were selected to assist with ELC grant implementation because they have specific credentials and expertise.

Across all projects purchase orders were put in place to buy furniture, lease office space, cable and wiring services, and computer equipment. Purchase orders were also established to hire IT consultants for project 10.

Please describe the entities (or types of individuals) to whom the State is distributing RTT-ELC funds through subgranting.

Projects 2 to 10 have a combination of private nonprofit, higher education, and public agency partners. Many of the partners are private non-profits such as – the Maryland Family Network, Downtown Baltimore Child Care Inc., the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), the Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, WestEd, and Crossway Community, Inc. Several higher education partners are working on projects; these are Howard Community College, Hagerstown Community College, Johns Hopkins University – Center for Technology in Education and the Bloomberg School of Public Health, and the University of Maryland at Baltimore. Public agencies are also partnering in grant implementation; these are the Board of Public Library Trustees in St Mary's County, Baltimore City Public Schools, Prince George's County Public Schools, Wicomico County Public Schools, and the Mental Hygiene Administration in the Maryland Department of Health.

Purchase orders were made to Towson University for IT consultants (project 10), DSR, Inc. (computers), Xerox State &Local Solutions, Inc. (IT programmer project 10), Deborah Roderick Stark (pedagogy writer for project 4), Maryland Correctional Entrepreneurs (furniture purchase), Faust Brothers (lease space), and Fiber Plus, Inc. (cable and wiring).

Please provide a brief summary of any substantive changes that were made to the State RTT-ELC budget within the past year.

All the approved RTT-ELC activities were entered into the Scope of Work and the GRADS360 management system. The major changes for Year 1 to the original timetable of the SOW budget are:

- Experienced delays in the recruitment of staff reducing the cost of personnel .
- Experienced delays of Data Entry contract and Incentive to Program & Pre-K for MD EXCEL due to problems with user expectance during testing and data base changes due to regulation (union due)
- Deferral to Year 2 of the contract regarding data management system components in support of Maryland EXCELS due to cost allocation from existing funds and delays in programming and UAT testing. In addition, reduced costs for data management components as a result of identifying cost efficiencies (see below).

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

Identified cost efficiencies in the data management component of ECCATS in support of Maryland EXCELS, namely the point-of-sale attendance system for child care subsidy, thereby reducing the cost allocation for Project 10.

Realignment of "carry over" funds, i.e., cost savings, to expand activities under the approved Scope of Work. Budget realignment is subject to standard budget amendment approval process.

Budget Tables

Budget Table 1: Overall Budget Summary by Budget Category--*Include budget totals for each budget category for the current grant year.*

Budget Table 1: Overall Budget Summary by Budget Category for Grant Year 1

Budget Categories	Budget	Expenditures
1. Personnel	720,755	136,570
2. Fringe Benefits	31,485	10,831
3. Travel	84,076	12,507
4. Equipment	152,809	145,809
5. Supplies	8,398	8,398
6. Contractual	8,880,205	4,811,141
7. Training Stipends		
8. Other	24,514	46,596

Budget Table 1: Overall Budget Summary by Budget Category for Grant Year 1		
Budget Categories	**Budget**	**Expenditures**
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	9,902,242	5,171,852
10. Indirect Costs*	176,217	86,097
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.		
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	25,000	25,000
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	10,103,459	5,282,949
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	29,309,431	29,902,715
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	39,412,890	35,185,664

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.

PROJECT BUDGET TABLES

Budget and Expenditure Table 2: by Project -- *The State must complete a Budget and Expenditure Table for each project for Grant Year 1.*

Budget Table 2: Project 1 ***Local Early Childhood Councils***		
Budget Categories	**Budget**	**Expenditures**
1. Personnel	6,000	
2. Fringe Benefits		
3. Travel	1,155	1,155
4. Equipment		
5. Supplies		
6. Contractual	120,000	
7. Training Stipends		
8. Other		
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	127,155	1,155
10. Indirect Costs*	4,019	144
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.		
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance		
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	131,174	1,299
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	120,000	120,000
15. **Total Budget** (add lines 13-14)	251,174	121,299

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.

Budget Table 2: Project 1 *Local Early Childhood Councils*		
Budget Categories	**Budget**	**Expenditures**
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.		

Budget Table 2: Project 2 *Maryland EXCELS*		
Budget Categories	**Budget**	**Expenditures**
1. Personnel	208,128	58,500
2. Fringe Benefits	24,177	4,639
3. Travel	51,344	2,000
4. Equipment	77,676	70,676
5. Supplies	5,434	5,434
6. Contractual	1,140,538	668,428
7. Training Stipends		
8. Other	8,936	8,936
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	1,516,234	818,613
10. Indirect Costs*	49,752	22,439
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.		
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance		
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	1,565,986	841,052
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	3,170,784	4,258,008
15. **Total Budget** (add lines 13-14)	4,736,770	5,099,060

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

Budget Table 2: Project 2 *Maryland EXCELS*		
Budget Categories	**Budget**	**Expenditures**
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.		

Budget Table 2: Project 3 *Quality Capacity Building*		
Budget Categories	**Budget**	**Expenditures**
1. Personnel		
2. Fringe Benefits		
3. Travel		
4. Equipment		
5. Supplies		
6. Contractual	1,750,000	1,709,501
7. Training Stipends		
8. Other		
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	1,750,000	1,709,501
10. Indirect Costs*	15,625	15,624
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.		
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance		
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	1,765,625	1,725,125
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	19,089,450	18,922,899
15. **Total Budget** (add lines 13-14)	20,855,075	20,648,024

Budget Table 2: Project 3 *Quality Capacity Building*		
Budget Categories	**Budget**	**Expenditures**
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.		

Budget Table 2: Project 4 *Promoting Use of Early Learning Standards*		
Budget Categories	**Budget**	**Expenditures**
1. Personnel	15,471	21,700
2. Fringe Benefits	1,227	1,721
3. Travel	4,620	
4. Equipment	10,882	10,882
5. Supplies	494	494
6. Contractual	187,130	142,630
7. Training Stipends		
8. Other	4,854	27,854
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	224,678	205,281
10. Indirect Costs*	9,583	12,721
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.		
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance		

Budget Table 2: Project 4 *Promoting Use of Early Learning Standards*		
Budget Categories	**Budget**	**Expenditures**
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	234,261	218,002
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	281,713	230,377
15. **Total Budget** (add lines 13-14)	515,974	448,379

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.

Budget Table 2: Project 5 *Professional Development Maryland Model for School Readiness*		
Budget Categories	**Budget**	**Expenditures**
1. Personnel	20,629	23,929
2. Fringe Benefits	1,636	1,898
3. Travel	6,160	480
4. Equipment	10,882	10,882
5. Supplies	494	494
6. Contractual	200,000	200,000
7. Training Stipends		
8. Other	1,454	1,454
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	241,255	239,137
10. Indirect Costs*	6,922	1,454

Budget Table 2: Project 5 *Professional Development Maryland Model for School Readiness*		
Budget Categories	**Budget**	**Expenditures**
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.		
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance		
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	248,177	240,591
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	1,000,256	992,151
15. **Total Budget** (add lines 13-14)	1,248,433	1,232,742

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.

Budget Table 2: Project 6 *Comprehensive Assessment System*		
Budget Categories	**Budget**	**Expenditures**
1. Personnel	421,129	17,691
2. Fringe Benefits	1,636	1,403
3. Travel	14,560	4,900
4. Equipment	12,861	12,861
5. Supplies	494	494
6. Contractual	1,302,129	1,302,129
7. Training Stipends		

Budget Table 2: Project 6 *Comprehensive Assessment System*		
Budget Categories	**Budget**	**Expenditures**
8. Other	1,454	1,454
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	1,754,263	1,340,932
10. Indirect Costs*	58,034	6,368
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.		
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance		
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	1,812,297	1,347,300
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	1,100,000	1,481,019
15. **Total Budget** (add lines 13-14)	2,912,297	2,828,319

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.

Budget Table 2: Project 7 *Child Development Innovations*		
Budget Categories	**Budget**	**Expenditures**
1. Personnel	6,649	4,045
2. Fringe Benefits	527	321
3. Travel	1,001	
4. Equipment	4,816	4,816

Budget Table 2: Project 7 *Child Development Innovations*		
Budget Categories	**Budget**	**Expenditures**
5. Supplies	247	247
6. Contractual	304,314	215,100
7. Training Stipends		
8. Other	727	727
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	318,281	225,256
10. Indirect Costs*	11,121	10,644
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.		
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance		
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	349,402	235,900
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	1,713,077	1,713,077
15. **Total Budget** (add lines 13-14)	2,041,479	1,948,977

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.

Budget Table 2: Project 8 *Family Engagement and Support*		
Budget Categories	**Budget**	**Expenditures**
1. Personnel	6,649	4,044

Budget Table 2: Project 8 *Family Engagement and Support*		
Budget Categories	**Budget**	**Expenditures**
2. Fringe Benefits	527	321
3. Travel	3,696	
4. Equipment	4,816	4,816
5. Supplies	247	247
6. Contractual	194,924	194,924
7. Training Stipends		
8. Other	727	727
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	211,586	205,079
10. Indirect Costs*	5,208	4,394
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.		
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance		
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	216,794	209,473
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan		
15. **Total Budget** (add lines 13-14)	216,794	209,473

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.

Budget Table 2: Project 9 *Leadership in Early Learning Academies*		
Budget Categories	**Budget**	**Expenditures**
1. Personnel	5,157	6,661
2. Fringe Benefits	409	528
3. Travel	1,540	
4. Equipment		
5. Supplies		
6. Contractual	100,000	100,000
7. Training Stipends		
8. Other		
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	107,106	107,189
10. Indirect Costs*	888	899
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.		
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance		
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	107,994	108,088
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan		
15. **Total Budget** (add lines 13-14)	107,994	108,088

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.

Budget Table 2: Project 10 ***Early learning Data System***		
Budget Categories	**Budget**	**Expenditures**
1. Personnel		
2. Fringe Benefits		
3. Travel		
4. Equipment	9,632	9,632
5. Supplies		
6. Contractual	3,581,177	278,429
7. Training Stipends		
8. Other	1,454	1,454
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	3,592,263	289,515
10. Indirect Costs*	7,636	7,636
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.		
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance		
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	3,599,899	297,151
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	2,834,151	2,185,184
15. **Total Budget** (add lines 13-14)	6,434,050	2,482,335

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.

Budget Table 2: Project 11 *Grant Monitoring*		
Budget Categories	**Budget**	**Expenditures**
1. Personnel	30,943	
2. Fringe Benefits	1,346	
3. Travel		3,972
4. Equipment	21,244	21,244
5. Supplies	988	988
6. Contractual		
7. Training Stipends		
8. Other	4,908	3,990
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	59,429	30,194
10. Indirect Costs*	7,429	3,774
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.		
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	25,000	25,000
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	91,858	58,968
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan		
15. **Total Budget** (add lines 13-14)	91,858	58,968

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.

DEFINITIONS

Note: All definitions below are taken from the notice.

Children with High Needs means children from birth through kindergarten entry who are from Low-Income families or otherwise in need of special assistance and support, including children who have disabilities or developmental delays; who are English learners; who reside on "Indian lands" as that term is defined by section 8013(6) of the ESEA; who are migrant, homeless, or in foster care; and other children as identified by the State.

Common Education Data Standards (CEDS) means voluntary, common standards for a key set of education data elements (*e.g.*, demographics, program participation, transition, course information) at the early learning, K-12, and postsecondary levels developed through a national collaborative effort being led by the National Center for Education Statistics. CEDS focus on standard definitions, code sets, and technical specifications of a subset of key data elements and are designed to increase data interoperability, portability, and comparability across Early Learning and Development Programs and agencies, States, local educational agencies, and postsecondary institutions.

Comprehensive Assessment System means a coordinated and comprehensive system of multiple assessments, each of which is valid and reliable for its specified purpose and for the population with which it will be used, that organizes information about the process and context of young children's learning and development in order to help Early Childhood Educators make informed instructional and programmatic decisions and that conforms to the recommendations of the National Research Council reports on early childhood.

A Comprehensive Assessment System includes, at a minimum--

(a) Screening Measures;

(b) Formative Assessments;

(c) Measures of Environmental Quality; and

(d) Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions.

Data System Oversight Requirements means policies for ensuring the quality, privacy, and integrity of data contained in a data system, including--

(a) A data governance policy that identifies the elements that are collected and maintained; provides for training on internal controls to system users; establishes who will have access to the data in the system and how the data may be used; sets appropriate internal controls to restrict access to only authorized users; sets criteria for determining the legitimacy of data requests; establishes processes that verify the accuracy, completeness, and age of the data elements maintained in the system; sets procedures for determining the sensitivity of each inventoried element and the risk of harm if those data were improperly disclosed; and establishes procedures for disclosure review and auditing; and

(b) A transparency policy that informs the public, including families, Early Childhood Educators, and programs, of the existence of data systems that house personally identifiable information, explains what data elements are included in such a system, enables parental consent to disclose personally identifiable information as appropriate, and describes allowable and potential uses of the data.

Early Childhood Educator means any professional working in an Early Learning and Development Program, including but not limited to center-based and family child care providers; infant

and toddler specialists; early intervention specialists and early childhood special educators; home visitors; related services providers; administrators such as directors, supervisors, and other early learning and development leaders; Head Start teachers; Early Head Start teachers; preschool and other teachers; teacher assistants; family service staff; and health coordinators.

Early Learning and Development Program means any (a) State-licensed or State-regulated program or provider, regardless of setting or funding source, that provides early care and education for children from birth to kindergarten entry, including, but not limited to, any program operated by a child care center or in a family child care home; (b) preschool program funded by the Federal Government or State or local educational agencies (including any IDEA-funded program); (c) Early Head Start and Head Start program; and (d) a non-relative child care provider who is not otherwise regulated by the State and who regularly cares for two or more unrelated children for a fee in a provider setting. A State should include in this definition other programs that may deliver early learning and development services in a child's home, such as the Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting; Early Head Start; and part C of IDEA[11].

Early Learning and Development Standards means a set of expectations, guidelines, or developmental milestones that--

(a) Describe what all children from birth to kindergarten entry should know and be able to do and their disposition toward learning;

(b) Are appropriate for each age group (*e.g.*, infants, toddlers, and preschoolers); for English learners; and for children with disabilities or developmental delays;

(c) Cover all Essential Domains of School Readiness; and

(d) Are universally designed and developmentally, culturally, and linguistically appropriate.

Early Learning Intermediary Organization means a national, statewide, regional, or community-based organization that represents one or more networks of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State and that has influence or authority over them. Such Early Learning Intermediary Organizations include, but are not limited to, Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies; State Head Start Associations; Family Child Care Associations; State affiliates of the National Association for the Education of Young Children; State affiliates of the Council for Exceptional Children's Division of Early Childhood; statewide or regional union affiliates that represent Early Childhood Educators; affiliates of the National Migrant and Seasonal Head Start Association; the National Tribal, American Indian, and Alaskan Native Head Start Association; and the National Indian Child Care Association.

Essential Data Elements means the critical child, program, and workforce data elements of a coordinated early learning data system, including--

(a) A unique statewide child identifier or another highly accurate, proven method to link data on that child, including Kindergarten Entry Assessment data, to and from the Statewide Longitudinal Data System and the coordinated early learning data system (if applicable);

(b) A unique statewide Early Childhood Educator identifier;

[11] Note: Such home-based programs and services will most likely not participate in the State's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System unless the State has developed a set of Tiered Program Standards specifically for home-based programs and services.

(c) A unique program site identifier;

(d) Child and family demographic information;

(e) Early Childhood Educator demographic information, including data on educational attainment and State credential or licenses held, as well as professional development information;

(f) Program-level data on the program's structure, quality, child suspension and expulsion rates, staff retention, staff compensation, work environment, and all applicable data reported as part of the State's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System; and

(g) Child-level program participation and attendance data.

Essential Domains of School Readiness means the domains of language and literacy development, cognition and general knowledge (including early mathematics and early scientific development), approaches toward learning, physical well-being and motor development (including adaptive skills), and social and emotional development.

Formative Assessment (also known as a classroom-based or ongoing assessment) means assessment questions, tools, and processes--

(a) That are--

(1) Specifically designed to monitor children's progress in meeting the Early Learning and Development Standards;

(2) Valid and reliable for their intended purposes and their target populations;

(3) Linked directly to the curriculum; and

(b) The results of which are used to guide and improve instructional practices.

High-Quality Plan means any plan developed by the State to address a selection criterion or priority in the notice that is feasible and has a high probability of successful implementation and at a minimum includes--

(a) The key goals;

(b) The key activities to be undertaken; the rationale for the activities; and, if applicable, where in the State the activities will be initially implemented, and where and how they will be scaled up over time to eventually achieve statewide implementation;

(c) A realistic timeline, including key milestones, for implementing each key activity;

(d) The party or parties responsible for implementing each activity and other key personnel assigned to each activity;

(e) Appropriate financial resources to support successful implementation of the plan;

(f) The information requested as supporting evidence, if any, together with any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers in judging the credibility of the plan;

(g) The information requested in the performance measures, where applicable;

(h) How the State will address the needs of the different types of Early Learning and Development Programs, if applicable; and

(i) How the State will meet the needs of Children with High Needs, as well as the unique needs of special populations of Children with High Needs.

Kindergarten Entry Assessment means an assessment that--

(a) Is administered to children during the first few months of their admission into kindergarten;

(b) Covers all Essential Domains of School Readiness;

(c) Is used in conformance with the recommendations of the National Research Council[12] reports on early childhood; and

(d) Is valid and reliable for its intended purposes and for the target populations and aligned to the Early Learning and Development Standards. Results of the assessment should be used to inform efforts to close the school readiness gap at kindergarten entry and to inform instruction in the early elementary school grades. This assessment should not be used to prevent children's entry into kindergarten.

Lead Agency means the State-level agency designated by the Governor for the administration of the RTT-ELC grant; this agency is the fiscal agent for the grant. The Lead Agency must be one of the Participating State Agencies.

Low-Income means having an income of up to 200 percent of the Federal poverty rate.

Measures of Environmental Quality means valid and reliable indicators of the overall quality of the early learning environment.

Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions means the measures obtained through valid and reliable processes for observing how teachers and caregivers interact with children, where such processes are designed to promote child learning and to identify strengths and areas for improvement for early learning professionals.

Participating State Agency means a State agency that administers public funds related to early learning and development and is participating in the State Plan. The following State agencies are required Participating State Agencies: the agencies that administer or supervise the administration of CCDF, the section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA programs, State-funded preschool, home visiting, Title I of ESEA, the Head Start State Collaboration Grant, and the Title V Maternal and Child Care Block Grant, as well as the State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care, the State's Child Care Licensing Agency, and the State Education Agency. Other State agencies, such as the agencies that administer or supervise the administration of Child Welfare, Mental Health, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention, the Child and Adult Care Food

[12] National Research Council. (2008). Early Childhood Assessment: Why, What, and How. Committee on Developmental Outcomes and Assessments for Young Children, C.E. Snow and S.B. Van Hemel, Editors. Board on Children, Youth, and Families, Board on Testing and Assessment, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12446

Program, and the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA) may be Participating State Agencies if they elect to participate in the State Plan.

Participating Program means an Early Learning and Development Program that elects to carry out activities described in the State Plan.

Program Standards means the standards that serve as the basis for a Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System and define differentiated levels of quality for Early Learning and Development Programs. Program Standards are expressed, at a minimum, by the extent to which--

(a) Early Learning and Development Standards are implemented through evidence-based activities, interventions, or curricula that are appropriate for each age group of infants, toddlers, and preschoolers;

(b) Comprehensive Assessment Systems are used routinely and appropriately to improve instruction and enhance program quality by providing robust and coherent evidence of--

(1) Children's learning and development outcomes; and

(2) program performance;

(c) A qualified workforce improves young children's health, social, emotional, and educational outcomes;

(d) Strategies are successfully used to engage families in supporting their children's development and learning. These strategies may include, but are not limited to, parent access to the program, ongoing two-way communication with families, parent education in child development, outreach to fathers and other family members, training and support for families as children move to preschool and kindergarten, social networks of support, intergenerational activities, linkages with community supports and adult and family literacy programs, parent involvement in decision making, and parent leadership development;

(e) Health promotion practices include health and safety requirements; developmental, behavioral, and sensory screening, referral, and follow up; and the promotion of physical activity, healthy eating habits, oral health and behavioral health, and health literacy among parents; and

(f) Effective data practices include gathering Essential Data Elements and entering them into the State's Statewide Longitudinal Data System or other early learning data system, using these data to guide instruction and program improvement, and making this information readily available to families.

Screening Measures means age and developmentally appropriate, valid, and reliable instruments that are used to identify children who may need follow-up services to address developmental, learning, or health needs in, at a minimum, the areas of physical health, behavioral health, oral health, child development, vision, and hearing.

State means any of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

State Plan means the plan submitted as part of the State's RTT-ELC application.

Statewide Longitudinal Data System means the State's longitudinal education data system that collects and maintains detailed, high-quality, student- and staff-level data that are linked across entities and that over time provide a complete academic and performance history for each student. The Statewide Longitudinal Data System is typically housed within the State educational agency but includes or can be connected to early childhood, postsecondary, and labor data.

Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System means the system through which the State uses a set of progressively higher Program Standards to evaluate the quality of an Early Learning and Development Program and to support program improvement. A Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System consists of four components: (a) tiered Program Standards with multiple rating categories that clearly and meaningfully differentiate program quality levels; (b) monitoring to evaluate program quality based on the Program Standards; (c) supports to help programs meet progressively higher standards (*e.g.*, through training, technical assistance, financial support); and (d) program quality ratings that are publically available; and includes a process for validating the system.

Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework means a set of expectations that describes what Early Childhood Educators (including those working with children with disabilities and English learners) should know and be able to do. The Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, at a minimum, (a) is evidence-based; (b) incorporates knowledge and application of the State's Early Learning and Development Standards, the Comprehensive Assessment Systems, child development, health, and culturally and linguistically appropriate strategies for working with families; (c) includes knowledge of early mathematics and literacy development and effective instructional practices to support mathematics and literacy development in young children; (d) incorporates effective use of data to guide instruction and program improvement; (e) includes effective behavior management strategies that promote positive social emotional development and reduce challenging behaviors; and (f) incorporates feedback from experts at the State's postsecondary institutions and other early learning and development experts and Early Childhood Educators.

APPENDIX

TABLE A

Scope of RTT-ELC Collaboration

Division/Agency	Type of Activity	GRADS360 Activity Index
MSDE Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services	Establish a coaching and mentoring training program for public and private community-based early learning and development programs serving children with IFSP/IEPs	3.11.
MSDE Division of Instruction	Revised early learning frameworks and standards aligned with the MD Common Core Curriculum K-12, and the appropriate alignment documents (e.g., Healthy Beginnings, Head Start Child Development and Early Learning Framework). Develop Kindergarten Entry Assessment (KEA) and formative assessments (36-72 mos.)	4.1. 6.1.
MSDE Division of Academic Reform and Innovation	Conduct Early Childhood Leadership Academies each year, starting October 2013 Identify the scope of all programs being targeted for quality capacity building (Breakthrough Center, community hubs, Preschool for All, Judy Center Satellites, and coaching and mentoring program.) Establish a statewide Early Childhood Breakthrough Center infrastructure Provide training and orientation on the Early Childhood Breakthrough Center Complete pilot study of the Early Childhood Breakthrough Center	9.5. 3.1. – 3.4.
MSDE Division of School and Student Support Services	Maryland will develop web-based data outcome and monitoring tools for the existing SEFEL initiative.	7.4.
MSDE Division of Library Services	Library Family Councils: Establish Library Family Councils in Library Systems serving Title I school districts Library Family Councils: Establish Family Information Centers in Library Systems serving Title I school districts	8.12.; 8.13
MSDE Division of Certification and Accreditation	Initiate a Maryland Approved Alternative Preparation Program for Early Childhood Education (ECE-MAAPP)	9.2.
MSDE Division of Assessment and Accountability	Develop Kindergarten Entry Assessment (KEA) and formative assessments (36-72	6.1.

	mos.) ELC Project 10 Data Systems links with RTTT Maryland Longitudinal Data System	
Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (DHMH)	Early Childhood Mental Health Phone Consultation for Pediatricians: Develop and implement phone consultation services for primary care providers in concert with the B-HIPP Project Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation Training for Pediatricians: Recruit and train primary care providers and ECMH consultants Reach Out and Read (ROR): Establish leadership, governance, and structure of statewide coalition to promote Reach Out and Read (ROR) ROR: Recruit additional jurisdictions/local coalitions to participate in ROR expansion ROR: Work with local coalitions to recruit additional pediatric practices to participate in ROR	7.1.; 7.2. 8.9-8.11
Maryland Department of Human resources	Conduct Governor's Task Force on Case Management Procedures for Maryland's Child Care Subsidy Program	1.4.

TABLE B

Governance of Local Early Childhood Advisory Councils

Jurisdictions (Total of 24)	Fiscal Agent
	LEA
	Local Management Boards (LMB)
	County Executive's Office

TABLE C

Committees, Councils, Workgroups by RTT-ELC projects (as of December 2012)

RTT-ELC Project	Workgroups
Project 1	Task Force on Improving Early Learning for Low Income and Disadvantaged Children
Project 2	Maryland EXCELS Workgroup DECD Research Advisory Group
Project 3	Judy Hoyer Advisory Council (expansion of Judy Center Partnerships in Baltimore City and Prince George's County) Crossfunctional Steering Committee (Early Childhood Breakthrough Centers)
Project 4	Prek Common Core Standards Workgroups Guide to Early Pedagogy Workgroup
Project 6	State Advisory Council National Technical Advisory Council Ad hoc work groups
Project 7	Development Screening Workgroup SEFEL Partnership Committee
Project 8	Coalition of Family Engagement
Project 10	Early Childhood Data System Committee

TABLE D

2012 Reading— Grade 3
MSA by Special Needs - Advanced + Proficient Percent

Year	All Students		Special Education		FARMS		LEP	
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
2012	85.0	53309 62703	67.9	4605 6781	76.1	21762 28603	77.9	4648 5966
2011	85.1	52751 61984	66.2	4340 6555	76.6	21102 27541	78.7	3918 4976
2010	84.0	49923 59454	65.4	4242 6483	74.5	19066 25592	73.3	3192 4352
2009	84.9	50852 59890	67.6	4406 6516	75.4	18117 24014	73.1	2955 4040
2008	83.0	48327 58235	62.0	4054 6537	72.0	15838 21987	64.0	2082 3252
2007	80.5	47819 59371	60.7	4191 6910	68.2	15024 22035	63.9	1664 2604
2006	78.3	46965 60017	57.2	4007 7005	65.4	14501 22165	55.5	1252 2256
2005	75.9	46621 61460	51.4	3634 7073	61.1	13993 22905	47.2	1065 2255
2004	71.0	44835 63135	42.9	3139 7317	54.4	12602 23145	44.7	1091 2439

KEY
= Number of students that performed in this proficiency level over the total number of students who took MSA.

TABLE E

2012 Mathematics— Grade 3
MSA by Special Needs - Advanced + Proficient Percent

Year	All Students		Special Education		FARMS		LEP	
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
2012	87.8	55027 62699	61.7	4181 6775	79.9	22838 28591	80.8	4854 6007
2011	86.3	53498 62008	61.0	3994 6548	78.0	21495 27561	78.2	3932 5026
2010	86.0	51180 59500	62.3	4036 6478	77.7	19894 25617	77.2	3395 4398
2009	84.3	50539 59920	57.2	3725 6507	75.3	18079 24015	73.1	2990 4089
2008	82.6	48128 58267	58.9	3853 6538	71.5	15721 22001	70.3	2323 3303
2007	78.6	46669 59382	52.5	3626 6903	64.9	14310 22048	62.1	1651 2660
2006	79.1	47532 60086	52.2	3657 7004	65.0	14436 22194	59.0	1367 2316
2005	76.8	47240 61489	49.5	3509 7082	62.2	14246 22916	55.7	1277 2291
2004	72.2	45627 63152	42.1	3081 7322	55.9	12937 23143	49.9	1236 2477

KEY
= Number of students that performed in this proficiency level over the total number of students who took MSA.