

Early Learning Challenge

2016 FINAL PERFORMANCE REPORT



Massachusetts

JUNE 2017





**Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge
Final Performance Report**

CFDA Number: 84.412

Massachusetts
2016

Due: *4/3/2017*

U.S. Department of Education
Washington, DC 20202



Performance Report: Cover Sheet

General Information

- 1. PR/Award #: S412A120017
- 2. Grantee Name (*Block 1 of the Grant Award Notification.*): Office of the Governor, State of Massachusetts
- 3. Grantee Address 51 Sleeper St., 4th floor, Boston, MA 02210
- 4. Project Director Name: Thomas L. Weber Title: Commissioner
Ph #: (617) 988-6612 Ext: (extension) Fax #: (617) 988-2451
Email Address: Tom.Weber@state.ma.us

Reporting Period Information

- 5. Reporting Period: From: 01/01/2012 to: 12/31/2016

Indirect Cost Information

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

Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s):
From: 7/1/2013 to: 6/30/2016
Approving Federal agency: 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.

Name of Authorized Representative: Thomas L. Weber

Title: Commissioner



Signature

Date: 3/30/2017

Executive Summary

The Executive Summary is the State’s opportunity to tell the story of its Race to the Top—Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) Grant. Reflect on your State’s accomplishments over the grant period and, in a couple of pages, share (1) the vision for RTT-ELC in your State (2) What has changed in the State and in early learning programs as a result of RTT-ELC (3) the lessons learned in implementing a comprehensive reform agenda. You may also want to share planned next steps for this work. The Executive Summary should be no more than ten pages in length.

Introduction

Funding from the Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) grant has allowed Massachusetts an unprecedented opportunity to accelerate early childhood education so that the states’ children have access to high quality early education that will put them on an early path to school success and productive citizenship. The Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care (EEC), the lead agency for the RTT-ELC grant, set an ambitious agenda to improve early learning through the following goals:

- improving the quality of early learning programs through increased participation in the state’s Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS)
- establishing a seamless system of developmentally appropriate learning and development standards for children from birth to third grade
- implementing comprehensive assessment practices through developmental screenings and formative assessment to measure children’s growth
- engaging families and local communities to support children’s school readiness, in particular early literacy, STEM education and social-emotional learning
- supporting early educators to increase their knowledge, skills and competencies in order to provide high quality learning experiences for children
- building infrastructure to systematically support early learning through enhanced IT capabilities and cross-sector collaborations

What follows is a summary of the accomplishments and successes achieved by Massachusetts from 2012 to 2016 as part of the RTT-ELC grant period, including the one year no-cost extension period.

Overall Accomplishments

As part of the RTT-ELC grant, Massachusetts piloted and/or scaled multiple initiatives to support early learning. These efforts are organized in seven categories: Program Quality, Early Learning and Development Standards, Comprehensive Assessment, Family and

Community Engagement, Birth to Third Grade Alignment, Workforce Development, and System Infrastructure.

Program Quality

The Massachusetts Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS), which was launched in 2011, saw a significant increase by 2013 in the numbers of early learning programs participating in QRIS during the course of the RTT-ELC grant period. In 2013, there was 46% participation in QRIS by eligible licensed programs and in 2016, the participation increased to 53%. The strategies implemented by EEC resulted in an upward trend of programs reaching the upper tiers of the QRIS (Level 3 and Level 4).

One of the primary reasons the state saw a steady increase in QRIS participation was the support they received by the EEC Program Quality Specialists (PQS). EEC used the RTT-ELC funds to hire six Program Quality Specialists to provide real time direct and online technical assistance to early educators (such as one to one consultations and webinars) on implementing the QRIS standards. The PQS team also developed comprehensive protocol to verify quality and created tools such as the Continuous Quality Improvement Plan (CQIP), to help early educators think strategically about program improvements that lead to positive child outcomes. The PQS built collaborative relationships with early learning programs throughout the state that fostered greater communication and understanding of the value of QRIS.

Another factor that contributed to the increase in early learning programs participating in QRIS was that EEC provided direct grants to early educators through the QRIS Program Improvement Grants for durable goods and planning time. These QRIS Program Improvement grants enabled these programs to make essential changes to enhance the quality of their programs. During the four years of the RTT-ELC grant, the state provided \$7,799,922 in funding to 717 early learning programs. These grants provided necessary support for programs to advance in QRIS and offer higher levels of quality for all of the children they served.

Massachusetts conducted a validation study of its QRIS from 2012-2016. The QRIS Validation Study measured key components of quality, assessed differences in quality across levels, and related levels of quality to children's developmental outcomes. The results of the QRIS Validation Study demonstrated that the state's QRIS does indeed have distinguished levels of quality among the different levels and that the children in the upper tiers of QRIS - levels 3 and 4 showed better outcomes in the study.

Early Learning and Development Standards

From 2012 to 2013, EEC conducted the Massachusetts Alignment Study, a comprehensive analysis of the existing early learning standards. The study identified a gap in preschool and kindergarten social and emotional standards state and standards to support dual language learners. EEC invested RTT-ELC funds to develop the Early English Development Standards (E-ELDS) for children ages 2.5-5.5 years and the Social and Emotional Learning and Approaches to Play and Learning Standards (SEL/APL) for preschool and kindergarten children. The standards were approved by the Board of Early Education and Care in 2016 and translated in multiple languages. EEC provided regional professional development trainings to assist educators and administrators to implement these standards in daily classroom practice and within families.

The E-ELDS, developed as part of state's strategy to support dual language learners in their early learning settings, help guide educators with curriculum development to ensure that the linguistic needs of dual language learners are being met and can progress in English language acquisition. The E-ELDS are aligned with the K-12 English Language Standards by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE). The SEL/APL Standards for PreK and K were created to support preschool and kindergarten children to develop and maintain trusting, healthy, and positive interactions and relationships with both adults and peers; develop a positive sense of self and self-efficacy; express a healthy range of emotions in socially and culturally appropriate ways.

Comprehensive Assessment

Massachusetts saw success in implementing comprehensive assessment strategies to understand children's growth and development. One strategy was the dissemination of developmental screening tools, the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) and Ages and Stages Questionnaire for Social Emotional (ASQ-SE), through the state's Coordinated Family and Community Engagement (CFCE) grantees. These CFCE grantees were able to offer developmental screenings to families of young children who were not in formal early learning settings. Over the course of the RTT-ELC grant, over 2,100 children were screened with the ASQ.

In building a comprehensive assessment system, the state implemented a second strategy of engaging the public school districts in the Massachusetts Kindergarten Entry Assessment (MKEA) initiative. MKEA brought formative assessment practices and tools to kindergarten teachers and administrators, including principals. Approximately 165 public school districts participated in MKEA and over 47,000 children were assessed.

The third strategy was to require the use of formative assessment tools in early learning programs at the two highest levels of the Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS). All programs at QRIS levels 3 and 4 were trained on using formative assessment practices, including how to use the data to inform classroom practices so that children can have high quality learning experiences.

Birth to Third Grade Alignment

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

From 2012 to 2015, EEC awarded the Birth to Grade Three (B-3) Community Implementation/Planning grants to twelve communities: Lowell, Boston, Springfield, Somerville, Pittsfield, Cape Cod, Holyoke, Lawrence, New Bedford, North Adams, Northern Berkshires, and Worcester. Communities used the grant to strengthen the existing B-3 infrastructure such as family engagement, improving alignment and transitions among community based early learning programs and public schools, improving 3rd grade literacy scores, professional development for educators and administrators, and school readiness. At the core of the B-3 communities' work was developing strong partnerships and collaboration among partners serving young children and their families to improve outcomes for young children. In 2015, the success of this B-3 alignment work helped position the Department of Early Education and Care to receive the Federal Preschool Expansion Grant (PEG) to award funding for five of these B-3 communities. Massachusetts has received \$45 million in Preschool Expansion Grant funding over three years and is eligible to receive a fourth year of funding in the amount of \$15 million, subject to appropriation. Each year of grant funding provides a year of free high-quality preschool for 850 four-year-old children across the five communities.

Family and Community Engagement

Recognizing that parents are a child's first teacher, Massachusetts allocated RTT-ELC grant funding to implement comprehensive approaches to bolster the capacity of adults and communities to support early learning of young children. From 2012 to 2015, EEC developed partnerships and resources for families and local communities to promote school readiness and family financial stability, so that children and families have safe and healthy environments to learn and grow.

EEC collaborated with United Way of Massachusetts Bay and Merrimack Valley to develop the *Brain Building in ProgressSM* campaign. *Brain Building in ProgressSM* is a multi-faceted campaign that is comprised of targeted messages that align with the components of quality early learning experiences and programs, engagement of key stakeholders and communities and resources for families. RTT-ELC funds were used to expand the reach of *Brain Building in ProgressSM* through efforts including: ad campaigns with state and local agencies, the development and dissemination of training on the science behind "brain building", and a complete redesign of the *Brain Building in ProgressSM* website, which includes a searchable calendar of "brain building events" offered in the state, a "brain building zone finder", tips on how to be a "brain builder", and featured campaign partners including the Massachusetts Bay Transit Authority, Registry of Motor Vehicles, and Vroom.

In collaboration with Boston Children's Museum (BCM), EEC engaged over 119 libraries and 52 museums across the state to provide developmentally appropriate activities for children and their families in the areas of early literacy and school readiness (including preparation for kindergarten and increasing interest and awareness of STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Math). The museums and libraries also collaborated with EEC in the public awareness campaign *Brain Building in ProgressSM*, to promote the importance of early education and care.

Through EEC's network of 99 family and community engagement programs, the Coordinated Family and Community Engagement (CFCE) grantees, community based organizations were able to provide evidence based literacy programs to over 90 local cities and towns across the Commonwealth. These organizations offered a variety of early literacy activities to build the capacity of adults to support children's reading and language development skills. Each year of the RTT-ELC funding, approximately 7,000 children and 5,000 parents participated in these early literacy activities led by the CFCE grantees.

The WGBH Education Foundation partnered with EEC to develop *Resources for Early Learning*, a comprehensive, early childhood digital library featuring more than 2,500 free media-based tools for teaching and learning. With a strong focus on English Language Arts (ELA) and Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM), *Resources for Early Learning* features a comprehensive, digital preschool curriculum, video-centered professional development modules, and resources for parents. *Resources for Early Learning* was designed to build the capacity of preschool classroom teachers and family child care providers to promote the growth of young children, and to support and engage parents in their role as their child's first teacher.

In addition to building the capacity of families to support school readiness, EEC invested RTT-ELC grant funds to assist families to increase their financial literacy skills. The rationale for this strategy was by increasing financial literacy skills, families will be better

positioned to provide greater economic security for their children. EEC partnered with the Massachusetts Community Action Programs (MASSCAP) to develop a Financial Literacy Education online course (with a training module) to support families in gaining long-term economic independence and self-sufficiency skills. Over 394 community agencies participated in the financial education initiative and those community agencies have provided financial literacy education to over 1,200 families. Communities of practice were also established as a sustainability strategy to continue supporting the work.

Workforce Development

Massachusetts invested the RTT-ELC grant funds to implement several activities to improve the knowledge, skills and competencies of early educators. Some activities focused on the leadership development of early educators, while others centered on improving individual skills of educators. Grant funds were also invested into research studies to help the state better understand the workforce development needs of the early educators.

In 2012, the Post-Master's Certificate Program (PMC) in Early Education, Research, Policy, and Leadership was developed through the University of Massachusetts-Boston (UMB). The PMC is an innovative 12-credit post master's certificate program that advances research, policy, leadership, and data-driven practice in early education and care. The purpose of the PMC is to improve the knowledge, skills, and abilities of early childhood educators from public and private programs that have already achieved their Master's degrees and are still working in early learning programs. From 2012 to 2015, three cohorts (of 15 students each) were supported with full scholarships to participate in the PMC program. Given the success of the PMC and the demand for such a program in Massachusetts, UMB created the first a doctoral program in early childhood education in Massachusetts. The Early Childhood Education and Care PhD program began in September 2016.

From 2012 to 2015, EEC conducted the Early Educators Fellowship Initiative (EEFI), a community-based leadership series for early education and care providers, including principals and directors, in public and private programs serving children from birth to grade three. The purpose of EEFI was to organize, equip and empower Massachusetts educators to build high-quality learning environments for young children, in partnership with families and communities. EEFI focused on systems building among early educators, principals, directors and local communities.

EEC developed the Peer Assistance and Coaching (PAC) model and a business planning course to improve skills of individual educators. PAC was designed to assist early childhood teachers and directors in improving their practice through effective peer support

and coaching in order to strengthen adult-child interactions (especially among high-needs children). PAC utilized training and coaching methods (such as video technology) to improve those educator competencies. Teachers had the opportunity to observe their peers implement best practices, as well as try out effective instructional practices in their own classrooms and receive real time feedback about their efforts from coaches through an online video platform.

RTT-ELC funds were also used to develop an online business planning course to help early educators (specifically family child care providers) to implement sound business practices and thus retain high quality staff. This course was designed to assist center based programs and family child care providers to perform effectively on the Program Administration Scale (PAS) and the Business Administration Scale (BAS) and thus meet higher level criteria on QRIS.

In addition to PAC and the business planning course, EEC conducted monthly webinars on various QRIS topics such as family engagement, health and safety, child assessment, and planning for continuous quality improvement. All of these webinars were recorded so that early educators can access them in the future.

Two research studies were conducted during the RTT-ELC grant period to better understand the needs of the early education workforce in Massachusetts—1) the Validation of Educator Competencies and 2) Opening Pathways: Strengthening Opportunities for Massachusetts Early Educators Who Are English Language Learners. The Validation of Educator Competencies focused on examining the relationships among educator supports, instructional practices, and child outcomes in early childhood settings. The Opening Pathways report provided research and recommendations on supporting the needs of English Language Learner early educators as they navigate the higher education system to be successful college students and obtain advanced degrees.

System Infrastructure

EEC partnered with other health and human service state agencies to strengthen the capacity of providers to support young children's growth and development. RTT-ELC grant funds were distributed to five agencies, the Department of Children and Families (DCF), Department of Mental Health (DMH), Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD), Department of Mental Health (DPH), and the Office of Refugees and Immigrants (ORI), to improve policies on child development within their respective agencies and provide trainings to staff. Below are highlights of the progress made between EEC's collaborations with these five state agencies.

The interagency partnership with the Department of Children and Families (DCF) and EEC was established to promote early childhood and child development within the child welfare system. DCF incorporated research and best practices in early childhood development and education into all aspects of their work including: revising existing policies and creating new policies and procedures for DCF social workers and other staff; enhancing training for new and current DCF staff; providing greater access to quality early education and care programs for DCF-involved families and foster parents; increasing awareness among all stakeholders (internal and external) about the importance of early childhood experiences and relationships, especially for children at risk of abuse and neglect; and providing concrete support and information for their parents/families to help them support their children's healthy, positive development.

The interagency partnership with the Department of Mental Health (DMH) and EEC was established to address the mental health needs of young children and their families and strengthen the comprehensive statewide system of mental health supports for children and families throughout the Commonwealth. DMH provided training on the evidenced based Positive Parenting Program to pediatricians and clinicians across the state. DMH also conducted trainings and consultations on early childhood mental health using the CSEFEL (Center on the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning) framework to support early educators to address behavioral challenges in the classroom. Additionally, DMH created and distributed the *Early Childhood Mental Guide for Early Childhood Educators*, a 60-page resource handbook in English and Spanish, to over 5,000 programs and educators statewide.

The interagency partnership with the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) and EEC was established to focus on aligning and improving access to early education and care services for children experiencing homelessness. Projects included developing and implementing a system for screening all children, connecting families experiencing homelessness with local services, identifying service gaps for re-housed families and those experiencing homelessness and their children and providing professional development to staff working with these families on early childhood development. Specifically, EEC, DHCD and DPH collaborated to provide three rounds of regional training and coaching to staff working in homeless shelters on using the Pyramid Model. As a result of this training, the staff reported increased confidence and skill in supporting parents to build their children's social emotional competence.

The interagency partnership with the Department of Public Health (DPH) and EEC was established to build and strengthen the system of health and mental health supports for young children and their families across early education and care and other child and family serving systems. To achieve this goal, DPH activities were distributed across four

strategy areas: 1) health infrastructure and supports; 2) mental health infrastructure and supports; 3) program quality improvement and; 4) cross-systems training. Within these four areas, DPH provided training, technical assistance, and policy guidance to provide nurturing environments and relationships that promote the healthy development of young children, prevent risk factors from impacting children's well-being, and address children's challenging behaviors.

The interagency partnership with Office of Refugees and Immigrants (ORI) and EEC was established to support early learning and school readiness for immigrant and refugee children and their families. The collaboration focused on outreach and engagement of immigrant and refugee communities to increase the awareness of early education benefits and services, and technical assistance regarding effective policies and programming for dual language learners. ORI conducted regional trainings for early childhood educators and administrators on immigration policy as it impacts children and families; cultural competency; child development; and educational principles in the context of multilingual homes and multicultural environments. ORI collaborated with two ethnic based community organizations to raise awareness of the brain building benefits of early education and early literacy. The outreach work focused on increasing family engagement and child participation in early education programs.

In addition to strengthening the collaborations among state agencies, RTT-ELC grant funds were also used to build EEC's information technology infrastructure in order to streamline the way EEC supports early education programs and collect data to inform policy making. The Early Childhood Information System (ECIS) was built as a single, high-quality source of data for reporting (data warehouse) to reduce the time required to generate reports and to support other state agencies, such as the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's (ESE) state Longitudinal Data System (LDS). The creation of ECIS has also allowed the state to gather data on programs, child demographics and attendance in order to make more informed policy decisions.

RTT-ELC grant funds, along with other state funds, were used to develop the Licensing Education Analytic Database (LEAD) as a new licensing data system that will allow EEC to simplify the way it conducts licensing and monitoring of early education programs. Some of LEAD's features include the use of a mobile tablet visit for EEC licensors that will allow for all licensing visit results to be immediately captured and communicated to providers and a provider portal to allow providers to interact with EEC electronically (i.e. conduct licensing transactions online). The creation and continued development of LEAD will allow EEC to move from a paper based licensing tracking system to an online electronic system that enables greater efficiency and customer service.

Lessons Learned

The main lesson learned was that successful implementation of a comprehensive reform agenda is highly dependent on infrastructure, planning and staff capacity. The number of initiatives intended under Massachusetts' plan required a significant staffing effort for timely implementation. EEC should have built a stronger infrastructure of RTT-ELC dedicated staff during the start-up of the RTT-ELC grant. Posting job descriptions and hiring RTT-ELC staff took longer than expected in the second year of the RTT-ELC grant.

. Given the 12 major projects that were proposed, along with all of the additional related activities and initiatives, EEC and RTT-ELC staff needed to provide additional oversight and management to all of the initiatives.

EEC was able to share their lessons learned with RTT-ELC grantees in Phases 2 & 3 at national meetings.

Conclusion

From 2012 to 2016, the Massachusetts' early education landscape was strengthened significantly with the investment of the RTT-ELC grant. The grant enabled the state to invest in EEC's capacity to support the early education and care field through additional staff, new and existing initiatives, collaborations with key stakeholders, and enhanced infrastructure.

One of the major shifts that occurred was the increased understanding of high quality early education as articulated through the Massachusetts QRIS. Through the RTT-ELC grant, the state was able to build and strengthen the QRIS, as well as help early educators, legislators and the general public understand the value of high quality early education. With the support of the Program Quality Specialists unit, more community based and public school early education programs are participating in the QRIS, which will help to support children's early learning and success.

Another significant outcome that resulted from the RTT-ELC grant was the state's ability to align Birth through Grade Three (B-3) policies. EEC established key working relationships with other state agencies, including the Departments of Elementary and Secondary Education, Higher Education, Public Health and Mental Health and external stakeholders including Strategies for Children and the United Way that have led to comprehensive and coordinated policy decisions for young children and their families. The B-3 policy framework has had a positive impact on local communities across Massachusetts as demonstrated by the B-3 alignment activities conducted in these communities. More

communities have implemented strategies to coordinate B-3 activities and resources to ensure there is a smooth transition from early education programs to elementary schools. In 2015, the success of this B-3 alignment work positioned Massachusetts to receive the Federal Preschool Expansion Grant (PEG) for five communities.

Building on the successes achieved through the RTT-ELC grant, Massachusetts is positioned to continue to strengthen the early education and care system. In 2017 and beyond, EEC has a strategic focus on workforce development; specifically improving the compensation, knowledge, skills and competencies of early educators along a career trajectory. EEC will also be making revisions to the QRIS based on the findings of the QRIS Validation Study with the intention to simplify the process for programs to participate in QRIS and support their efforts to enhance and provide high quality early education across the state.

Core Areas

A. Successful State Systems

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

Overall Accomplishments

Reflect and relate your accomplishments during the four-year grant and No-Cost Extension period in aligning and coordinating early learning and development across the State.

Please report on your progress against all applicable goals, targets, and projects in the State's application. Provide an overall assessment of your grant implementation (you may want to explain the major accomplishments in the projects you outlined in your RTT-ELC Project Plan, identify strategies used, and how identified challenges and lessons learned will inform future work). Discuss how RTT-ELC funds contributed to project goals and outcomes. Include evidence and data to support your discussion (e.g., tools created, student outcomes, survey results, changes in instructional practice).

The Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care (EEC), the lead agency for the grant, set an ambitious agenda to improve early learning through the following goals:

- improving the quality of early learning programs through increased participation in the state's Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS)
- establishing a seamless system of developmentally appropriate learning and development standards for children from birth to third grade

- implementing comprehensive assessment practices through developmental screenings and formative assessment to measure children’s growth
- engaging families and local communities to support children’s school readiness, in particular early literacy, STEM education and social-emotional learning
- supporting early educators to increase their knowledge, skills and competencies in order to provide high quality learning experiences for children
- building infrastructure to systematically support early learning through enhanced IT capabilities and cross-sector collaborations

Overall Massachusetts was successful in achieving these goals as demonstrated by the following accomplishments:

- The Massachusetts Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS), which was launched in 2011, saw a significant increase in the numbers of early learning programs participating in QRIS during the course of the RTT-ELC grant period. In 2013, there was 46% participation in QRIS by eligible licensed programs and in 2016, the early learning programs participation increased to 53%. In 2013, there were only four programs in the upper tiers of QRIS levels 3 and 4, and by 2016, there were 265 in the upper tiers of QRIS levels 3 and 4.
- The development of the Early English Development Standards (E-ELDS) 2.5-5.5 years and Social and Emotional Learning and Approaches to Play and Learning Standards (SEL/APL) for Preschool and Kindergarten. These standards were approved by the Board of Early Education and Care and translated in multiple languages. Regional professional development was provided to assist educators and administrators to implement these standards in daily classroom practice and within families.
- Over 2,100 children were screened with the developmental screening tool - Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) through local community providers and over 47,000 kindergarten children were assessed through the Massachusetts Kindergarten Entry Assessment (MKEA) initiative.
- EEC developed partnerships and resources for families and local communities to promote school readiness and family financial stability so that children have safe and healthy environments to learn and grow. Highlights included a multi-faceted early education public awareness campaign, a comprehensive network of over 119 museums and libraries providing early literacy and STEM education activities, and an early childhood digital library featuring more than 2,500 free media-based tools for teaching and learning.

- Investment in birth through grade three (B-3) policies to assist twelve communities improve child outcomes through alignment of systems serving infants, young children, and their families. The success of this B-3 alignment work helped to position Massachusetts to receive \$15M from the Federal Preschool Expansion Grant (PEG) for five of these B-3 communities.
- The development of two innovative models to improve the knowledge, skills and competencies of early educators. The Post-Master’s Certificate Program (PMC) in Early Education, Research, Policy, and Leadership, developed through the University of Massachusetts-Boston (UMB), is an innovative 12-credit post master’s certificate program that advances research, policy, leadership, and data-driven practice in early education and care. The Peer Assistance and Coaching (PAC) model was created to assist early childhood teachers and directors in improving their practice through effective peer support and coaching in order to strengthen adult-child interactions. Teachers had the opportunity to observe their peers implement best practices as well as try out effective instructional practices in their own classrooms and receive real time feedback about their efforts from coaches through an online video platform.
- Partnerships with five health and human service state agencies—the Department of Children and Families (DCF), Department of Mental Health (DMH), Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD), Department of Mental Health (DPH), and the Office of Refugees and Immigrants (ORI)—to strengthen the capacity of providers to support young children’s growth and development through improved policies on child development within their respective agencies and professional development trainings to staff.
- The further development of the Early Childhood Information System (ECIS) a single, high-quality source of data for reporting (data warehouse) to provide data on child indicators and the launch of the Licensing Education Analytic Database (LEAD), a new licensing data system that will simplify the way the state licensors monitor early education programs.

Governance Structure

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

The Department of Early Education and Care (EEC) was the lead agency for the RTT-ELC grant. EEC is part of the Executive Office of Education, one of eight Executive Offices

under the Governor. The Commissioner of Early Education and Care, Thomas L. Weber, has managed the Department of Early Education and Care since 2013. An eleven member Board of Early Education and Care sets policies and regulations related to early education and care programs and services in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

EEC partnered with the following state agencies to implement grant initiatives from 2012-2015:

- Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
- Department of Higher Education
- Department of Children and Families
- Department of Mental Health
- Department of Housing and Community Development
- Department of Public Health
- Office of Refugees and Immigrants

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 four-year grant and No-Cost Extension period.

Massachusetts involved many stakeholders in the implementation of its RTT-ELC grant initiatives. Stakeholder groups include leadership governing bodies, advisory committees, and working groups from the early education field. The following is a list of committees and advisory councils that supported and/or guided EEC's work during the four year grant period and the No-Cost Extension period:

Board Early Education and Care: as described above, the Board is the governing body of the Department of Early Education and Care (EEC) and consists of members that are a cross disciplinary group that represents education, health and human services, higher education, early childhood programs, and families and community members. The Board provided guidance on the development, implementation and sustainability planning of various RTT-ELC initiatives.

EEC Advisory Council: The Advisory Council is comprised of a wider representation of stakeholders involved in the systems of early education and care, as well as family support and human services. The Advisory Council provides guidance to the agency's work and initiatives and provides a comprehensive stakeholder audience to gather feedback to vet the work of the agency. The Advisory Council offered guidance on how EEC could implement and sustain various RTT-ELC initiatives within the existing state infrastructure.

Project Specific Advisory Committees: In addition to the governance of the Board and guidance from the Advisory Committee, EEC convened several groups to provide stakeholder input on specific projects and initiatives, including:

- Post-Masters Certificate Program Advisory Committee
- Peer Assistance and Coaching Advisory Panel
- Brain Building in Progress Advisory Committee
- QRIS Working Group
- QRIS Professional Development Review Team
- QRIS Public School Task Force
- QRIS Validation Study Advisory Board
- Birth through Grade Three Advisory Group

Other key partners that played an active role in RTT-ELC grant initiatives include:

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

Proposed Legislation, Policies, or Executive Orders

Describe any changes or proposed changes to state legislation, budgets, policies, executive orders and the like that had an impact on or was the result of the RTT-ELC grant. Describe the expected impact.

Legislation

There were no changes to state legislation that impacted or were the result of the RTT-ELC grant.

Policies

No EEC policies impacted the Massachusetts' Early Learning Plan in 2016.

Executive Orders

None of the Executive Orders enacted in 2016 impacted Massachusetts' Early Learning Plan.

Participating State Agencies

Describe any changes in participation and commitment by any of the Participating State Agencies in the State Plan during the four-year grant and No-Cost Extension period.

Over the life of the grant, EEC collaborated with other state agencies to strengthen the knowledge and capacity of providers who work with young children and their families. The interagency partnerships include the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD), the Department of Public Health (DPH), the Department of Mental Health (DMH), the Department of Children and Families (DCF), and the Office of Immigrants and Refugees (ORI). The state has also strengthened relationships with other state education agencies—the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) and the Department of Higher Education (DHE). These state agencies partners remained committed in collaborating with EEC to implement the Massachusetts Early Learning Plan and will continue to work collaboratively with EEC in the future.

B. High-Quality, Accountable Programs

Overall Accomplishments

Reflect and relate your accomplishments during the four-year grant and No-Cost Extension period in the area of improving quality in early learning programs in your State, including development and use of a Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS).

Please report on your progress against all applicable goals, targets, and projects in the State's application. Provide an overall assessment of your grant implementation (you may want to explain the major accomplishments in the projects you outlined in your RTT-ELC Project Plan, identify strategies used, and how identified challenges and lessons learned will inform future work). Discuss how RTT-ELC funds contributed to project goals and outcomes. Include evidence and data to support your discussion (e.g., tools created, student outcomes, survey results, changes in instructional practice).

Background

The Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge Grant has been the primary foundation for building and strengthening the Massachusetts QRIS; allowing the state to develop metrics for, evaluating, and supporting programs to be of high quality. In the last five years, the QRIS has evolved to better respond to the needs of participating programs, adapted its technical assistance model to meet those needs, and validated the performance of that model.

With funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) and the Child Care Development Fund (CCDF), Massachusetts implemented the state's tiered QRIS in 2011. In 2012, EEC focused on further educating and training providers about QRIS, clarifying QRIS related policies, linking financial resources to QRIS participation and creating the means to validate the state's QRIS.

In 2012 with RTT-ELC funds, Massachusetts engaged in a study to examine the 2010 provisional QRIS standards with evidence-based research and to determine if these standards were aligned with best practices as perceived by those in the field. The research findings included strong evidence of correlation based on experimental studies.

In 2013, Massachusetts commissioned a survey of early education and care programs and providers. The purpose of the survey was to gather input and feedback about how the QRIS was working for participating centers, schools, and family child care providers, as well as the ways in which the system and support for the system could be improved. The confidential survey was administered to a random selection of early education and care programs from December 2013 to January 2014, by the UMass Donahue Institute (UMDI), an independent applied research and program evaluation organization.

Recommendations from this study included:

- Develop a robust infrastructure to help programs and providers improve and advance;
- Simplify and align QRIS with other quality measures and requirements;
- Remove or reduce common barriers to maximize success; and
- Enhance communication and messaging to build on initial success of QRIS.

Technical Assistance Model

In response to these recommendations, Massachusetts adapted its technical assistance model to meet the needs of programs and providers participating in, or considering

participating in, the QRIS. By 2014, Massachusetts was fully staffed with six Program Quality Specialists. By this time, the state had established its technical assistance model through the QRIS continuum: programs at levels 1 and 2 were supported largely through group and on-line trainings, along with support from coaches and mentors that were staffed from EEC's five statewide Educator and Provider Support (EPS) grantees. Programs at QRIS level 3 would receive a Technical Assistance Site Visit. This visit would serve as both onsite verification of program quality using the Environment Rating Scales (ERS), and an opportunity for face-to-face technical assistance between a provider and a Program Quality Specialist. Programs applying for QRIS level 4 would require a visit from an ERS reliable rater, and must meet minimum subscale and overall ERS benchmarks during that reliable rater visit.

Continuous Quality Improvement Plan (CQIP)

A key component of the QRIS is identifying the technical assistance needed to improve program quality. To this end, Massachusetts piloted a Continuous Quality Improvement Plan (CQIP) tool during in 2014. The CQIP has allowed programs to reflect on progress they made in improving program quality and record those outcomes. In 2015, Massachusetts adapted the CQIP for a system-wide launch. The CQIP is now required for all programs applying for QRIS at Levels 2, 3, and 4, and is translated into multiple languages. An evaluation of the CQIP showed that this model resulted in deepened program and educator engagement with QRIS standards and enhanced capacity to create and maintain high-quality environments.

Alignment Studies

To address common barriers, Massachusetts commissioned alignment studies to reduce redundancies in the criteria programs must meet between the QRIS criteria and those of: Head Start, National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), National Association for Family Child Care (NAFCC), and the Council on Accreditation (COA). Criteria that these national programs were requiring were aligned as closely as possible with the existing QRIS criteria to assist programs in meeting the QRIS standards.

Participation and Number of Programs in Upper Tiers

These efforts have resulted in an upward trend in program participation. In 2013, there was 46% participation in QRIS by all eligible licensed programs and in 2016, QRIS participation increased to 53%.

These efforts have also resulted in an upward trend in programs reaching the upper tiers of the QRIS (level 3 and level 4). In 2013, there were only four programs in the upper tiers of QRIS and in 2016, there were 265 programs in the higher tiers of QRIS.

QRIS Validation and Next Steps

In 2016, researchers from Wellesley College and UMass Donahue Institute finalized the MA QRIS Validation study. The MA QRIS Validation study addressed a range of approaches and research questions, with a particular emphasis on assessing the outputs of the rating process and examining how ratings are associated with children's development. These are required components of validation studies conducted in states participating in the RTTT-ELC. Specifically, the MA QRIS Validation study assessed whether components of quality and the quality levels can be relied on to accurately differentiate program quality, and the extent to which QRIS quality levels are associated with expected differences in children's development and growth.

The researchers made recommendations for the future revisions of the MA QRIS. Thus far, their recommendations include: revising the criteria and verification requirements as described above; allowing NAEYC-accredited and Head Start programs to enter the QRIS as granted Level 2 programs; reducing lead teacher education qualifications; establishing a re-verification of programs at Levels 3 and 4 every 3 years; strengthening the self-assessment process at Level 2; clarifying formal professional development policy; and considering the use of a hybrid QRIS system with blocks at the lower 3 levels and points at the higher 2 levels, creating a 5-level system.

In November 2016, the researchers and Program Quality staff held public comment stakeholder meetings to discuss validation study results, present researcher recommendations, and solicit field input into the next revision of the QRIS. Massachusetts plans to use feedback from these meetings in conjunction with researchers' recommendations to frame the MA QRIS in 2017 and future years.

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

Please check all that apply – The State's TQRIS is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards that address or are aligned with:

- Early learning and development standards
- A comprehensive assessment system
- Early childhood educator qualifications
- Family engagement strategies
- Health promotion practices
- Effective data practices

Describe progress made during the reporting year and across all five years of grant implementation in **developing or revising** a TQRIS that is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards.

In 2012, Massachusetts engaged in a study to determine whether the 2010 provisional QRIS standards were still current and aligned with best practices in the field. The research included strong evidence of correlation based on experimental studies.

In 2013, Massachusetts learned through its pilot QRIS Validation Study that many of the QRIS standards were difficult to measure. In response to this finding, EEC worked with its content knowledge partners on QRIS evaluation, revisions, and policy development for all QRIS program types. These groups reviewed the initial QRIS standards revisions recommended by EEC and made additional recommendations based on the prospective impact to the field.

In 2014, EEC launched a standards revision process based on data from the QRIS Pilot Validation Study, data from ERS Reliable Raters, feedback from the field and other stakeholders, and national best practice research. Standards and guidance revisions for all program types (i.e. center-based, family child care, out-of-school time and public schools) were approved by the EEC Board and implemented in 2015. Revisions included:

- The integration of the Early English Language Development Standards into the QRIS criteria for curriculum and learning;
- Moving the QRIS Health Consultant site visit from QRIS Level 2 to Level 3 because programs were not ready for a Health Consultant visit at this level and programs at Level 3 were more deeply engaged with QRIS; and
- Requiring that programs participating in QRIS offer benefits to part-time staff, as well as clarify the requirements for written business plans.

Massachusetts piloted a Continuous Quality Improvement Plan (CQIP) tool in 2014 with recipients of the QRIS Quality Improvement Grant. Programs used data collected through self-assessments and Reliable Rater observations to identify strengths, as well as areas for potential growth. Programs then developed concrete action steps and identified key individuals and resources to support implementation of the action steps. The CQIP has allowed programs to reflect on gains they had made in improving program quality and record these outcomes. In 2015, Massachusetts adapted the CQIP for a system-wide launch. The CQIP is now required for all programs applying for QRIS at Levels 2, 3, and 4, and is translated into multiple languages.

In 2015, Massachusetts gathered another set of recommendations to revise QRIS standards from its three QRIS Work groups. The QRIS Working group focused on verification guidance for programs and providers, in particular, clarifying which measurement tools and documentation are required as part of the QRIS applications, in order to help eliminate inefficiencies in communication among Program Quality staff and programs and providers. The QRIS Professional Development Review Team researched the types of qualifications and professional development necessary for high-quality programs and made subsequent recommendations. The QRIS Public School Task Force continued to develop a QRIS program type to meet the unique needs of public school preschool programs. All of the QRIS Working groups provided valuable input to inform future recommendations and revisions for QRIS.

In 2016, researchers from Wellesley College and UMass Donahue Institute finalized the QRIS Validation Study. Their recommendations included: revising the criteria and verification requirements; allowing NAEYC-accredited and Head Start programs to enter the QRIS as granted Level 2 programs; reducing lead teacher education qualifications; establishing a re-verification of programs at Levels 3 and 4 every 3 years; strengthening the self-assessment process at Level 2; clarifying formal professional development policy; and considering the use of a hybrid QRIS system with blocks at the lower 3 levels and points at the higher 2 levels, creating a 5-level system.

In November 2016, the researchers and Program Quality Specialist staff held public comment stakeholder meetings to discuss the QRIS validation study results, present researcher recommendations, and solicit field input into the next iteration of the QRIS. Massachusetts plans to use feedback from these stakeholder meetings, in conjunction with researchers' recommendations, to frame the MA QRIS in 2017.

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

Describe progress made during the reporting year and across all five years of grant implementation in promoting participation in the TQRIS. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress was made in this area by the end of the four-year grant period and the No-Cost Extension period.

In 2012, Massachusetts conducted a qualitative interview study of early education and care program directors throughout the state with representation from directors of programs who were participating in QRIS and those that had not started to engage in QRIS. This study

was conducted to better understand the existing challenges with QRIS and the opportunities for QRIS participation. Some of the study's findings included:

Respondents had generally positive feelings about the QRIS and saw it as a worthwhile tool that may facilitate improvement of the quality of their early education programs and were motivated to move up within the rating system of the QRIS.

Although respondents were motivated to improve quality, many felt daunted by the process of participating in the QRIS and were concerned that they lacked the resources necessary to advance in the QRIS.

A majority of the participants discussed the QRIS staff educational requirements as a significant barrier to moving up. Many felt the system should be able to reward staff experience in addition to educational attainment and most were doubtful that they would be able to require their staff to seek advanced degrees. Similarly, respondents suggested that they would be unable to pay a commensurate salary for staff that did obtain advanced degrees. Lastly, respondents voiced their concerns that early education staff are historically difficult to retain in their early childhood programs after successful completion of an advanced degree.

Respondents reported a significant amounts of time spent attempting to understand the QRIS and complete the various components of the application. Respondents also wished they had more accessible technical support from EEC.

To address these participation-related concerns raised by the study, Massachusetts:

- Developed an online fundamentals course on QRIS in multiple languages (English, Spanish, Haitian Creole, Chinese, Khmer and Portuguese) for providers. This course is designed to provide early education and out of school time educators with an introduction to the Massachusetts QRIS so that they become familiar with it and participate in QRIS.
- Developed a Business Planning Course for early educators. The course helps educators in family and center based settings to implement sound business practices that will result in higher scores on the PAS, BAS and APT and achieve a higher QRIS level.
- Partnered with the Educator and Provider Support (EPS) grantees to support early educators and programs to:
 - Increase competency and earn a degree, certificate, or credential in early childhood education or a related field.
 - Access to the resources and supports (coaching and mentoring) to set and achieve professional and academic goals.

- Receive supports and resources to achieve and maintain accreditation.
- Receive support to achieve upward movement in the QRIS.

In 2013, EEC:

- Instituted monthly QRIS orientation sessions in each of the five regional offices, immediately following licensing renewal meetings.
- Held over five hundred individual QRIS Technical Assistance meetings between the Program Quality Specialist unit and Center Based educators and program staff, Family Child Care providers, Public School and License -Exempt educators and program staff, and After School/Out of School Time educators and program staff across the state.
- Established a QRIS Working Group for Program Administrators and a QRIS Working Group for Educators to provide input on QRIS policy development such as the Environment Rating Scales policy and QRIS Level 1 requirements for public school programs.
- Revised its policy on the Environment Rating Scales (ERS) to encourage greater participation at higher levels of QRIS.

In 2014, Massachusetts implemented monthly technical assistance webinars for family child care system support staff. These webinars included “Understanding the Environment Rating Scales and ERS Scoring Policy,” “Navigating the Professional Qualifications Registry,” and “The Continuous Quality Improvement Process”, and focused on critical topics to support improved program quality.

Massachusetts launched the QRIS Online Community (www.QRIScommunity.org) in collaboration with the United Way of Massachusetts Bay and Merrimack Valley. This resource, geared towards educators, administrators, and providers, included specialized groups, discussion forums, and a section for sharing resources and best practices.

In 2015 and 2016, Massachusetts offered supplemental technical assistance to programs and providers in a variety of ways, including:

Continuing Technical Assistance Webinars: These monthly webinar opportunities focused on topics that are critical to program quality and advancement in the QRIS. In 2015, webinar topics included family engagement, health and safety, child assessment, and planning for continuous quality improvement, and all of the webinars were recorded for future access.

QRIS Newsletter: This quarterly email communication announces upcoming webinars, provides links for resources, and includes contact information for program quality staff.

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

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

Information Technology: In an effort to improve the current QRIS Information Technology (IT) infrastructure and better support programs in QRIS, Massachusetts worked with an information technology contractor in to conduct a needs assessment and develop recommendations for future IT improvements. These recommendations will inform the new IT system when it is fully developed to align with any future revisions to QRIS.

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c)

In the **Final Progress Report Excel Workbook** 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. Grantees will need to populate the table using last year's APR data and include data on "Actuals" for the No-Cost Extension period.

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

TARGETS										
Number and Percent of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool										
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619										
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA										
Programs receiving from CCDF funds										
Licensed Family Child Care Homes and Licensed Center-Based Facilities not receiving CCDF funds										

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.

ACTUALS																		
Number and Percent of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS																		
Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline			Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Year 4			Year 5		
	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%
State-funded preschool																		
Specify																		
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹																		
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C																		
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619																		
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA																		
Programs receiving from CCDF funds																		
Licensed Family Child Care Homes and Licensed Center-Based Facilities not receiving CCDF funds																		

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

(B)(2)(c) Data Notes

2016 Performance Measure (B)(2)(c) Data Notes

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

UPK: The data is from the FY 2016 UPK Program Survey and is cross-referenced with the Commonwealth's QRIS Program Manager (QPM), EEC's online QRIS application management system. The total number of UPK programs participating in QRIS is 184: 98 Center-based programs; 10 public schools; and 9 FCC Systems (representing 76 System-affiliated FCC Providers). The FY 2016 UPK Grant supports a total of 524 classrooms serving a total of 7,973 preschool-age children.

Head Start: FY 2016 Head Start Program information is cross-referenced with the Commonwealth's QRIS Program Manager (QPM), EEC's online QRIS application management system. The data includes Head Start Center Based programs and Family Center Based programs that are required to be in QRIS (it does not include Home-Based programs as they are not required to participate in QRIS). There are 182 Head Start programs participating in QRIS.

IDEA Part C: The state does not report on IDEA part C for this performance measure. The MA QRIS Standards were not designed to address program quality in Early Intervention (EI) programs (under Part C of IDEA) The Commonwealth's Early Intervention service delivery model operated by the Massachusetts Department of Public Health, is designed to support children and families in their natural environments. Children and families do not receive EI services within a designated program site.

IDEA Part B: Data was obtained from the MA Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. For school year 2016-2017, there are 519 public schools in Massachusetts that offer a Grade PK (Prekindergarten). Of these schools, 513 received funding under Part B- 619 of IDEA. As of December 31, 2016, 164 of the public schools that received funding under Part B-619 of IDEA were participating in QRIS.

Title I: Data was obtained from the MA Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. For school year 2016-2017, there are 519 public schools in Massachusetts that offer a Grade PK (Prekindergarten). Of these public schools with Grade PK, 215 received Title I school wide funding. As of December 31, 2016, 49 Title I school wide schools with PK were participating in QRIS.

CCDF: The CCDF data comes from the Early Childhood Information Systems (ECIS) which extracted the financial billing data for CCDF from January to December 2016. There are 4,235 programs receiving CCDF funding between January and December 2016 and of this total 3,710 programs are participating QRIS. The numbers of CCDF programs in QRIS in the state vary from grant year because programs close and new programs open. Programs close voluntarily or because of financial constraints.

License Exempt: According to data provided by the QRIS Program Manager, EEC has identified 376 license-exempt programs (public schools, private schools, community based organizations, and faith-based organizations) that are participating in QRIS. Of this total, 223 have a QRIS Rating. EEC does

not have data on the total number of license-exempt programs throughout the state because these programs are overseen by other local entities.

IPL: Data is from the IPLE Performance Report was verified using the with the Commonwealth's QRIS Program Manager (QPM), EEC's online QRIS application management system. As of December 31, 2016, 121 IPLE-funded program receive funding. Of these, 110 IPLE-funded programs have been granted a QRIS Rating by EEC; while 11 of the IPLE-funded programs are participating in QRIS (demonstrated by the successful submission of a QRIS Application with a status of Final submitted to EEC).

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

Describe the State's 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 during the reporting year and across all five years of grant.

Throughout the MA QRIS, a number of criteria reference specific practices or policies are verified by using programs' overall scores on the following measurement instruments.

Environmental Rating Scales (ERS):

- Infant/Toddler Environmental Rating Scale-Revised (ITERS-R)
- Early Childhood Environmental Rating Scale-Revised (ECERS-R)
- Family Child Care Environmental Rating Scale-Revised (FCCERS-R)
- School-Age Care Environmental Rating Scale-Revised (SACERS)

Business and Program Administration Scales:

- Program Administration Scale (PAS)
- Business Administration Scale (BAS)

Other Scales:

- Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS)
- Arnett Caregiver Interaction Scale (Arnett-CIS)
- Strengthening Families Self-Assessment Tool (SFSAT)

While these instruments play a central role in defining and measuring the Standards, the system also encompasses a range of other specific standards. In 2013, Massachusetts began to enhance supports for program quality along the continuum. Educators and family child care providers in the lower QRIS tiers (Levels 1 and 2) were supported largely through group and on-line trainings, along with support from coaches and mentors that are contracted with our Educator and Provider Support grantees. Shifting some of the support for programs and providers in the lower QRIS tiers to EPS grantees allowed the Program Quality Specialists to provide more individualized technical assistance. The Program Quality Specialists' expertise in the quality standards, professional development requirements and measurement tools, helps to both support programs that are in the "focused development" stage of QRIS level 3, while also preparing them for assessment by Reliable Raters in QRIS level 4.

In 2014, Massachusetts began conducting QRIS level 3 technical assistance site visits to verify quality. During these visits, the Program Quality Specialists conducted Environmental Rating Scale (ERS) observations. If a program met all of the ERS criteria, they were granted a QRIS Level 3 status. That same process of ERS observations continued for QRIS level 4, in addition to the requirement that programs must also be verified by an ERS reliable rater. The benchmarks on all measurement tools (ERS, Business Administration Scale/Program Administration Scale, Classroom Interaction Scoring System, Arnett Caregiver Interaction Scale, Assessment of After School Program Practices Tool - Observation and Questionnaire), policy and procedure documentation, and professional qualification requirements became more rigorous at the higher QRIS levels 3 and 4.

In 2015 and 2016, Massachusetts focused on monitoring program quality by providing tools and resources to support educators in understanding and meeting the criteria of the standards.

- The PQS unit developed guidance to clarify what was required to meet the QRIS standards. The additional guidance for meeting QRIS criteria resulted in increased inter-rater reliability of documents, professional qualifications, and observed program quality across the state.
- Massachusetts added user-friendly, accessible resources, called "QRIS Toolboxes", to its QRIS webpage, in an effort to help programs and providers understand the requirements of the QRIS, and prepare to participate and advance in the QRIS.

Resources in the QRIS Toolbox included:

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

Program Quality Specialists streamlined their process for QRIS caseload management. The number of open applications are calculated monthly, as well as the number of programs granted at each Level. The Program Quality Specialists use this data to identify and address trends in caseload management and to strategically prioritize their technical support. Through the new monthly caseload review process, the Program Quality Specialist unit is able to process 96% of QRIS applications within one month of submission.

The Program Quality Specialist unit continues to work closely with contracted Environment Rating Scales (ERS) Reliable Raters from Wellesley College. ERS Reliable Raters have provided extensive trainings to the Program Quality Specialists in the comprehensive set of ERS tools including Infant/Toddler (ITERS), Early Childhood (ECERS), Family Childcare (FCCERS), and School Age Childcare (SACERS). The trainings included classroom presentations, group and individual on-site practice, and reliability checks for each attendee.

Wellesley College also provided ongoing ERS support, answered ERS-related questions from the Program Quality Unit, hosted ERS webinars for the field, and provided resources and tools for the field to address ERS challenges. Wellesley College provided detailed site visit summary reports that served as a guide for programs to develop their Continuous Quality Improvement plan with their Program Quality Specialists.

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

Please check all that apply – The State has 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:

- Program and provider training
- Program and provider technical assistance

- Financial rewards or incentives
- Higher, tiered child care subsidy reimbursement rates
- Increased compensation

Describe the progress made improving the quality of the Early Learning and Development Programs that are participating in your State TQRIS during the reporting year and across all five years of grant implementation based on the policies and practices above.

Throughout the course of Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge Grant, Massachusetts offered a QRIS Improvement Grant to support early educators to improve quality within their classrooms and advance with the state's QRIS. Educators used these grant funds to purchase durable goods to address the areas of potential growth they identified in their CQIP. Grantees were intentional in ordering durable goods that would help them make necessary improvements and over 80% of these grantees reported that they made changes based on data from their measurement tool assessments. The QRIS Improvement grants have motivated and supported programs to apply for the next level of QRIS with over 85 % of programs reporting that they planned to apply for the next level of QRIS. The QRIS Program Quality Improvement grant also provided funding for program planning, so that educators could review their measurement tools and self-assessment scores and use that data to develop Continuous Quality Improvement Plans (CQIP).

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

In 2015, Massachusetts completed an alignment study between QRIS and Head Start, in order to reduce redundancy and ease the QRIS application process for Head Start programs. The state learned that IT issues present the largest obstacles to Head Start programs participating in QRIS.

In 2016, researchers from Wellesley College and UMass Donahue Institute finalized the QRIS Validation Study. The researchers made recommendations for the next generation of the QRIS. Their recommendations include: revising the criteria and verification requirements as described above; allowing NAEYC-accredited and Head Start programs to

enter the QRIS as granted Level 2 programs; reducing lead teacher education qualifications; establishing a re-verification of programs at Levels 3 and 4 every 3 years; strengthening the self-assessment process at Level 2; clarifying formal professional development policy; and considering the use of a hybrid QRIS system with blocks at the lower 3 levels and points at the higher 2 levels, creating a 5-level system.

In November 2016, the researchers and Program Quality Specialist staff held public comment stakeholder meetings to discuss validation study results, presented researcher recommendations, and solicited field input into the next iteration of the QRIS. Massachusetts plans to use feedback from these meetings in conjunction with researchers' recommendations to frame the MA QRIS in 2017.

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

In the **Final Progress Report Excel Workbook**, 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.											
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	TARGETS					ACTUALS					
	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Total Number of Programs Enrolled in the TQRIS											
Number of Programs in Tier 1											
Number of Programs in Tier 2											
Number of Programs in Tier 3											
Number of Programs in Tier 4											
Number of Programs in Tier 5											
Number of Programs Enrolled But Not Yet Rated											

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

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

TARGETS										
Number and percentage of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool										
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619										
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA										
Programs receiving from CCDF funds										
First 5 California Child Signature Program										

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

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.

ACTUALS																		
Number and percentage of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS																		
Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline			Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Year 4			Year 5		
	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%
State-funded preschool																		
Specify																		
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹																		
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C																		
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619																		
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA																		
Programs receiving from CCDF funds																		
First 5 California Child Signature Program																		

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

Data Notes

2016 Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) Definition of Highest Tiers

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

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

The data provided above is from the QRIS Program Manager (QPM), EEC's online QRIS application management system. The data provided reflects the number of programs in each tier/level of QRIS that have been granted a QRIS Rating by EEC. The total number of programs participating in QRIS is 5,318. Of the programs participating in QRIS, 5,239 programs have received a QRIS Rating. The following list represents the number of programs according to the highest QRIS Rating Granted by EEC. This number includes all QRIS Program Types for both EEC-licensed and EEC- licensed exempt programs.

The number of programs by their highest QRIS Rating is as follows:

- QRIS Rating Level 1: 3,508 programs
- QRIS Rating Level 2: 1,501 programs
- QRIS Rating Level 3: 207 programs
- QRIS Rating Level 4: 23 programs

Please note:

- **For RTT - ELC Year 1 and Year 2:**
All programs that were participating in QRIS included the number of programs that had submitted a QRIS Application with a status of “Final Submitted to EEC”. For RTT - ELC Year 1 and Year 2, program tier classifications were reported based upon the program’s self-assessed QRIS level.
- **For RTT - ELC Year 3, Year 4 and Year 5:**
All programs that were participating in QRIS included the number of programs that had submitted a QRIS Application with a status of “Final Submitted to EEC”. For RTT - ELC Year 3, Year 4, and Year 5, program tier classifications reported is based upon each program’s highest QRIS Rating granted by EEC. Currently QRIS Rating Level 4 is considered the highest QRIS rating in Massachusetts.

The QRIS is built on a strong foundation of licensing, which is QRIS Level 1, and they become more rigorous at the higher Levels to bring quality programming to children and families. The QRIS Levels begin with Level 1, which requires that a program is either EEC licensed or meets EEC licensing standards. At each Level, the standards are designed to gradually increase towards the full integration of practices known to be indicators of high quality education and care across the mixed-delivery system. Level 2 is titled "Commitment to Quality," and requires Level 1 criteria and a series of self-assessments using QRIS measurement tools. Programs are encouraged to start a Continuous Quality Improvement Plan. Policy documents and professional qualifications are verified by the EEC before programs are granted Level 2. Level 3 is titled "Focused Development," and requires all Level 2 criteria plus higher benchmarks on QRIS measurement tools scores. At Level 3, EEC verifies policy documents, professional qualifications, and at this Level, EEC Program Quality Specialists observe

classrooms using Environment Rating Scales to confirm minimum subscale and overall score benchmarks. The minimum overall benchmark for Level is 4.5. Level 4 is titled "Full Integration," and requires all Level 3 criteria plus higher benchmarks on QRIS measurement tools. At Level 4, Environment Rating Scales reliable raters perform an observation to confirm benchmarks on each ERS subscale, and an overall minimum score of 5.5. EEC verifies required policy documents and professional qualifications.

2016 Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2) Data Notes

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

UPK: This data is from the FY 2016 UPK Program Report. There were 5,730 high needs children served by UPK programs in the top tiers of QRIS (levels 2, 3 and 4). Please note that the FY 2016 UPK Grant was a competitive procurement which required all applicants to be, at a minimum, Level 2 in QRIS.

Head Start: This data is from the FY 2016 Massachusetts Head Start Program Information Report. This includes Head Start Center Based programs and Family Center Based programs that are required to be in QRIS (it does not include Home-Based programs as they are not required to participate in QRIS). There were 12,136 high needs children served in Head Start programs participating in QRIS at all levels. Of this total, there were 11,297 high needs children in programs at the top tiers of QRIS (levels 2, 3 and 4). The percentage calculation was based on the following: 11,297 (total number high needs children in top tiers of QRIS) divided by 12,136 (total number high needs children in all QRIS levels 1, 2, 3 and 4) equals 93%.

IDEA, Part C: The state does not report on IDEA part C for this performance measure. The MA QRIS Standards were not designed to address program quality in Early Intervention (EI) programs (under Part C of IDEA) The Commonwealth's Early Intervention service delivery model operated by the Massachusetts Department of Public Health, is designed to support children and families in their natural environments. Children and families do not receive EI services within a designated program site. The state does not collect data on children receiving EI services in early education programs participating in QRIS.

IDEA, Part B: Data was obtained from the MA Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. For school year 2016-2017, 16,887 preschool-age children identified with high needs were served in 513 public schools funded under of IDEA Part B- 619. 1,738 preschool-age children identified with high needs were enrolled in one of the 43 Part B- 619 funded public school that had also received a QRIS Rating Granted at QRIS Levels 2, 3 or 4.

Title I: Data was obtained from the MA Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. For school year 2016-2017, 7,659 preschool age children were identified by school districts as students with high needs and served in schools that received Title I school wide funding (Title I -SW). Of the 49 Title I-SW schools participating in QRIS, eight of these (8) schools had received a QRIS Rating Granted

at QRIS Levels 2, 3 or 4. School building level enrollment data on Title I -SW. is not available grade level.

CCDF: The Department of Early Education and Care (EEC) implemented a new financial assistance system in July 2015. Data from 2015 only included data from January-June 2015 due to a delay in the billing functionality in the new systems being implemented. The new financial assistance system has provided EEC with a higher data quality. The data source is the Early Childhood Information System (ECIS). In year 5, there were 59,201 high needs children in CCDF funded programs participating in QRIS. Of this total, 19,379 children are in QRIS programs at levels 2, 3 and 4.

IPL: Data was obtained from the IPLE Performance Report and was verified using the with the Commonwealth's QRIS Program Manager (QPM), EEC's online QRIS application management system. The IPLE programs served 2,062 children who were identified as high needs. Forty-three (43) IPLE programs were in the top tiers of QRIS (QRIS Rating Granted at Level 2, 3, or 4 and served 885 children who were identified with high needs.

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

Describe progress made during the reporting year, and across all five years of grant implementation, in validating the effectiveness of the TQRIS during the reporting year and across all five years of grant implementation, including the State's strategies for determining whether TQRIS tiers accurately reflect differential levels of program quality and assessing the extent to which changes in ratings are related to progress in children's learning, development, and school readiness. Describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress was made by the end of the four-year grant and No-Cost Extension period.

In 2012 EEC initiated the QRIS Validation Study to ensure that programs are rated properly and that the higher tiers of the QRIS are linked to improved child outcomes. The research study was designed to incorporate the following phases:

1. Methods planning and pilot study
2. At-scale validation of key quality components and associated provisional standards, and assessing differences in quality across levels
3. At-scale validation of the link between quality levels and children's development and growth trajectories
4. Final data analysis and reporting

The QRIS Validation Study goals were to validate key components of quality, assess differences in quality across levels, and relate levels of quality to children's developmental outcomes.

In 2013, Massachusetts conducted a pilot study to develop and test specific instruments and to assess procedures for data collection and communication with providers. The study included program information questionnaires, director interview protocols, teacher surveys, parent surveys, and child assessments. While overall pilot results were encouraging, especially related to data collection and response rates, it became evident that the QRIS was still in an early state of implementation.

Massachusetts hired UMass Donahue Institute (UMDI) in 2014 to conduct an at-scale study of the QRIS. The study received approval by EEC and the New England Institutional Review Board in June 2014. UMDI and Wellesley Centers for Women revised the research study plan to include the following analyses:

1. Examining the validity of key underlying concepts in the QRIS
2. Examining the measurement strategies used to assess quality
3. Assessing the outputs of the rating process
4. Examining how ratings are associated with children's development

Center-based programs were randomly selected for participation from a list of all programs that were participating in the QRIS at that time. Participants included 192 eligible preschool and toddler classrooms representing QRIS Levels 1, 2, and 3. In addition, six classrooms at QRIS level 4 were included as a case study. Program level data were collected through staff interviews and surveys about business practice, professional development, workforce qualifications, family and community engagement, curriculum, and assessment. Classroom level data were collected using the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scales (ECERS-R). Child level data were collected using a pre-post design using the following tools: Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, 4th Edition (PPVT-4); 2 subtests of the Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Achievement, 3rd Edition (WJ-III); Devereaux Early Childhood Assessment for Preschoolers, 2nd Edition (DECA P2); and the Preschool Learning Behavior Scale (PLBS). Additionally, the Devereaux Early Childhood Assessment for Toddlers (DECA-T) was used with the toddler sample.

Observation and data collection launched in 2015 and results were analyzed in 2015-2016. The QRIS validation study included many key findings:

1. Program characteristics by affiliation (i.e., multiservice agency or FCC system affiliation) differed significantly by level. Programs achieving higher levels in the QRIS were increasingly more likely to claim multiservice agency or FCC system affiliation than programs in the lower levels.
2. Average ECERS-R and ITERS-R scores rose as programs progressed through the levels of the QRIS.
3. Programs exhibited the greatest strength in the Parents & Staff and Language & Reasoning/Listening & Talking subscales of the Environment Rating Scales.
4. Programs exhibited the greatest challenge in the Space & Furnishings and Personal Care Routines subscales of the Environment Rating Scales.
5. Significant differences were found in programs by QRIS Level. Preschool classrooms in level 3 programs were of significantly higher quality than preschool classrooms in level 1 and level 2 programs on overall ECERS-R, Personal Care Routines, Language & Reasoning, Interactions, and Parents & Staff. Level 3 was higher than level 1 on Space & Furnishings. Levels 2 and 3 were higher quality than level 1 on Activities.
6. Infant/toddler classrooms in level 2 and level 3 programs were of significantly higher quality than infant/toddler classrooms in level 1 programs on overall ITERS-R, Listening & Talking, and Activities. Level 2 was higher quality than level 1 on Space & Furnishings. Level 3 was higher quality than level 1 on Interactions. Level 3 was higher than level 2, and levels 2 and 3 were higher than level 1, on Parents & Staff.
7. For a majority of the QRIS criteria (68%), there were significant differences by QRIS level in the number of programs that met the criteria. Differences for an additional 10% were approaching significance. Despite this, researchers recommend modifications to most criteria and/or verification requirements in order to better differentiate requirements, further define quality, establish greater consistency, and clarify ambiguities.
8. Significant gains were noted on child measures across all levels of the QRIS. Specifically, children in level 3 programs showed significantly greater improvement in their PPVT scores over time than did children in level 2 programs ($p < .05$). Children in level 3 programs showed significantly greater developmental gains in the Attachment Subscale of the DECA than did those in level 1 programs ($p < .05$).

Based on these findings and others, researchers have recommended several revisions to the QRIS. These include:

- Revising the criteria and verification requirements as described above

- Allowing NAEYC-accredited and Head Start programs to enter the QRIS as granted level 2 programs
- Reducing lead teacher education qualifications
- Through policy changes, prioritizing the support of vetted curricula through future iterations of the QRIS Improvement grants
- Reducing the requirement for Memoranda of Understanding between programs and service providers
- Supporting licensing to ensure basic safety, environmental, and health practices are in place
- Establishing a re-verification of programs at levels 3 and 4 every 3 years
- Strengthening the self-assessment process at level 2
- Clarifying formal professional development policy
- Considering the use of a hybrid QRIS system with blocks at the lower 3 levels and points at the higher 2 levels, creating a 5level system

Massachusetts plans to use feedback from the 2016 public meetings on QRIS, in conjunction with researchers' recommendations, to make changes to the QRIS in 2017 and beyond.

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

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

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

Focused Investment Areas

C. Promoting Early Learning Outcomes

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

Describe the progress made in the reporting year and across all five years of grant implementation, including supports that are in place to promote the understanding of and commitment to the Early Learning and Development Standards across Early Learning and Development Programs. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress was made in these areas by the end of the four-year grant and the No-Cost Extension period.

The RTT-ELC grant enabled the state to create two new set of standards: the Early English Language Development Standards (E-ELDS) for children ages 2.5 to 5.5 years old and the Social and Emotional Learning and Approaches to Play and Learning Standards (SEL/APL) for preschool and kindergarten children. Both set of standards were approved by the Board of Early Education and Care and were translated into five different languages.

From 2012 to 2013, the E-ELDS were developed as part of state's strategy to support dual language learners in their early learning. Specifically, the Standards were designed to:

- help guide lesson planning to ensure that the different linguistic needs of dual language learners are being met through their program day;
- support dual language learners to reach their next level of English Language Development;
- make programmatic decisions about class composition, staffing, curriculum, and assessment in programs that serve dual language learners; and
- advance within the Massachusetts QRIS.

The goals for the SEL/APL Standards were to support all children to:

- develop and maintain trusting, healthy, and positive interactions and relationships with both adults and peers;
- develop a positive sense of self and self-efficacy; express a healthy range of emotions in socially and culturally appropriate ways;
- understand the role of social interactions; and
- develop the skills needed to regulate attention, impulses, and behavior.

These areas are considered important factors in school readiness, including the ability to tackle and persist at challenging or frustrating tasks, follow directions, take risks and make mistakes, and work as part of a group.

The state provided professional development on both set of standards through a regional train the trainer model (TOT) during Year 4 and the Non-Cost Extension year. Trainers

were required to provide free community trainings on the standards to educators and administrators across the state. An online course on the SEL/APL Standards was developed in English and Spanish. The state will continue to provide professional development on these standards through the Educator and Provider Support (EPS) grantees.

The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education is also part of collaboration with 17 other states and the Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL) on the development of policies, learning standards or goals, and guidelines to support statewide implementation of social and emotional learning.

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

Describe the progress made during the reporting year and across all five years of grant implementation. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress was made in these areas by the end of the four-year grant and the No-Cost Extension period.

Over the last five years of the RTT-ELC grant and the No-Cost Extension period, Massachusetts saw success in implementing comprehensive assessment strategies to understand children's growth and development. One strategy was the dissemination of developmental screening tools, the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) and Ages and Stages Questionnaire for Social Emotional (ASQ-SE), through the state's family and community engagement infrastructure of the Coordinated Family and Community Engagement (CFCE) grantees to offer screenings to children that are not in formal child care programs across the state. A second strategy was to engage the public school districts in the Massachusetts Kindergarten Entry Assessment (MKEA) initiative to bring formative assessment practices to kindergarten teachers. The third strategy was to require the use of formative assessment tools in programs at QRIS level 3 and level 4.

Development Screenings with ASQ and ASQ-SE

Beginning in 2012, EEC collaborated with local community agencies through the CFCE grantee network to provide training on child development screening practices and the ASQ toolkit. After receiving training, practitioners worked with families to conduct screenings on children in over 335 cities and towns across Massachusetts. EEC also partnered with the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) to bring training on child development and the ASQ to homeless shelters. Over the four years of the RTT-ELC grant, over 2,100 children have been screened. Moving forward, through the CFCE grantees, EEC will continue to offer the ASQ development screening.

Massachusetts Kindergarten Entry Assessment (MKEA)

The Massachusetts Kindergarten Entry Assessment (MKEA) initiative enabled the state to engage public school districts in a broader conversation about developmentally appropriate practices such as observation and formative assessment.

During the four year grant period and the no-cost extension period, the state provided professional development training on observation and formative assessment (including training on the online formative assessment tools- Teaching Strategies Gold and Work Sampling System) to teachers and administrators in over 165 public school districts (out of approximately 318 school districts total in the state). During this time, over 47,000 kindergarten children were assessed with one of these formative assessment tools. Kindergarten teachers and administrators obtained critical knowledge in observing children's growth and development over time, gained skills in documenting their progress through formative assessment tools and learned how to utilize formative assessment data to improve their classroom instruction.

Formative Assessment in QRIS Programs

As Massachusetts developed the different levels of QRIS, it incorporated the use of formative assessment as a best practice for high quality programming. EEC provided training on formative assessment to all programs in QRIS. In 2013, there were only four programs in the upper tiers of QRIS level 3 and 4, and in 2016, there were 265 programs in QRIS level 3 and 4. Approximately 16,000 children in QRIS programs at levels 3 and 4 benefitted from high quality programming. Teachers and administrators were able to implement more developmentally appropriate practices in the classroom based on a stronger understanding of the value of formative assessment.

Birth to Third Grade Alignment

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

From 2012 to 2015, EEC awarded the Birth to Grade Three (B-3) Community Implementation/Planning grants to twelve communities: Lowell, Boston, Springfield, Somerville, Pittsfield, Cape Cod, Holyoke, Lawrence, New Bedford, North Adams, Northern Berkshires, and Worcester. Communities used the grant to strengthen the existing B-3 infrastructure such as family engagement, improving alignment and transitions among community based early learning programs and public schools, improving 3rd grade literacy

scores, professional development for educators and administrators, and school readiness. At the core of the B-3 communities' work was developing strong partnerships and collaboration among partners serving young children and their families to improve outcomes for children. In 2015, the success of this B-3 alignment work helped to position the Department of Early Education and Care to receive the Federal Preschool Expansion Grant (PEG) for five of these communities. The PEG grant has funded 5 communities to provide 858 children with a high quality, full-day, full year preschool program.

Health Promotion (Section C(3) of Application)

Describe the progress made during the reporting year and across all five years of grant implementation. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress was made in this area by the end of the four-year grant and the No-Cost Extension period.

Not applicable.

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d)

In the **Final Progress Report Excel Workbook**, 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.

	TARGETS					ACTUALS					
	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Number of Children with High Needs screened											
Number of Children with High Needs Referred for Services Who Received Follow-Up/Treatment											
Number of Children with High Needs who participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well child care											
Of these participating children, the number or percentage of children who are up-to-date in a schedule of well child care											

Date Notes

(Enter narrative here, we suggest a 1,000 word limit)

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

Describe the progress made during the reporting year and across the five years of grant implementation. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress was made in this area by the end of the four-year grant and No-Cost Extension period.

The RTT-ELC grant funds allowed EEC to enhance and expand family engagement efforts more comprehensively across the state. The following are key themes that characterize EEC's family engagement and support activities:

- Enhancing existing efforts in all of the state's evidence-based literacy activities and school readiness initiatives to strengthen the capacity of families and educators to support early learning
- Connecting state agencies across the sectors of early education and health and human services to create shared opportunities to build capacity and common language
- Strengthening the knowledge and skills of EEC staff, early education and care providers, museum and library staff and other stakeholders to engage and support families;
- Creating common language and practice related to child development and financial literacy across the state's family engagement network, the Coordinated Family and Community Engagement (CFCE) programs, and their community partners
- Developing resources that are accessible and embedded in a variety of initiatives that can be sustained after RTT-ELC.

The CFCE network acted as a natural vehicle for statewide dissemination of materials and training that was developed with grant funds. The following is a summary of all RTT-ELC grant funded activities that helped to strengthen family and community efforts to support growth and development of young children.

Museums and Libraries Partnership for Parent, Family and Community Engagement

EEC collaborated with Boston Children's Museum (BCM) to increase the capacity of museums and libraries to support the optimal development of all children through intentional family engagement activities and early learning opportunities. The partnership focused on four areas: early literacy, school readiness including preparation for kindergarten, interest and awareness of STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Math), and public awareness of the importance of early education and care through the state's Brain Building in Progress communications initiative.

Over 400 staff from 323 community agencies and institutions participated in this initiative over the course of four years to strengthen the capacity of museums and libraries to create enriching learning environments for young children and their families.

Media-Based Literacy Support for Families and Educators

In partnership with the WGBH Educational Foundation, EEC created the *Resources for Early Learning* website (www.resourcesforearlylearning.org). *Resources for Early Learning* was created as a comprehensive digital library featuring hundreds of free media-based tools for teaching and learning focused on English Language Arts (ELA) and Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) preschool curriculum, professional development modules, online educational games, and other digital tools for educators and parents.

Brain Building in Progress (BBIP)

In partnership with United Way of Massachusetts Bay and Merrimack Valley, EEC developed a public awareness campaign, Brain Building in Progress (BBIP) to raise awareness about the importance of investing in the early years and how connections between early experiences and later educational outcomes directly relate to future economic prosperity. A highlight of this campaign was the partnership with the Massachusetts Bay Transit Authority (MBTA) to host advertisements on the local trains and buses about BBIP and early childhood education.

Evidence Based Family Literacy

RTT-ELC grant funds provided support to 24 existing Coordinated Family and Community Engagement (CFCE) programs to enhance their implementation of evidence-based early literacy programming for children and families in their communities. Each year of the RTT-ELC funding, approximately 7,000 children and 5,000 parents participated in these early literacy activities.

Brazelton Touchpoints

EEC offered ten trainings on the Brazelton *Touchpoints* model, which provides a common language of child behavior and development to enable families, communities, and care providers to work more effectively together on behalf of children. Two hundred and seven participants from community nonprofits and state agencies completed the training.

Financial Literacy Education

EEC collaborated with the Massachusetts Community Action Programs (MASSCAP) to develop a Financial Literacy Education online course (with a training module) to support families in gaining long-term economic independence and self-sufficiency skills. The

purpose of the course was to increase the capacity of families to provide stable and healthy learning environments for young children.

Interagency Partnerships

EEC partnered with multiple state agencies to support young children and their families. The partnerships with the Department of Children and Families (DCF), Department of Mental Health (DMH), Department of Public Health (DPH), Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) and the Office of Refugees and Immigrants (ORI) focused on promoting early childhood development policies and best practices, including supports for families.

Quality Rating and Improvement System Standards

The Massachusetts QRIS has integrated culturally and linguistically appropriate family engagement practices in all of its program quality standards. For example, programs at QRIS level 2 are required to use the Strengthening Families Self-Assessment Tool as a mechanism to ensure best practices in family engagement are utilized.

In 2014, the Harvard Family Research Project (HFRP) featured Massachusetts' family engagement initiatives in a brief "A Strong Start for Family Engagement in Massachusetts". HFRP described EEC's efforts in the following way:

...the state's Race to the Top—Early Learning Challenge award in 2011 has allowed the state to accelerate and enhance its family engagement efforts and strengthen the infrastructure that would allow these efforts to flourish statewide. Unlike other states that used Race to the Top funding to pilot and evaluate a range of new programs, Massachusetts leveraged the windfall of federal dollars in order to deepen and sustain its existing, widely recognized initiatives and to selectively innovate projects. Thus, Massachusetts's dynamic and growing statewide family engagement system presents valuable insights for policymakers and practitioners. The state's successes demonstrate how to maximize the opportunity that Race to the Top offers for sustaining quality family engagement in early childhood.

D. Early Childhood Education Workforce

Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and progression of credentials. (Section D(1) of Application)

Describe the progress made during the reporting year and across all five years of grant implementation, including progress in engaging postsecondary institutions and other professional development providers in aligning professional development opportunities with the State Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework. Please describe the State's

strategies to ensure that measurable progress was made in this area by the end of the four-year grant and the No-Cost Extension period.

Through the Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge Grant, Massachusetts was able to successfully engage more institutions of higher education (IHEs) to align college coursework and professional development offerings with EEC's Core Competencies that articulate the most critical knowledge and skills needed to be an effective early educator. EEC provided funding to the Massachusetts Readiness Center Network to enhance engagement and recognition of the early education and out of school time workforce across the state.

The Readiness Centers collaborated with the Educator and Provider Support (EPS) grantees to align existing professional development offerings. The EPS grantees are the state's primary vehicle for providing regional professional development opportunities and support services such as technical assistance, coaching and mentoring to educators and providers in the mixed delivery system.

The Readiness Centers worked to strengthen partnerships with IHEs in the different regions of the state. These partnerships fostered greater collaboration. Prior to the RTT-ELC grant, only 26 IHEs (both public and private) were aligned with EEC's Core Competencies and currently there are 39 colleges offering certificate or degrees for the early education workforce that are aligned with EEC's Core Competencies.

Through regular committee meetings of early childhood education faculty, the Readiness Centers helped to improve academic advising of students (especially those transferring from a two year to four year degree program), alignment of college coursework and articulation of transfer agreements. A highlight of the Readiness Centers' work with the IHEs was the creation of a common website, the Early Educators Pathway, with information from all regions and colleges that serve the early education and out of school time workforce.

Readiness Centers, in collaboration with the EPS grantees and other key stakeholders, played a leadership role to create professional development advancements that would have otherwise not been created. Examples include:

- Development of an Associate's degree (AA) to Bachelor's degree (BA): 2 + 2 Programs at multiple campuses across the state. Participating IHEs include the Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts with Berkshire Community College, Quinsigamond Community College with Worcester State University and Becker College, Greenfield Community College with Elms College, and Holyoke Community College with Elms College, and Urban College of Boston with Fisher College.

- The creation of new degree programs to support the early education and out of school time workforce at Fitchburg State University, Salem State University, University of Massachusetts (Boston), and Bridgewater State University.
- Alignment and integration of coursework with Worcester Public Schools and Quinsigamond Community College and Worcester State University.
- Development of a high School diploma to AA degree through the Accuplacer Boot Camp program and the availability of AA college coursework for high school students at Worcester Technical High School through Quinsigamond Community College.
- Expansion of support for dual language learners at the college level through Quinsigamond Community College. The Readiness Center directors participated in the Master Cadre training on the Early English Language Development Standards (E-ELDS) and collaborated with the EPS grantees to provide additional professional development opportunities on these standards.
- At the end of the RTT-ELC grant period, the Readiness Centers transitioned to separate programs or initiatives for early educators at individual IHEs. Some statewide and regional partnerships that were formed through the Readiness Center Networks will continue at individual IHEs across the Commonwealth and through EEC's EPS grantees.

**Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities.
(Section D(2) of Application)**

Describe the progress made during the reporting year and across all five years of grant implementation. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress was made in this area by the end of the four-year grant and the No-Cost Extension period.

Massachusetts invested the RTT-ELC grant funds to implement several initiatives to improve the knowledge, skills and competencies of early educators. Some initiatives focused on the leadership development of early educators, while others centered on improving individual skills of educators. Grant funds were also invested into research studies to help the state better understand the workforce development needs of the early educators.

Supporting Leadership Development

Post Master's Certificate (PMC) in Early Education, Research, Policy, and Leadership

EEC worked with faculty at the University of Massachusetts Boston (UMB) to design and deliver the Post Master's Certificate (PMC) in Early Education, Research, Policy, and

Leadership. PMC is an innovative 12-credit post master's certificate program that advances research, policy, leadership, and data-driven practice in early education and care. The purpose of PMC was to improve the knowledge, skills, and abilities of early childhood educators from public and private programs. The coursework within the PMC program is aligned with EEC's Core Competency areas, the state's QRIS standards, and the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) Advanced Standards (AS).

Three cohorts (of 15 students each) were supported with full scholarships to participate in the PMC program. Graduates of the PMC program have taken on leadership roles within the early education field. Examples of their leadership activities include: serving on early childhood working groups such as EEC's work groups for the Massachusetts Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS), teaching college coursework on early childhood education, and presenting at statewide conferences.

Given the success of the PMC and the demand for such a program in the state, UMB created the first a doctoral program in early childhood education. The Early Childhood Education and Care PhD program began in September 2016.

Early Educators Fellowship Initiative (EEFI)

During the four years of the RTT-ELC grant, the state conducted the Early Educators Fellowship Initiative (EEFI), a community-based leadership series for early education and care providers in public and private programs serving children from birth to grade three. The purpose of EEFI was to organize, equip and empower Massachusetts educators to build high-quality learning environments for young children, in partnership with families and communities. EEFI focused on systems building among early educators and action in local communities.

EEFI consisted of day-long workshops featuring an engaging combination of presentations, case studies, interactive discussions and small group work. The framework of EEFI was intentionally aligned with existing state birth through grade three initiatives such as the Birth to Third Grade alignment grants to local communities, the Massachusetts Kindergarten Entry Assessment (MKEA), and QRIS.

Improving Individual Skills

Peer Assistance and Coaching (PAC)

Peer Assistance and Coaching (PAC) was designed to assist early childhood teachers and directors in improving their practice through effective peer support and coaching in order to strengthen adult-child interactions (especially among high-needs children), increase workforce retention, promote career advancement and professionalization, and provide accessible professional development opportunities for the field. PAC utilized training and

coaching methods (such as video capture) to improve those educator competencies. Teachers had the opportunity to observe their peers implement best practices as well as try out effective instructional practices in their own classrooms and receive real time feedback about their efforts from coaches through an online video platform. Coaches participated in regional professional learning communities (PLCs) and received specialized training in relationship-based coaching and the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS). PAC utilized the CLASS rating tool to evaluate the effectiveness of the peer coaching and mentoring. The CLASS scores of the teachers improved in FY14 and FY15. CLASS evaluations showed improvement in the three domains of emotional support, classroom organization and instructional support.

Given the success of the PAC program, in 2016 the state used RTT-ELC funding to conduct a statewide training of trainers to support educators to establish peer coaching models within their programs and organizations. In FY16, EEC contracted with one of the PAC vendors to deliver a training series called Coaching for Change, based on the promising practices and lessons learned in the PAC project with the goal of supporting effective coaching practices across the state.

Business Planning

RTT-ELC funds were used to develop an online business planning course to help educators to implement sound business practices and thus retain high quality staff. This course was designed to assist center based programs and family child care providers to perform effectively on the Program Administration Scale (PAS) and the Business Administration Scale (BAS) and thus meet higher level criteria on QRIS.

QRIS webinars and technical assistance

EEC developed an online fundamentals course on QRIS in multiple languages (English, Spanish, Haitian Creole, Chinese, Khmer and Portuguese) for providers. This course is designed to provide early education and out of school time educators with an introduction to the Massachusetts QRIS so that they could become familiar with QRIS and actively participate in QRIS.

Additionally, EEC conducted monthly technical assistance webinars for family child care system support staff. These webinars, such as "Understanding the Environment Rating Scales and ERS Scoring Policy," "Navigating the Professional Qualifications Registry," and "The Continuous Quality Improvement Process", focused on critical topics that support improved program quality.

EEC also developed the QRIS Online Community (www.QRIScommunity.org) in collaboration with the United Way of Massachusetts Bay and Merrimack Valley. This

resource, geared towards educators, administrators, and providers, included specialized groups, discussion forums, and a section for sharing resources and best practices.

Workforce Studies

Validation of Educator Competencies

EEC contracted with the American Institutes for Research (AIR) to conduct a two-year research study examining the relationships among educator supports, instructional practices, and child outcomes in early childhood settings. Specifically, this study focused on validating educator competencies in social emotional development, literacy, numeracy and evaluate the effectiveness of digital strategies in increasing teacher competency and parent involvement in children's development.

Opening Pathways: Strengthening Opportunities for Massachusetts Early Educators Who Are English Language Learners

EEC contracted with the CAYL Institute to develop a roadmap for English Language Learners (ELLs) that informs higher education and EEC on how to support multi-lingual educators as they navigate entry to higher education institutions, matriculation and degree attainment. The report, *Opening Pathways: Strengthening Opportunities for Massachusetts Early Educators Who Are English Language Learners*, provided research and recommendations on supporting the needs of English Language Learners as they navigate in the higher education system and assist them to be successful in obtaining advanced degrees. This work will be sustained through ongoing discussions with EEC and the Department of Higher Education (DHE) around credentials and the educational needs of the early childhood field.

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

In the **Final Progress Report Excel Workbook**, 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.

	TARGETS					ACTUALS					
	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Total number of "aligned" institutions and providers											
Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider											

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.

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											
Type of Credential	Baseline	Baseline	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Child Development Assistant (Lowest)											
Child Development Associate Teacher											
Child Development Teacher											
Child Development Master Teacher											
Child Development Site Supervisor											
Child Development Program Director (Highest)											

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

ACTUALS												
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												
Type of Credential	Baseline	Baseline	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Child Development Assistant (Lowest)												
Child Development Associate Teacher												
Child Development Teacher												
Child Development Master Teacher												
Child Development Site Supervisor												
Child Development Program Director (Highest)												

(D)(2)(d) Data Notes

2016 Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1) Data Notes

EEC's Race to The Top Early Learning Challenge Grant application listed 58 institutions of higher education in Massachusetts with degrees in education. Further refinement of that list of colleges and universities has found that there are only 52 colleges and universities in Massachusetts that will issue credentials to the early education workforce in 2016. Although some of the Massachusetts early education bachelor's degree programs align with EEC's Core Competency Areas, the majority of bachelor degree granting programs in Massachusetts issue degrees to individuals looking to work in the Massachusetts' public school system.

The Massachusetts Department of Higher Education has confirmed the number of graduates for the 2014 -2015 academic year through the USDOE, Integrated Postsecondary Education Database (IPEd). The data included in table D2D1 for Year Four has been revised, this information includes data from 41 public and private IHEs in Massachusetts serving early educators. Since data for the 2015 - 2016 academic year is not yet available through IPEds EEC has requested preliminary graduation rate data through its Educator and Provider Support (EPS) grant. It is anticipated through EEC's EPS grantees that 1,111 early childhood educators will earn an associate's, bachelors, or master's degree in early childhood education.

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

2016 Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2) Data Notes

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

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

The data for Credential Type I: *Child Development Associate/ ECE Certificate* includes data from EEC's Professional Qualifications which issued 8,485 certificates ranging from teacher to director II between January 1, 2016 and December 31, 2016. EEC supported 112 early childhood educators to earn their Child Development Associate through the Council for Professional Recognition; 123 college level certificates were also awarded by aligned IHEs.

E. Measuring Outcomes and Progress

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

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

The domains covered by the Massachusetts Kindergarten Entry Assessment (MKEA) included social-emotional, cognitive, language, literacy, math, and physical. School districts used either the Teaching Strategies Gold (TSG) or Work Sampling System (WSS) as their formative assessment tool. In the academic year 2015-2016, approximately 47,649 kindergarten children were assessed over two time periods—in the fall of 2015 and the spring of 2016.

EEC collaborated with the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) to implement MKEA during the grant period and the No-Cost Extension period. EEC contracted with an external vendor, Collaborative for Educational Services (CES), to provide training to teachers and administrators on formative assessment practices, including the TSG and WSS online tools.

In 2016, EEC, ESE and CES worked with educational consultant Judy Jablon to develop a series of video modules on observation formative assessment. The following videos include:

- one 45-60 minute learning module that will highlight the observational formative assessment process;
- one 5 minute video vignette on how educators collect and interpret evidence as they interact with children;
- one 5 minute video vignette on how educators assess children's social and emotional learning throughout the day; and
- one 5 minute video vignette on how educators work together with their teaching partner(s) so that they can efficiently assess children.

The video modules are currently housed on CES's website for any program to access. These videos are part of Massachusetts overall strategy to continue activities that will increase the understanding of the value of using formative assessment as a kindergarten entry assessment to support student achievement.

The Full Day Kindergarten Grant was not continued in the 2016-2017 school year. The two education agencies, ESE and EEC will continue to collaborate closely to connect

community based early childhood programs with public schools on seamless transitions to kindergarten as well as implement best practices in observation and formative assessment. In 2017, ESE will put forth a policy statement to the field on the importance of observation and formative assessment, and will continue provide guidance on best practices in these areas.

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

Describe the progress made during the reporting year and across all five years of grant implementation, including the State's progress in building or enhancing a separate early learning data system that aligns with and is interoperable with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System. Describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress was made in this area by the end of the four-year grant and the No-Cost Extension period.

The RTT-ELC grant provided Massachusetts with the critical resources to strengthen the state's data systems. In 2012, Massachusetts began developing of an Early Childhood Information System (ECIS) to (1) create a single, high-quality source of data for reporting (ECIS data warehouse), (2) construct a reporting platform which reduces the time required to generate reports and (3) to support other state agencies, such as the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's (ESE) state Longitudinal Data System (LDS), also referred to as EDWin Analytics. The creation of ECIS has also allowed the state to understand data on programs, child demographics and attendance.

In 2013, ECIS data was integrated into EDWin Analytics, thus enabling a flow of early childhood education and program data into one location. EDWin Analytics was built through a phased integration of data between the agencies comprising the Executive Office of Education (EOE), the departments of Early Education and Care (EEC), Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) and Higher Education (DHE). ESE is engaged in both data integration and the generation of State Assigned Student Identification (SASID) number for all its students which will include those students with a history in subsidized care from EEC.

Program quality data from the Massachusetts Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) and workforce data from the Professional Qualifications Registry (PQR) was loaded in ECIS in 2013. QRIS and PQR data enabled the creation of more reports that included program and workforce data, such as workforce demographics, program quality trends, child waitlist and licensing. One functionality of ECIS is a dashboard to measure trends versus goals to enable policy makers to improve their decision making process based on real time data. In 2014 and 2015, EEC integrated the new Child Care Financial Assistance System (CCFA) data into ECIS. CCFA data within ECIS allowed for more comprehensive reporting on family income and demographics.

Since January 2015, EEC has been working with EOE to secure the necessary resources and funding to build a new licensing data system. The Licensing Education Analytic Database (LEAD) provides a single system for licensing and investigation information, replacing the two existing licensing data systems the Licensing Manager and the Complaint Tracking System. LEAD is a more robust system that follows the licensing process from beginning to end and houses all information related to the licensing process in one location. Some of LEAD's features include:

- A mobile tablet for all EEC licensors to allow for all licensing visit results to be immediately captured and communicated to providers.
- Reports and dashboards for EEC executives, managers, supervisors, investigators and licensors to easily monitor the status of the licensing work.
- A provider portal, which will allow providers to interact with EEC electronically. Providers will be able to conduct licensing transactions such as applying for a license, filing required reports with EEC, reporting incidents, and responding to visit or investigation findings.

LEAD is being developed in various phases. Phase one of the LEAD roll out began in June 2016 and included licensing investigations, mobile licensing visits and limited provider portal functionality. Phase two and Phase three roll out of LEAD included the family child care licensing application processes and differential licensing processes across all of licensing. In 2016, LEAD data was integrated into the ECIS. Data from the Child Care Financial Assistance System (CCFA) continued to be integrated into ECIS in 2016 so that subsidy care financial reports can be available to policy makers.

In 2017, EEC plans to continue with the development of LEAD and aligning it with ECIS. Furthermore, EEC will invest resources into improving IT infrastructure to support its workforce development strategies and will continue to work with EOE to advocate for additional IT funding and resources.

Attach the following final documents:

- **Final Validation Study**
- **Kindergarten Entry Assessment Summary**

Future State plans

Thank you for filling out the Race to the Top—Early Learning Challenge grant Final Progress Report. Please provide the Departments with a description of your State’s future early learning plans.

EEC’s priorities for FY18 include the following:

Advancing the Workforce and Increasing Program Quality – The Department and Board of Early Education and Care have placed a strong focus on the needs of early educators, their opportunities for entry into and advancement in the field, and the rates paid to programs to hire and retain their staff, in order to help strengthen the early educator workforce both overall and as a key means to providing high levels of program quality that lead to improved outcomes for children. In addition to increasing rates, we are utilizing our state quality funds to provide professional development that will help increase our workforce’s capacity to provide positive outcomes for the children they serve. This includes foundational supports, career pathways, mentoring and coaching. We are also refining our quality standards to reflect best practices and current research in the field of early childhood education.

Meeting CCDBG Requirements – The 2014 re-authorization of the Child Care Development Block Grant (CCDBG) program and the CCDBG final rule promulgation in Fall 2016 bring new mandates that the Commonwealth needs to meet in order to remain eligible for \$500 million in federal reimbursement claims annually. The CCDBG reauthorization requires states to conduct annual, unannounced compliance monitoring visits for both licensed and license-exempt child care providers; post licensing studies, monitoring reports, and major investigation findings online; and conduct additional levels of educator background record checks. The Department has been innovating new practices to more effectively utilize resources to support programs, including developing a differential licensing model that uses targeted indicators to assess non-compliance risks and needed levels of monitoring.

Preparing for Contract Bids in 2018- EEC awards child care financial assistance through vouchers to families and contracts with programs for a set number of enrollment seats. All of EEC’s subsidized care contracts (Income Eligible, Supportive, teen Parent, and Homeless Child Care) with programs are set to expire in 2018. EEC is planning an open competitive bid to procure new contracts starting 7/1/18. The current contracts have been in place since 2009 and a new bid is needed to comply with state procurement laws. On average, around 21,000 children are served through these contracts.

Department Organization and Operations – At all levels of the organization, EEC staff are charged with supporting the early education workforce. Licensors and Program Quality Specialists, who spend the bulk of their time in programs, are the EEC front line in this regard. Policy staff play a critical role in ensuring that licensing, QRIS and grant expectations align and emphasize the supports needed to meet and advance quality requirements. Auditing staff ensure that contracts and subsidies are being managed according to the regulations. Commissioner Weber has implemented a reorganization of the agency- with three Deputy Commissioners whose units work in concert to ensure program safety and quality, the efficient use of grants and subsidies and the effective management of the agency as a whole.

Budget and Expenditure Tables

Expenditure Table 1: Overall Expenditure Summary by Budget Category— *Report your actual expenditures for the entire grant period.*

Budget Table1: Budget Summary by Budget Category						
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Grant Year 5 (e)	Total (f)
1. Personnel	290,787	688,569	845,843	836,827	202,308	2,864,334
2. Fringe Benefits	77,973	182,518	230,437	243,688	66,170	800,786
3. Travel	5,388	26,806	22,702	38,816	1,369	95,080
4. Equipment	625	1,775	-	-	-	2,400
5. Supplies	4,475	11,441	1,909	10,985	-	28,810
6. Contractual	3,026,624	7,004,901	8,719,349	7,984,985	671,374	27,407,233
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	16,951	75,176	63,453	-	-	155,580
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	3,422,824	7,991,186	9,883,692	9,115,301	941,221	31,354,224
10. Indirect Costs*	169,066	331,770	449,784	531,576	75,516	1,557,712
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	796,214	2,566,524	4,875,803	6,125,183	2,465,935	16,829,659
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	86	-	36,429	221,889	-	258,405
13. Total Grant Funds Expended (add lines 9-12)	4,388,189	10,889,480	15,245,709	15,993,949	3,482,673	50,000,000
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	46,954,903	672,507	567,085	204,950	-	48,399,446
15. Total Statewide Expenditures (add lines 13-14)	51,343,093	11,561,987	15,812,794	16,198,900	3,482,673	98,399,446

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

Column (f): Show the total amount expended for all grant years.

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

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

Line 11: Show the amount of funds 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 was expected to 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. The State could request to amend this amount if needed.

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

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

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

*(Enter **narrative** here, we suggest a 1,000 word limit)*

Please provide the Departments with an estimated total of grant funds to be returned to the U.S. Treasury.

*(Enter **narrative** here, we suggest a 1,000 word limit)*

Budget and Expenditure Tables by Project -- Report your actual budget expenditures for the entire previous grant period. Copy the table and questions below for each project.

Budget Table 2: Project 1 – Grants Management Budget

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Grant Year 5 (e)	Total (f)
1. Personnel	238,045	593,041	759,995	791,469	202,308	2,584,859
2. Fringe Benefits	66,402	164,154	210,312	235,070	66,170	742,108
3. Travel	5,176	20,681	20,083	33,816	1,369	81,124
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	4,475	4,674	214	-	-	9,363
6. Contractual	40,772	84,937	2,500	-	-	128,209
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	354,871	867,488	993,103	1,060,356	269,847	3,545,664
10. Indirect Costs*	161,845	307,844	431,560	522,322	75,516	1,499,087
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	86	-	36,429	221,889	-	258,405
13. Total Grant Funds Expended (add lines 9-12)	516,801	1,175,331	1,461,092	1,804,567	345,364	5,303,156
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	179,374	179,374	179,374	179,374	-	717,496
15. Total Budget (add lines 13-14)	696,175	1,354,706	1,640,466	1,983,941	345,364	6,020,652

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

Column (f): Show the total amount expended for all grant years.

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

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

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

Line 12: The Participating State Agency's allocation of the \$400,000 the State must set aside from its Total Grant Funds Requested 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 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.

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

*(Enter **narrative** here, we suggest a 1,000 word limit) Spending in Project 1 for RTT-ELC was roughly \$28K more than budgeted because higher than anticipated indirect cost in Year 4. The Year 4 indirect increase was slightly off-set by lower than projected personnel, fringe and indirect cost in Year 5.*

Budget and Expenditure Tables by Project -- Report your actual budget expenditures for the entire previous grant period. Copy the table and questions below for each project.

Budget Table 2: Project 2 - Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS): Program Quality Supports

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Grant Year 5 (e)	Total (f)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	928,883	2,652,598	4,570,991	3,399,557	-	11,552,029
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	928,883	2,652,598	4,570,991	3,399,557	-	11,552,029
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-	-
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 Expended (add lines 9-12)	928,883	2,652,598	4,570,991	3,399,557	-	11,552,029
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	5,062,000	-	-	-	-	5,062,000
15. Total Budget (add lines 13-14)	5,990,883	2,652,598	4,570,991	3,399,557	-	16,614,029

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

Column (f): Show the total amount expended for all grant years.

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

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

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

Line 12: The Participating State Agency's allocation of the \$400,000 the State must set aside from its Total Grant Funds Requested 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 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.

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

*(Enter **narrative** here, we suggest a 1,000 word limit) Spending in Project 2 for RTT-ELC was roughly \$200K less than budgeted. As stated in the Narrative section for Project 2 in the October 2016 revision, we had planned on extending Activity 2.7 in the no cost extension year. However we did not continue Activity 2.7 in 2016 due to ongoing changes with QRIS.*

Budget and Expenditure Tables by Project -- Report your actual budget expenditures for the entire previous grant period. Copy the table and questions below for each project.

Budget Table 2: Project 3 - Measuring Growth Through the MA Early Learning Development Assessment System (MELD)

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Grant Year 5 (e)	Total (f)
1. Personnel						
2. Fringe Benefits						-
3. Travel						-
4. Equipment						-
5. Supplies						-
6. Contractual	524,512	175,281	666,182	865,000	253,916	2,484,890
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	524,512	175,281	666,182	865,000	253,916	2,484,890
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	431,942	144,740	831,573	294,336	-	1,702,591
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	-	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Grant Funds Expended (add lines 9-12)	956,454	320,021	1,497,756	1,159,335	253,916	4,187,482
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	13,849,530	-	-	-	-	13,849,530
15. Total Budget (add lines 13-14)	14,805,984	320,021	1,497,756	1,159,335	253,916	18,037,012

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

Column (f): Show the total amount expended for all grant years.

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

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

Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs,

and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.

Line 12: The Participating State Agency's allocation of the \$400,000 the State must set aside from its Total Grant Funds Requested 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 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.

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

*(Enter **narrative** here, we suggest a 1,000 word limit) Overall, we spent \$286K less than the state budget amount for Project 3. As stated in the Narrative section for Project 3 in the October 2016 revision, Project 3 under spent \$155K at the end of Year 4. This is primarily due to surplus funds in project 3.2 (\$117K) and 3.8 (\$37K). Activity 3.2 and 3.8 were scheduled in the no cost extension year. Activity 3.2 was budgeted for \$224K, but only spent \$116K and Activity 3.8 was budgeted for \$170K, but only expended \$138K.*

Budget and Expenditure Tables by Project -- Report your actual budget expenditures for the entire previous grant period. Copy the table and questions below for each project.

Budget Table 2: Project 4 - Family Engagement with Evidence Based Practice

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Grant Year 5 (e)	Total (f)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	243,921	859,255	682,756	474,437	-	2,260,370
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	243,921	859,255	682,756	474,437	-	2,260,370
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-	-
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 Expended (add lines 9-12)	243,921	859,255	682,756	474,437	-	2,260,370
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	14,649,530	-	-	-	-	14,649,530
15. Total Budget (add lines 13-14)	14,893,452	859,255	682,756	474,437	-	16,909,900

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

Column (f): Show the total amount expended for all grant years.

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

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

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

Line 12: The Participating State Agency's allocation of the \$400,000 the State must set aside from its Total Grant Funds Requested 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 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.

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

*(Enter **narrative** here, we suggest a 1,000 word limit) Minor adjustments totaling \$6.94 in Year 4 is the only discrepancy.*

Budget and Expenditure Tables by Project -- Report your actual budget expenditures for the entire previous grant period. Copy the table and questions below for each project.

Budget Table 2: Project 5 - Sustaining Program Effects in the Early Elementary Grades

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Grant Year 5 (e)	Total (f)
1. Personnel	20,500	48,500	47,489	45,357	-	161,846
2. Fringe Benefits	1,640	3,880	8,310	8,618	-	22,448
3. Travel	-	5,700	2,172	5,000	-	12,872
4. Equipment	625	1,775	-	-	-	2,400
5. Supplies	-	6,767	1,695	10,985	-	19,447
6. Contractual	-	20,007	42,944	45,720	-	108,671
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	20,000	6,800	-	-	26,800
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	22,765	106,629	109,410	115,680	-	354,484
10. Indirect Costs*	2,235	10,312	9,047	9,254	-	30,848
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	215,759	1,129,413	1,637,272	2,081,308	-	5,063,752
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	-	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Grant Funds Expended (add lines 9-12)	240,759	1,246,354	1,755,730	2,206,242	-	5,449,084
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	3,367,219	-	-	-	-	3,367,219
15. Total Budget (add lines 13-14)	3,607,978	1,246,354	1,755,730	2,206,242	-	8,816,303

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

Column (f): Show the total amount expended for all grant years.

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

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

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

Line 12: The Participating State Agency's allocation of the \$400,000 the State must set aside from its Total Grant Funds Requested 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 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.

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

*(Enter **narrative** here, we suggest a 1,000 word limit) Overall Project 5 under spent \$34K at the end of Year 4. This is primarily due to surplus funds in project 5.3 (\$28K).*

Budget and Expenditure Tables by Project -- Report your actual budget expenditures for the entire previous grant period. Copy the table and questions below for each project.

Budget Table 2: Project 6 - Standards: Validation and Alignment

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Grant Year 5 (e)	Total (f)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	538,773	677,546	742,148	1,235,230	289,057	3,482,754
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	538,773	677,546	742,148	1,235,230	289,057	3,482,754
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-	-
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 Expended (add lines 9-12)	538,773	677,546	742,148	1,235,230	289,057	3,482,754
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	125,000	-	125,000	-	-	250,000
15. Total Budget (add lines 13-14)	663,773	677,546	867,148	1,235,230	289,057	3,732,754

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

Column (f): Show the total amount expended for all grant years.

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

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

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

Line 12: The Participating State Agency's allocation of the \$400,000 the State must set aside from its Total Grant Funds Requested 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 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.

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

*(Enter **narrative** here, we suggest a 1,000 word limit) Overall Project 6 under spent \$10K at the end of Year 4. This is due to \$10K surplus funds in project 6.1. Project 6 is included in the no cost extension year. Activity 6.2 was budgeted for \$234K, Activity 6.3 was budgeted for \$54K and Activity 6.4 was budgeted for \$50K. At the end we did not expend the \$50K anticipated for Project 6.4 in Year 5.*

Budget and Expenditure Tables by Project -- Report your actual budget expenditures for the entire previous grant period. Copy the table and questions below for each project.

Budget Table 2: Project 7 - Interagency Partnerships						
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Grant Year 5 (e)	Total (f)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	-	-	-	-	-	-
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	-	-	-	-	-	-
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-	-
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	143,020	1,039,078	1,695,190	1,763,053	-	4,640,342
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	-	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Grant Funds Expended (add lines 9-12)	143,020	1,039,078	1,695,190	1,763,053	-	4,640,342
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	-	-	-	-	-	-
15. Total Budget (add lines 13-14)	143,020	1,039,078	1,695,190	1,763,053	-	4,640,342

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

Column (f): Show the total amount expended for all grant years.

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

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

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

Line 12: The Participating State Agency's allocation of the \$400,000 the State must set aside from its Total Grant Funds Requested 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 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.

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

*(Enter **narrative** here, we suggest a 1,000 word limit) Overall Project 7 spent \$41K less than the Year 4 total budget. Originally believed DPH cost would be somewhat higher (based on the October 2016 revised budget), but much of these cost (personnel and indirect) did not materialize. AS the RTT-ELC grant wound down many of the RTT-ELC related personnel moved on prior to the close.*

Budget and Expenditure Tables by Project -- Report your actual budget expenditures for the entire previous grant period. Copy the table and questions below for each project.

Budget Table 2: Project 8 - Ensuring Competency through Workforce Knowledge, Skills and Practice-Based Support

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Grant Year 5 (e)	Total (f)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	322,896	1,383,366	1,477,151	1,658,853	128,401	4,970,668
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	322,896	1,383,366	1,477,151	1,658,853	128,401	4,970,668
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-	-
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 Expended (add lines 9-12)	322,896	1,383,366	1,477,151	1,658,853	128,401	4,970,668
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	9,503,997	-	-	-	-	9,503,997
15. Total Budget (add lines 13-14)	9,826,893	1,383,366	1,477,151	1,658,853	128,401	14,474,665

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

Column (f): Show the total amount expended for all grant years.

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

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

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

Line 12: The Participating State Agency's allocation of the \$400,000 the State must set aside from its Total Grant Funds Requested 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 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.

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

*(Enter **narrative** here, we suggest a 1,000 word limit) Minor adjustments totaling \$106.69 in the overall budget is the only discrepancy.*

Budget and Expenditure Tables by Project -- Report your actual budget expenditures for the entire previous grant period. Copy the table and questions below for each project.

Budget Table 2: Project 9 - Measuring Growth by Developing a Common Measure for Kindergarten Entry Assessment (KEA)

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Grant Year 5 (e)	Total (f)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-		-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-		-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-		-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-		-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-		-
6. Contractual	157,659	74,867	-	-		232,527
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-		-
8. Other	-	-	-	-		-
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	157,659	74,867	-	-		232,527
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-		-
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 Expended (add lines 9-12)	157,659	74,867	-	-		232,527
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	-	-	-	-		-
15. Total Budget (add lines 13-14)	157,659	74,867	-	-		232,527

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

Column (f): Show the total amount expended for all grant years.

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

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

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

Line 12: The Participating State Agency's allocation of the \$400,000 the State must set aside from its Total Grant Funds Requested 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 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.

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

*(Enter **narrative** here, we suggest a 1,000 word limit) N/A*

Budget and Expenditure Tables by Project -- Report your actual budget expenditures for the entire previous grant period. Copy the table and questions below for each project.

Budget Table 2: Project 10 - Early Childhood Information System (ECIS)

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Grant Year 5 (e)	Total (f)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-		-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-		-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-		-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-		-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-		-
6. Contractual	-	-	-	-		-
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-		-
8. Other	-	-	-	-		-
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	-	-	-	-		-
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-		-
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	5,493	253,292	711,768	1,986,486	2,465,935	5,422,974
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	-	-	-	-	-	-
13. Total Grant Funds Expended (add lines 9-12)	5,493	253,292	711,768	1,986,486	2,465,935	5,422,974
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	218,253	447,500	247,500	-	-	913,253
15. Total Budget (add lines 13-14)	223,745	700,792	959,268	1,986,486	2,465,935	6,336,226

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

Column (f): Show the total amount expended for all grant years.

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

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

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

Line 12: The Participating State Agency's allocation of the \$400,000 the State must set aside from its Total Grant Funds Requested 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 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.

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

(Enter narrative here, we suggest a 1,000 word limit) Overall Project 10 (1 project activity) under spent a total of \$615K when compared to the most recently approved Year 4 budget. Project 10 is included in the no cost extension year. It was budgeted to spend \$2.2M in year 5 (in the October 2016 revision). Overall, we spent \$2.5M in Year 5. The additional funds came from surpluses from other projects to help support the increased cost of IT development.

Budget and Expenditure Tables by Project -- Report your actual budget expenditures for the entire previous grant period. Copy the table and questions below for each project.

Budget Table 2: Project 11 - Pre-K to Three Alignment for Educational Success: Communication

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Grant Year 5 (e)	Total (f)
1. Personnel	32,242	47,028	38,359	-		117,629
2. Fringe Benefits	9,931	14,484	11,815	-		36,230
3. Travel	212	425	447	-		1,084
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-		-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-		-
6. Contractual	3,000	36,000	24,500	125,000		188,500
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-		-
8. Other	16,951	55,176	56,653	-		128,780
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	62,336	153,113	131,774	125,000		472,223
10. Indirect Costs*	4,986	13,614	9,177	-		27,777
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 Expended (add lines 9-12)	67,322	166,727	140,951	125,000		500,000
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	-	45,633	15,211	25,576		86,420
15. Total Budget (add lines 13-14)	67,322	212,360	156,162	125,000		560,844

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

Column (f): Show the total amount expended for all grant years.

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

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

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

Line 12: The Participating State Agency's allocation of the \$400,000 the State must set aside from its Total Grant Funds Requested 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 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.

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

*(Enter **narrative** here, we suggest a 1,000 word limit) N/A*

Budget and Expenditure Tables by Project -- Report your actual budget expenditures for the entire previous grant period. Copy the table and questions below for each project.

Budget Table 2: Project 12 - Pre-K to Three Alignment for Educational Success: Content Based Media Partnership

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Grant Year 5 (e)	Total (f)
1. Personnel	-	-	-	-	-	-
2. Fringe Benefits	-	-	-	-	-	-
3. Travel	-	-	-	-	-	-
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	-	-	-	-	-	-
6. Contractual	266,208	1,041,044	510,176	181,187	-	1,998,615
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	266,208	1,041,044	510,176	181,187	-	1,998,615
10. Indirect Costs*	-	-	-	-	-	-
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 Expended (add lines 9-12)	266,208	1,041,044	510,176	181,187	-	1,998,615
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	-	-	-	-	-	-
15. Total Budget (add lines 13-14)	266,208	1,041,044	510,176	181,187	-	1,998,615

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

Column (f): Show the total amount expended for all grant years.

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

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

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

Line 12: The Participating State Agency's allocation of the \$400,000 the State must set aside from its Total Grant Funds Requested 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 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.

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

*(Enter **narrative** here, we suggest a 1,000 word limit) The final cost of the project came in \$5,500 less than projected. This is the adjustment made in Year 4.*

Appendix:
Performance Measure Tables

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c): Increasing the number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the statewide TQRIS.								
TARGETS								
Number and Percent of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS								
Type of Early Learning and Development Program in	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	216	100.00%	216	100.00%	216	100.00%	216	100.00%
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	145	66.00%	221	100.00%	221	100.00%	221	100.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	-	0.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	102	20.00%	229	45.00%	356	70.00%	508	100.00%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	34	20.00%	56	33.00%	112	66.00%	128	100.00%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	8,406	100.00%	8,406	100.00%	8,406	100.00%	8,406	100.00%
License-exempt	26	35.00%	27	40.00%	33	45.00%	37	50.00%
Inclusive Early Learning Environments/Inclusive Preschool Learning Environments (IPLE)	50	30.00%	164	100.00%	164	100.00%	164	100.00%

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.

ACTUALS																		
Number and Percent of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS																		
Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline			Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Year 4			Year 5		
	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%
State-funded preschool	216	192	89.00%	166	166	100.00%	226	226	100.00%	224	224	100.00%	224	224	100.00%	184	184	100.00%
Specify	Universal Pre-Kindergarten (UPK)																	
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	221	112	51.00%	214	214	100.00%	219	219	100.00%	233	233	100.00%	221	221	100.00%	182	182	100.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	59	-	0.00%	-	-	0.00%	-	-	0.00%	-	-	0.00%	-	-	0.00%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	508	29	6.00%	504	70	14.00%	504	98	19.00%	515	103	20.00%	514	112	22.00%	513	164	32.00%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	170	18	11.00%	172	28	16.00%	172	24	14.00%	194	20	10.00%	206	33	16.00%	215	49	23.00%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	8,406	1,088	13.00%	8,469	3,287	39.00%	4,410	3,393	77.00%	4,410	3,702	84.00%	3,671	3,332	91.00%	4,235	3,710	88.00%
License-exempt	75	25	33.00%	75	136	181.00%	75	9	12.00%	233	122	52.00%	255	163	64.00%	376	223	59.00%
Inclusive Early Learning Environments/Inclusive Preschool Learning Environments (IPLE)	164	25	15.00%	141	69	48.94%	135	130	96.00%	136	136	100.00%	137	137	100.00%	110	121	90.00%

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

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1): Increasing the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS.										
	TARGETS				ACTUALS					
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Total Number of Programs Enrolled in the TQRIS	8,187	8,647	8,647	6,015	1,345	4,489	4,410	5,891	5,207	5,318
Number of Programs in Tier 1	222	722	922	5,000	1,111	2,099	1,820	4,589	2,975	3,508
Number of Programs in Tier 2	4	9	17	1,700	86	1,075	1,344	1,497	1,320	1,501
Number of Programs in Tier 3	1	2	3	175	84	156	324	94	182	207
Number of Programs in Tier 4	1	2	3	20	9	23	24	2	15	23
Number of Programs in Tier 5										NA
Number of Programs Enrolled But Not Yet Rated									715	79

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

TARGETS								
Number and percentage of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS								
Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	6,193	100.00%	6,193	100.00%	6,193	100.00%	6,193	100.00%
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	10,751	65.00%	12,405	75.00%	14,059	85.00%	6,193	100.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C								
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	3,721	25.00%	7,441	50.00%	11,162	75.00%	14,882	100.00%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	2,963	25.00%	5,926	50.00%	8,889	75.00%	11,852	100.00%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	14846	100.00%	14846	100.00%	14846	100.00%	14846	100.00%
Inclusive Early Learning Environments/Inclusive Preschool Learning Environments (IPLE)	3,301	55.00%	1,892	65.00%	4,501	75.00%	6,002	100.00%
License-exempt	26	35.00%	27	40.00%	33	45.00%	37	23.00%

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

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.

ACTUALS																		
Number and percentage of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS																		
Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline			Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Year 4			Year 5		
	# Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%
State-funded preschool	6,193	4,308	70.00%	5,844	5,844	100.00%	3,456	3,456	100.00%	4,248	3,071	72.00%	4,267	4,208	99.00%	5,730	5,730	100.00%
Specify	UPK																	
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	16,540	9,614	58.00%	16,469	10,770	65.00%	16,086	16,086	100.00%	14,199	8,246	58.00%	15,566	6,193	40.00%	12,136	11,297	93.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C																		
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	14,882	2,045	13.00%	14,915	3,594	24.00%	14,915	1,271	9.00%	15,133	522	3.44%	15,898	694	4.00%	17,125	1,738	10.00%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	11,852	662	4.00%	11,167	1,164	10.00%	11,167	914	8.00%	17,019	324	2.00%	6,848	477	7.00%	7,659	Not reported	Not reported
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	14,846	1,935	13.00%	14,756	14,000	95.00%	61,655	37,113	60.00%	67,637	20,261	30.00%	46,124	24,794	54.00%	59,201	19,379	33.00%
Inclusive Early Learning Environments/Inclusive Preschool Learning Environments (IPLE)	6,936	2,911	48.00%	6,936	1,915	27.00%	3,182	2,090	65.00%	3,657	732	20.00%	2,426	954	39.00%	2,062	885	43.00%
License-Exempt																		

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

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.

	TARGETS				ACTUALS					
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Total number of "aligned" institutions and providers	32	38	49	58	26	37	36	47	48	39
Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider	1,098	1,179	1,260	1,341	1,017	1,670	2,100	2,296	2,295	2,407

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.

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								
Type of Credential	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Child Development Associate/ ECE Certificate	4,076	10.00%	4,226	10.00%	4,451	11.00%	4,751	11.00%
Associate's Degree in ECE	1,270	3.00%	1,570	4.00%	1,920	5.00%	2,320	6.00%
Bachelor's Degree in ECE	657	2.00%	832	2.00%	1,057	3.00%	1,357	3.00%
Post Graduate Degree in ECE (MEd & PhD)	153	0.40%	203	0.50%	253	1.00%	303	1.00%

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

ACTUALS												
Number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who have moved up the progression of credentials,												
Type of Credential	Baseline	Baseline	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Child Development Associate/ ECE Certificate	4,001	10.00%	4,639	10.00%	4,748	13.00%	5,476	13.00%	6,341	7.00%	8,696	
Associate's Degree in ECE	1,020	2.00%	1,224	0.50%	1,503	21.00%	1,628	40.00%	581	0.60%	545	
Bachelor's Degree in ECE	557	1.00%	784	0.50%	1,023	30.00%	250	1.00%	1,049	1.00%	871	
Post Graduate Degree in ECE (MEd & PhD)	103	0.20%	1,089	2.00%	1,340	23.00%	187	0.50%	482	0.50%	853	