

Early Learning Challenge

2016 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT



New Mexico

JUNE 2017





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

New Mexico

2016

Due: February 28, 2017

U.S. Department of Education
Washington, DC 20202
OMB Number: 1810-0713
Expiration Date: October 31, 2019

Paperwork Burden Statement

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



Annual Performance Report Section List

General Information

Executive Summary

A(3) Successful State System

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

B(2) Promoting Participation in the TQRIS

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

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

B(5) Validating the Effectiveness of the State TQRIS

C(1) Early Learning and Development Standards

C(2) Comprehensive Assessment Systems

C(3) Health Promotion

C(4) Engaging and Supporting Families

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

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

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

E(2) Early Learning Data Systems

A(1) Background Data Tables



Performance Report: Cover Sheet

General Information

1. PR/Award#: S412A130025

2. Grantee Name Office of the Governor, State of New Mexico

3. Grantee Address 490 Old Santa Fe Trail, Room 400
City: Santa Fe
State: New Mexico Zip: 87501

4. Project Director Name: Christopher Ruskowski
Title: New Mexico Public Education Department

Phone #: (505) 819-7512 Ext.: _____ Fax #: _____

Email: christopher.ruskowski@state.nm.us

Reporting Period Information

5. Reporting Period: From: 01/01/2016 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: 01/01/2016 To: 12/31/2016

Approving Federal agency: ED HHS Other Specify other: _____

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

Executive Summary

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

Executive Summary

New Mexico is pleased to report that at the end of Year Four of the Early Learning Challenge Grant, the State continues to make significant progress in grant implementation across all six of its Early Learning Challenge Projects: *Grants Management*; *FOCUS-TQRIS*; *Early Childhood Investment Zones*; *Workforce Development*; *Early Childhood Data Systems*; *Kindergarten Entry Assessment*.

New Mexico's ongoing, comprehensive commitment to building an early learning system of the highest quality for its most at-risk young children and their families is the result of collaboration among State agencies, community partners, and stakeholders and is reflected in the following 2016 accomplishments.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

New Mexico has made significant progress on the Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) grant since it began in January 2013, with much of Years One and Two spent on gearing up to implement the grant, including hiring key staff; establishing contracts; and establishing governance and communications processes. Year Three highlights included continued strides towards building a robust, high quality learning system for our youngest children; further improving communications with key stakeholders; implementing the first statewide implementation of the Kindergarten Observation Tool; increasing TEACH scholarship participants; incorporating FOCUS-TQRIS across all New Mexico early learning programs; and initiating work in the identified Early Childhood Investment Zones.

The 2016 Annual Performance Report provides an overview of New Mexico's RTT-ELC activities for Year Four of the grant, highlighting several areas of progress and accomplishments within the six projects towards building successful state "systems of systems" that connect early care health and education into a continuum of integrated, high-quality, comprehensive services, including:

1. Grants Management

Governance

Enhanced collaboration and communications continued as a result of New Mexico implementing a coordinated governance model that places authority and accountability across the three participating agencies - Children, Youth and Families Department (CYFD), Department of Health (DOH), and Public Education Department (PED). The structure includes an Executive Team and Leadership Team. The Executive Team meets monthly to gain updates and resolve inter-agency concerns. The Leadership Team continued to meet twice per month to discuss policy questions and implementation plans, review the status of each project, discuss any major challenges, maintain alignment among project policies and activities, and discuss and confirm any necessary adjustments to the budget, scope of work, and implementation plans.

The Project Grant Manager continues to oversee the overall management and implementation progress for the RTT-ELC grant. While authority and accountability is managed across the three departments, management and reporting responsibilities continued within PED, with quarterly status reports provided to the Department Secretary. The following additional activities were achieved under Grants Management in 2016:

No-Cost Extension

New Mexico completed the necessary requirements to be approved for a 1 year No-Cost Extension amendment to complete the following work: *Grants Management*, to provide oversight and support, in particular, staff to oversee and monitor contracts for other extension projects and to ensure compliance with grant requirements; *FOCUS-TQRIS*, to complete the work of extending FOCUS-TQRIS across three state agencies; *Professional Development*, to complete the activities through the FOCUS-TQRIS professional development system that supports New Mexico's early childhood workforce; *Data*, to complete development

of an Early Childhood Integrated Data System (ECIDS) to integrate data from the three state agencies; and *Kindergarten Entry Assessment*, to fully complete KEA implementation by June 2017.

Monitoring

In October 2016, New Mexico participated in the “Part B Desk Monitoring” review with focus on the following areas: Successful state systems; high quality programs; and investments in supporting early childhood educators, learning development at kindergarten entry, and data systems. The report findings concluded that there were no recommendations to strengthen implementation.

Sustainability

In October 2016, New Mexico contracted with Policy Equity Group, LLC to work with the state's Sustainability Team to develop the New Mexico RTT-ELC Sustainability Plan. The work initiated in 2016 includes reviewing work and conducting an inventory of accomplishments in preparation for input from stakeholders and further plan development during 2017. Goals of the sustainability Plan are to tell New Mexico RTT-ELC story, actively engage the RTT-ELC stakeholder community, develop criteria and identify each project's need for sustainability and the overall amount of funding necessary to sustain the work, and recommend funding amounts and sources that can be used to sustain the projects.

Communication

New Mexico continued to implement the communication and marketing plan initially developed in 2014 and further refined in 2015. The plan includes communications to both internal State staff and external stakeholders. During 2016, the Early Learning NM website - - www.earlylearningnm.org continued to expand in content and serve as a resource for information on upcoming events; RTT-ELC project updates; testimonials on the impact of the work thus far; priorities and activities of the New Mexico Early Learning Advisory Council (ELAC); and information on early learning programs in order for parents to know how to access these programs and services. In addition to periodic e-newsletters issued throughout the year, a statewide stakeholder meeting was held in April to provide an update on the work accomplished thus far; reinforce how stakeholders fit into and are engaged in the system transformation; and provide input on how best to inform early childhood system partners on the progress and benefits realized thus far.

2. Raising the Quality of Early Learning Programs

Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS)

New Mexico's progress towards an aligned FOCUS-TQRIS includes agreed upon essential elements that support: family engagement; inclusive practices for children with developmental delays or disabilities; culture and language; dual language learners; promoting social relationships; Professional Qualifications; Intentional Teaching and Early Intervention Practices; Intentional Leadership; and Continuous Quality Improvement. Progress towards an aligned FOCUS-TQRIS system is being articulated and measured in sustaining our Early Learning standards within all sectors to benefit young children, families and communities. Year Four accomplishments in this area include:

- Family Child Care (FCC) providers were convened to launch a new criteria. The FOCUS FCC Criteria was created to better accommodate the unique learning environment children experience in a home center. Approximately 20 licensed programs from across the state participated in the initial launch. During the pilot phase, feedback and suggestions were welcomed from programs in order to improve the draft criteria. Additionally, a webinar orientation about the new criteria is posted on the *New Mexico Kids* website, a site designed for both early care and learning providers and families and easily accessible.
- Criteria for Out-of-School Time programs followed. The document was presented at the New Mexico Association of the Education of Young Children in March. It launched with four pilot programs in April.
- A full day event titled, *New Mexico Early Learning Institute: A Journey to Celebrate*, was held with 350 providers, consultants, administrators and higher education faculty participating. The institute highlighted and celebrated the success of quality early learning programs throughout the state. FOCUS providers shared their TQRIS journey and the knowledge they've gained in presentations and through a gallery walk.
- The FOCUS Essential Elements of Quality for State-Funded Preschool Programs was developed using the

New Mexico PreK Program Standards as the basis for the 5 Star Criteria. Thus far, all PED PreK programs are being phased into FOCUS. PreK is funded in 54 of 89 districts and 6 charter schools. Additionally, 41 of the 89 districts are fully implementing FOCUS in their Special Education and Title I preschool programming. A total of 244 New Mexico PreK, 1900 special education, and 67 Title I preschool classrooms received monthly consultative support to implement the 5 Star Criteria during 2016, while all FOCUS trainings were offered to preschool personnel and administrators in all 89 school districts and any state charter schools with preschool programs.

- New Mexico's Family Infant Toddler (FIT) program completed its Essential Element measurement tools for all Level III practices and Level II - IV scoring rubric; completed the FIT Focus document; and continued work to determine how the FIT FOCUS scoring rubric for each Essential Element of Quality rolls up into the overall program score.
- The FIT Program held its annual conference in June with over 160 participants from the 34 FIT provider agencies across the state participating. The conference focused on the work being conducted under grant to develop TQRIS. Panel discussions highlighted pilot programs underway to promote evidence-based early intervention practices through the use of video recording of home visits and the Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) Quality Rating Scale, a tool that promotes the development of functional, routines-based and family centered IFSPs.
- To support the program's Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) process, the FIT program designed a pilot to promote evidence-based early intervention practices through the use of video recording of home visits that are then reviewed in a reflective coaching session. The pilot includes utilizing the tools from the Family Guided Routines Based Intervention approach (<http://fgrbi.fsu.edu/index.html>) as part of a collaboration with Juliann Woods Ph.D. from Florida State University. Larry Edelman, from Colorado, collaborated with the FIT Program and Juliann Woods to build into the design the use of video technology.

Testimonials

"Family involvement and community engagement have been the main focus of our FOCUS. As a result, we have better relationships with our families and are giving our children a stronger sense of community whereby they are showing more initiative and improved communications in the classroom and with each other."

Beverly Stokes, Miss Bev's Child Care

"Prior to FOCUS, support for special education programs and professional development varied. FOCUS has built a foundation for high quality programs from every aspect. No matter where your child lives, through FOCUS you now have access to a quality early learning program for your child."

Alex Ruiz, UNM Training & Development Consultant

3. Investing in Communities

Early Childhood Investment

The Early Childhood Investment Zones touch every region and every border of New Mexico, and range from rural to urban population centers, covering 11 priority counties (based on child risk index) and 35 priority school districts (based on academic risk index).

The Investment Zone initiative is strategically designed to engage all sectors of the early childhood system (home visiting, FIT, early learning, Head Start, 619 special education, Title I, Pre-K, public health, and family support) to make a shared commitment to improving outcomes for young children. As a co-learning opportunity, the Family Development Program provided collaborative leadership training for effective coalition-building and immersion in *Mind in the Making: The Science of Early Learning* to support development of a common, accessible language for how young children learn and grow. The overall goal of this engagement is to establish cross-sector commitment and coalition sustainability for local communities to become fully engaged in FOCUS and its long-term investment in quality for all young children in New Mexico.

Testimonials

"Our goal is to establish a listing of resources for teachers and families that are already in existence in our

community. For example, many times resource directories include listings in Albuquerque and no one realizes that our local WIC office and pediatricians can connect families. In sustaining our work, we are reaching out to engage other community groups, like the local rotary, small business association, local newspaper, school board, etc. to share our goals and gain their support in helping us promote and sustain our early childhood investments.”

Lara Lehman, UNM Continuing Education Early Childhood Services

“We are more a frontier community than a rural community with mostly seniors now raising their grandchildren. We recently partnered with the school during their family night and had a huge turnout. We planned for 50 and had three times the amount of people attend. We are helping our families to socialize and engage more with their children.”

Alejandro Ortega, UNM Health Services & Prevention Resource Center

“We are small but a mighty group. There are five of us who consistently attend our monthly meetings to plan activities with families to reinforce the importance of reading and learning through play. Our long range goal is to have a child care center in our community.”

Jenny Warren, Guadalupe Early Childhood Home Visiting Program

4. Professional Development

Early Childhood Higher Education Task Force

New Mexico developed the Early Childhood Higher Education Task Force to establish a professional development system in New Mexico's early childhood workforce. The task force examined the competencies that guide the professional development system and accompany the early childhood licensure. Through this effort, mobile students and families will have the same requirements for licensure no matter where they go. the primary task was the successful articulation of the two-year and four-year institutions through the development of common core content and the creation of a statewide common catalog of courses.

T.E.A.C.H.® Scholarships

The scholarships are helping early childhood programs have more qualified staff and more effective programs for New Mexico's children. Some of the educators who are taking advantage of T.E.A.C.H. scholarships funded by Race to the Top are New Mexico PreK education assistants or teachers, educators working in programs involved with the new FOCUS Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (also funded by Race to the Top), parent educators and parent-teachers working with Spanish speaking parents and children, family child care home educators and teachers working in programs that are preparing to get involved with FOCUS, home visitors, early interventionists, and early childhood special education teachers in the public schools.

284 Scholarships supported by Race to the Top are listed below by distribution category:

Funders/Categories	Scholars	Percentage
RTT PED Scholars	29	10%
RTT Home Visitors	23	8%
RTT DOH Early Intervention	26	9%
RTT PhD cohort at NMSU	13	5%
RTT PhD cohort at Walden	1	0.4%
RTT CYFD Childcare	193	68%
Total	285	100%

EarlyEdU Institute

The Office of Child Development attended with University of Washington's EarlyEdU Alliance Institute, in partnership with the New Mexico Higher Education Task Force. Individuals from the CYFD, Santa Fe Community College, and the Thornburg Investment Firm were present at the two-day Institute. As a result, work began to crosswalk the EarlyEdU course syllabi to the New Mexico Universal Catalogue of Courses for Early Care, Education and Family Support. To date, two New Mexico higher education Institutes are offering the EarlyEdU courses to help students complete degrees in the Early Childhood field.

Integrated Learning Approach

The New Mexico *Integrated Learning Approach* was introduced to impact change in the field of Early Childhood by transforming professional development opportunities into dialog rich, learning-centered events that respect and value the prior experiences of the adult learner. The roll out of this approach began with a 4-day course (30 hour) event designed to introduce trainers, consultants, and coaches across the state to the NM Integrated Learning Approach.

Participants in this course shared a common goal of effectively educating, facilitating, and/or consulting with Early Childhood professionals. They strive to create situations where learning is sustained and makes a difference for children and families throughout New Mexico. As trainers and consultants, they are committed to continued growth and learning. Additionally, many of the course participants will be key to sustaining the impacts of the roll out of this new *Integrated Learning Approach in Professional Development*. All participants will apply their learning from this course to strengthen their approach with the future learning opportunities they plan and implement. Following is feedback received from roll out attendees:

Testimonials

"The response to the Integrated Learning Approach is so positive! We are witnessing more dialogue and interaction as a part of the learner application. How do we know they're learning? They're modeling it!"

"I have been using the Integrated Learning Approach in my debriefings during consultation visits. How great that this approach gives people the opportunity to empower themselves by learning through discovery, dialogue and action!"

"We organized a 2-hour session using the "4 As" from the Integrated Learning Approach - Anchor, Add, Apply and Away. The outcome was great! Participants had time for reflection, conversation and action. My colleague ran into one of the participants at another meeting and she shared that it was one of the best sessions she had ever attended!"

Training and Consultation Competencies

New Mexico's continued contract with Global Learning Partners, Inc. (GLP) to implement a training and consultation model based upon assessment and feedback obtained was further implemented in 2016. In implementing this approach, GLP introduced Dialogue Education™, a researched-based approach to working effectively with adults as well as from the proven and effective principles and practices from Early Childhood trainers and consultants. Dialogue Education™ is a structured system made up of tested principles of adult learning theory and practices based in the work of Dr. Jane Vella. The principles have demonstrated over time the ability to transform learning in most settings. These promising practices balance delivery of new information with learner's experiences through interactive, dialogue-based and hands-on involvement with the content to be learned. This system is "learning-centered" as opposed to trainer- or consultant-centered.

Participants in this course built on their actual and perceived current practices and discovered new ways to create training and consulting events that are even more meaningful to those with whom they work, thus ensuring each future event is relevant, engaging and immediately applicable. By the end of FY17, approximately 180 individuals making up 10 cohorts will have completed this course and will be working towards using the Integrated Learning Approach in their work as a facilitator of adult learning. Each cohort has cross sector representation with participants joining together to form an ongoing community of learners.

NM Pyramid Partnership for Social-Emotional Competences

To date, over 400 individuals from New Mexico have participated in “train the trainer” events to ensure that training is available on the Pyramid Framework to all early childhood practitioners in every corner of New Mexico. In addition to the work of the Master Cadre, a cross sector leadership team, known as the New Mexico Pyramid Partnership, is guiding the initiative with the intent of developing and sustaining a statewide, collaborative professional development system that further utilizes the Pyramid Framework.

5. Promoting Accountability

Early Childhood Integrated Data System (ECIDS)

Throughout 2016, New Mexico made substantial progress with promoting accountability by developing a data system that integrates data from across early learning programs serving young children to measure child outcomes over time and to enable planning for early learning investments. As with most projects of this scope and level of complexity, there were challenges to overcome in the development process. Despite the challenges, the following implementation milestones were realized:

- In January through March 2016, contract negotiations with selected software development vendors concluded; a contracted Project Manager was brought on board; and a kick off meeting was held to identify project deliverables, assumptions and a framework for implementation. Technical and Project Management strategy sessions followed the kickoff meeting.
- A shared project document repository was created and the following relevant documentation was produced: Issues/Action Items Log; Project Team Directory; Change Request Log; Risk Register; Configuration Management Items; Decision Log; Task List; Meeting Folders; Monthly Status Reports; and Project Management Plan folder.
- A multi-agency “ECIDS IT Project Team” was formed with technical leads from each source data agency. To enhance communications, regular Monday project meetings were established to include technical leads and the software development vendor.
- A series of data mapping meetings were initiated among the database architects and source data agencies to begin mapping *Essential Data Elements* to the CEDS V5 data dictionary. This was expanded to include Department of Health required data fields that are not education related.
- The above data mapping led to the development of the *Unique ID (UID)* component of the overall ECIDS data system. Data mapping and development of the Complete Data Warehouse (CDW) product followed later in the year.
- A series of meetings among the 7 ECIDS source data agencies' IT staff network were conducted to determine the best method for the ETL (extract, transform and load) procedures and to enable uniform data collection and easy entry of the Essential Data Elements by both participating state agencies and programs into the ECIDS Unique ID system and data warehouse.
- Work continued through the summer with the data governance working group drilling down to the data elements that will be used to inform the data profiles defined. Help was enlisted from New Mexico State epidemiologists in the area of GIS and defining geo-code elements to include in the ECIDS data warehouse for mapping purposes.
- The second half of 2016 was very busy with end-users resolving near matches and together resolving duplicate or shared IDs. ECIDS Unique IDs were also assigned for historical data for all data sources. Additionally, the platform was expanded as the electronic data management (eDM) software and the CDW product were loaded into the TEST environment.

EPICS Child Care and EPICS PreK Success's

As of December 31, 2016 CYFD has completed its requirement gathering, the development and the UAT User Acceptance Testing for the Child Care components and PreK in EPICS. The development of these pieces have utilized all Race to the Top (RTT-ELC) funds related to the EPICS data project - Grads 360 Task 5.5 Develop EPICS (Enterprise Provider Information Constituent Services) system for CYFD Early Childhood programs. The development of Child Care for RTT-ELC consisted of Child Care Assistance to include Intake/Application, Eligibility and Placement/Contract. Also developed was Child Care provider management to include provider certifications and their quality levels for licensed and registered providers.

These Child Care components were built to complement existing EPICS functionality to include Background Checks and the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP). By aligning these systems into EPICS we were able

to strengthen the Health and Safety for our children. All providers who will provide child care and PreK must be certified in EPICS and only those caregivers and educators that have eligible background check can provide services to our children. Various notifications have been developed to provide information to staff regarding their Back Ground Eligibility. All caregivers and educators are constantly being screened in EPICS against the NM Department of Public Safety Sex Offender Registry.

We have developed the PreK program that was being supported by a contractor into EPICS. PreK will use the same Health and Safety checks that are used for Child Care. We have developed a PreK Classroom to include Early PreK and PreK and to be broken out by classroom sessions. Teachers will have the ability to enter a child's assessments for the fall and in the spring and compare the child's results individually or by session. Various notifications have been developed to provide information to teachers so that they can manage their PreK students. EPICS PreK will track teacher's educational levels and any training they may have taken.

By aligning Child Care and Prek into EPICS we are able to follow the child's progress in one system versus the tracking of a child in silo systems. EPICS is a web based system allowing Child Care workers and PreK teachers to access the system via the World Wide Web.

The Child Care and PreK components will go into production in April 2017. We will begin using PreK for the new school year starting in July 2017.

All Child Care components including the RTT-ELC components will be in production in late 2017 for full use in January 2018.

New Mexico Indicator-Based Information System (NM-IBIS)

During calendar year 2016, work continued on IBIS-PH version 3.0. Changes to the database were fairly radical. We knew the changes would require several months of effort, and that the effects of those changes would not result in new features or functionality. The new database structure was necessary to support the types of data visualizations we desire, including the following:

- Dashboard interface, with interactivity between the charts and maps.
- User options over how data are displayed, with improved ability to make comparisons between various data dimensions, e.g., compare school district, child care center, county, or community with state values, national benchmarks, or target values.
- Allow for display of trends within dimension values, e.g., how a school district, child care center, county, or community has performed over time.
- The new database structure has been implemented and the IBIS-PH-Admin application (the interface that sits over the DB and allows staff to maintain their indicator report content) has been rewritten to conform to the new structure.

Geocoding Statewide Address File (GSAF)

The GSAF continues to gain records and accuracy as more New Mexico data records are geocoded and as counties and communities across the state improve their tax parcel files and E-911 locator files. Major improvements to the GSAF in 2016 included replacement of data resulting from the Rio Rancho address verification project (a project undertaken by the City of Rio Rancho, one of New Mexico's largest and fastest-growing communities).

A large number of duplicate records were cleaned from the GSAF in 2016. Those duplicates were largely multiple-unit housing structure. For apartment buildings and multiplexes, only one pair of geocoordinates (point) is desired. The GSAF file went from a peak of 841,583 records in October 2015 to its current total of 780,696. The reduction in the number of records did not reduce the geocoding power of the GSAF reference file. In fact, it improved its utility for automated geocoding processes because a staff member does not have to resolve those duplicates each time one is encountered during the geocoding process.

According to the most recent American Community Survey, New Mexico had 914,979 housing units in 2015. Of those, 761,797 were occupied units, and 141,969 were multiple-unit structures (requiring only one geocode for anywhere from 2 to 20+ units). In addition, we had 140,131 commercial addresses in 2014. Those numbers suggest that a 100% complete GSAF file would include about 939,400 address records, and that our current GSAF appears to be about 83% complete.

The NM GSAF geocoding process is now matching 90% of a statewide sample of New Mexico Public Education Department's STARS database without manual intervention.

DOH has implemented an ArcGIS server that will permit web-enabled use of the GSAF for geocoding of data records.

6. Supporting Schools in Meeting Each Child's Needs

Kindergarten Observation Tool (KOT)

As part of our comprehensive plan to ensure that all New Mexico students have the opportunity to succeed in school, the Kindergarten Observation Tool (KOT) was developed to help teachers better understand a child's strength in learning, well-being, social development, and conceptual understanding at the beginning of school.

In 2016, all New Mexico public, charter and K-3 Plus kindergarten programs implemented the KOT within the first 30 days of this school year, with all final data being submitted by October 15, 2016. This accomplishment includes:

- 1,447 teachers completed their participation in the KOT;
- 22,073 students statewide had Final Ratings submitted; and
- 89 school districts, 23 state charter schools, and numerous district charter schools received PED technical assistance, support and guidance during the full implementation.

Additionally, key improvements to the KOT Application (KOTA) and its' server were made prior to full implementation based on field test participants' feedback. Data from KOT field testing was used to conduct a set of further analyses and validation. One area that continues to be a focus for ensuring the KOT positively impacts early learning throughout the state is communication with stakeholders. We learned from this implementation that we focused intensely on communicating directly with teachers in the field, but not with the school and district leaders who are also affected by the KOT. Teachers requested more intentional training and communication with principals and district leaders. Informing the leaders about the purpose and structure of the KOT would further support the teachers in the field administering the KOT in their classrooms

The KOT team recognizes that sustainability will be essential for the KOT to remain a positive force in early childhood education in the state of New Mexico. Without additional funding sources, the KOT runs the risk of being implemented without fidelity. Without fidelity to the proper administration of the KOT, the data runs the risk of being invalid. So much is hinging on the KOT being the first opportunity to collect quality data in public education in our state. Therefore, sustainability efforts are ongoing including legislating for funds to retain the efforts gained through the RTT-ELC grant.

Testimonials

"KOT is really easy to use. It's a testimony to how much care they took in developing the online application for us teachers who do not have the technical background. With KOT, I can now demonstrate where a child is developmentally and immediately begin to address their individual needs."

Dana Pacewicz, Albuquerque, NM

"When I at first saw we needed to observe 27 rubrics, I thought how time consuming this was going to be. In reality, KOT helped me zero in on where my students are in each of the different developmental areas. It helped me to see and understand more clearly the whole child right at the start of the school year."

Amy Hurley, Corrales, NM

"With KOT, I was able to group my class according to their needs and quickly be able to bring the entire class upto speed ... behaviorally and academically. In early education, it is so important to look at the whole child and with KOT I am able to validate my observations."

Jessica Southard, Clovis, NM

"KOT helped me document and confirm right away what I had thought in my initial observation. As a result, I was able to make sure each student received the appropriate intervention immediately. I have to admit, at first I was not thrilled with administering another assessment. I quickly understood it's not a test, it's a valuable tool to guide instruction and intervention that can actually prevent a child from spiraling downward."

Lexi Romero, Maxwell, NM

Successful State Systems

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

Governance Structure

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

New Mexico's Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) governance structure continues to be stable and strong in 2016. New Mexico's partnership with the participating agencies of: Public Education Department, Department of Health and Children, Youth and Families Department has been a successful coordination of efforts to ensure the progression of the RTT-ELC work.

The NM Early Childhood Advisory Council (ELAC) is still pro-active in its effort to support the RTT-ELC projects.

Stakeholder Involvement

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

Central to New Mexico's ongoing quality journey is a commitment to Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) at all levels. FOCUS stakeholders identify strengths and challenges of the TQRIS system in an ongoing fashion and therefore inform and influence improvements every day.

To ensure the new FOCUS Family Child Care criteria reflected input from the field, several work groups were held. The work groups included members from UNM FOCUS, TTAP, and the Office of Child Development including Home Visiting and Quality. Preliminary feedback was given by FCC providers at various statewide events.

In April, approximately 75 individuals who are engaged in various aspects of New Mexico's early learning system came together at the Indian Cultural Center in Albuquerque to hear updates on projects initiated through the Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge (RTT -ELC) grant and to share how best to move this work forward together. There were four panel presentations on the work currently underway and intended outcomes towards building a strong foundation for New Mexico. The presentations can be found on the [Early Learning New Mexico](#) website.

As a result of the FOCUS Cross Sector meetings, Child Trends worked with the FIT FOCUS steering committee to help plan for their Stakeholder event. The FIT team presented the FOCUS criteria to their stakeholder group for feedback at the event. Child Trends prepared a brief presentation to provide an overview of the goals and

lessons learned from QRIS implementation across the country.

New Mexico partnered with the Policy Equity Group to develop a sustainability plan. A defined goal of the plan is to actively engage the Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) stakeholders in discussion, building support for the plan in 2017. Stakeholders include agencies, organizations, philanthropy, advocacy groups, practitioners and parents involved in the state's RTT-ELC implementation.

Proposed Legislation, Policies, or Executive Orders

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

During the 2016 30-day Legislative Session (January 19 - February 18, 2016) the following proposed Memorial related to Early Childhood was introduced and passed.

(SJM 1) RECONVENE J. PAUL TAYLOR CHILDHOOD TASK FORCE- This Memorial is to reconvene the J. Paul Taylor Early Childhood Task Force in order to continue working to improve collaboration among stakeholders and developing further early childhood behavioral health and child abuse prevention plans.

Participating State Agencies

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

The RTT -ELC Governance Team meets on a regular basis to discuss RTT-ELC issues and Early Childhood matters. The Governance Team also meets with the Cabinet Secretaries to review and discuss decisions about programs, policies and decisions that promote positive outcomes (sustainability, ongoing projects,communications). These meetings represent the commitment and participation from the (3) agencies beyond the RTT Grant.

PED will continue to support the implementation of FOCUS in NM PreK classrooms through training and consultation. Without further funding from the RTT-ELC, consultation will not be provided for Special Education and Title 1 preschool classrooms after June 30, 2017. NM PreK will allow Special Education and Title 1 preschool staff to attend training when space permits.

DUE TO FORMATTING ISSUES, THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK

High-Quality, Accountable Programs

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Developing and Adopting a Statewide TQRIS - Progress Made

The New Mexico Early Learning Guidelines and the goals they outline for children's growth and development provide a common outcome that programs are striving to achieve. Yet, it is clear that the services and strategies to support children and their families differ in important ways across the sectors. Identifying the essential elements of quality services provided across the early childhood system can provide a unifying framework for an integrated system. Early childhood public policy reforms in New Mexico are built upon the belief that families and communities must be the platform from which all efforts are launched. We believe that all work must be informed by and driven by a deep respect for the diverse values and cultures of New Mexico's families.

Although New Mexico has been at the forefront of the movement to create standards within the early childhood system, it has taken great care to ensure that these standards do not impose the standardization of practice upon individual children, their families, or the communities where they live. Rather, it is the State's experience that these standards provide a framework in which programs are able to flourish and implement unique and appropriate programs that are based on the strengths of each community. This way, community specific programs are able to reflect and preserve the history, culture, language, and traditions to support and strengthened each and every child's success.

The ultimate goal of these efforts is to ensure that families, programs and practitioners have an equitable understanding of how to seek and access quality programs and services across the early learning system.

Central to New Mexico's ongoing quality journey is a commitment to Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) at all levels. The FOCUS criteria and consultation model was reviewed as a part of the CQI process. Feedback was gathered through on site observations and provider and community interviews. The Consultation and Verification process will be revised in 2017 with the following components in mind: approach, consistency, content, documentation and time-lines.

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

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

FOCUS, New Mexico's third generation of Tiered Rating Quality Improvement System (TQRIS) has continued to grow and respond to the needs of early childhood programs statewide. All FOCUS work supports the goal of increased, sustainable quality in those programs in order to provide New Mexico children and families the best possible early childhood experience. Central to this ongoing quality journey is a commitment to Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) at all levels.

There have been, and will continue to be, ongoing efforts to address the below progress. As FOCUS aligns with other early childhood service programs, pooling resources and revising procedures, program and infrastructure needs will be met with increasing efficiency.

Progress in promoting participation in TRQIS:

- FOCUS has 315 active programs with 5-15 new programs applying each month.

- 125 programs have been verified, as indicated:

- 3 Star = 72
- 4 Star = 28
- 5 Star = 25

Many of these programs have either re-verified at their current Star level or advanced a Star level indicating commitment to the TQRIS process and sustainability.

*51 programs moved up since the last reporting:

- 14 Star 2 to 3
- 13 Star 3 to 4
- 24 Star 4 to 5

- Revisions to some of the verification criteria based on program feedback, UNM staff experience, and the Children, Youth and Families Department's analysis. These changes have been well received by the provider community.
- Continued engagement in rigorous professional development by UNM FOCUS staff including:
 - Online training, initial and refresher courses, on Program Assessment tools such as ERS, CLASS, PAS and BAS.
 - The intensive New Mexico Integrated Learning Approach training
- Shadowing consultants in other training and consultation programs
- Increased competence and confidence using technology for training and consulting
- Broadening knowledge of tools and approaches for consulting on the Authentic Observation Documentation and Curriculum Planning process (AODCP)
- Participating in service alignment efforts such as partnering with New Mexico PreK to offer integrated consultation services
- Participating in multi and trans-disciplinary teams in order to help programs who are most at risk

[NMTQRIS Web Application](#)

The NMTQRIS Web Application is the database of record for all data related to both active and inactive FOCUS programs in the State of New Mexico.

NMTQRIS stores the following data:

- 394 FOCUS programs (both active and inactive)
- 66 user accounts
 - Internal users - FOCUS Consultants, FOCUS Verifiers, FOCUS Program Managers, and System Administrators;
 - External users - FOCUS program directors and /or FOCUS designees
- 400 people records
- 142 verification ratings records
- 232 weekly time tracker records

The NMTQRIS web application serves prospective and current programs, participating state agency staff, FOCUS Verifiers, Program Managers and Consultants.

NMTQRIS has an on-line application that is high quality, professional, and fully responsive to all mobile devices for prospective programs interested in FOCUS. Current FOCUS programs are also able to update their own data, upload documents and reviewed posts uploaded by consultants and verifiers.

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c)

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

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c): Increasing the number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the statewide TQRIS.										
Targets: Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	39	100%	39	100%	39	100%	39	100%	39	100%
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	35	90%	35	94%	35	96%	35	91%	35	100%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	35	0%	35	0%	35	8%	35	24%	35	25%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	667	0%	667	25%	667	50%	667	75%	667	100%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	67	0%	67	0%	67	50%	67	100%	67	100%
Programs receiving CCDF funds	2,215	32%	2,215	37%	2,215	61%	2,215	64%	2,215	44%
Other 1	20	0%	20	10%	20	25%	20	50%	20	100%
<i>Describe:</i>	Home Visiting									
Other 2	28	0%	28	15%	28	22%	28	49%	28	71%
<i>Describe:</i>	State-funded preschool - PreK CYFD; PreK Providers in FACTS									
Other 3										
<i>Describe:</i>										

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

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

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

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

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

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

Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline			Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four		
	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool	39	39	100%	39	0	0%	39	39	100%	196	196	100%	145	145	100%
<i>Specify:</i>	PreK PED														
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	35	30	85%	35	32	91%	35	32	91%	35	32	91%	35	30	85%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	35	35	0%	34	0	0%	34	0	0%	34	8	24%	34	11	29.4%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	667	667	0%	667	0	0%	667	0	0%	499	147	29%	450	301	67%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	67	67	0%	67	0	0%	67	0	0%	17	17	100%	67	67	100%
Programs receiving CCDF funds	2,215	712	32%	2,215	813	37%	1,567	962	61%	1,482	947	64%	1,356	959	71%
Other 1	20	20	0%	26	0	0%	24	0	0%	27	10	38%	12	30	40%
<i>Describe:</i>	Home Visiting														
Other 2	28	28	0%	28	6	15%	101	22	22%	65	32	49%	134	130	97%
<i>Describe:</i>	State-funded preschool - PreK CYFD; PreK Providers in FACTS														
Other 3															
<i>Describe:</i>															

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

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

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

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

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

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

As we educate school personnel on the benefits and mechanics of inclusive settings, and provide the means of connecting with both public school NM PreK, private and non-profit child care centers and Head Start programs, many more districts are placing children in these programs as LRE and providing special education teachers and ancillary staff to serve the child in these classrooms per the IEP. This has resulted in a reduction in the numbers of children in self-contained special education classrooms.

Participation in FOCUS has been added to the CYFD PreK Contracts. Programs will have one year to enroll in FOCUS after the date the contracts are signed. Early PreK for 3 year olds are also part of the FOCUS TQRIS and have been counted as PreK numbers.

Child Care TQRIS includes FOCUS, Aim High and Nationally Accredited programs participating in New Mexico's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System.

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

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

There are continuous efforts to increase participation in TQRIS by Head Start programs. Work groups are getting together to coordinate the efforts.

Participation in FOCUS has been added to the Home Visiting contracts. Programs will have one year to enroll in FOCUS after full implementation and after signing the contract; whichever comes first.

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

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

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

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

The New Mexico Early Learning (FOCUS) Cross Sector Leadership Team has been established as a way to ensure an aligned FOCUS TQRIS for the State in the following ways:

- o Identify and define the quality elements that are essential for the New Mexico Early Learning System across sectors.
- o Examine how the sectors may develop a common quality framework that can be articulated and measured, monitored, and/or supported:
- o Benefit children, families, program leaders, early childhood educators, practitioners, and early childhood service providers consistently across sectors.

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

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

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

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

Improving the Quality of the Early Learning and Development Programs - Progress Made

New Mexico's development of quality elements and criteria for classroom based early learning programs are being validated by Child Trends a nationally recognized agency with expertise in TQRIS. Each early learning community provider is assigned a consultant that helps them meet the criteria through training and coaching and who assists the provider agency to establish a Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) system.

The CQI approach supports the program in conducting:

- o a self-assessment of their quality;
- o implementing planned changes / improvements;
- o measuring the effectiveness of the changes / improvements; and making the adjustments needed

The FIT program collected data on the implementation of the Individualized Family Service Plan Quality Rating Scale. The previously validated scale was used by the FIT program Family Service Coordinators from eight FIT provider agencies and by an external rater for 252 initial Individualized Family Service Plans. Inter-rater reliability reached an average of 95% indicating that the Family Service Coordinators have improved their knowledge in what should be included in a high quality IFSP.

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

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

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1): Increasing the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS.					
Targets					
	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
Total number of programs enrolled in the TQRIS	1,027	882	832	782	732
Number of programs in Tier 1	75	75	75	75	75
Number of programs in Tier 2	262	531	498	465	432
Number of programs in Tier 3	59	50	47	44	41
Number of programs in Tier 4	83	70	66	62	57
Number of programs in Tier 5	184	156	146	137	127
Number of programs enrolled but not yet rated					

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1): Increasing the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS.					
Actuals					
	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
Total number of programs enrolled in the TQRIS	1,027	1,027	998	986	989
Number of programs in Tier 1	75	75	36	32	30
Number of programs in Tier 2	262	412	633	608	579
Number of programs in Tier 3	59	71	72	86	92
Number of programs in Tier 4	83	63	73	80	84
Number of programs in Tier 5	184	174	184	180	204
Number of programs enrolled but not yet rated					

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

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

No FIT provider agencies participating in FIT FOCUS have yet been verified.

Data Includes programs participating in the AIM High TQRIS. There were no programs verified using FOCUS TQRIS during Year Two of the project. Verification of programs at the 3 STAR began in March 2014. The data above includes all provider from Basic Licensure (STAR level 2) and 2+ thru STAR level 5.

Child Care TQRIS includes FOCUS, Aim High and nationally Accredited programs participating in New Mexico's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System.

PreK data includes special education and Title 1 programs participating in FOCUS and all NM PreK programs. Verification began in February, 2017.

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

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

Data Includes programs participating in the AIM High TQRIS. There were no programs verified using FOCUS TQRIS during Year Two of the project. Verification of programs at the 3 STAR began in March 2014. The data above includes all provider from Basic Licensure and STAR level 2 and 2+ thru STAR level 5.

No PED programs were verified during year 4. Verification for 5-STAR began in February 2017.

Targets have been met and in some cases exceeded.

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"?

PED defines its "highest tiers" by expanding upon the highly successful NM PreK Program Standards.

Under the revised TQRIS (FOCUS), the STAR levels are defined as follows:

2+ STAR - Pilot programs moving from Basic 2 STAR level to 3 STAR level, implementing criteria designed for 2+ FOCUS within a determined time (years 1 and 2);

3 STAR - Quality Standards added for Assessment, Staff Qualifications, Full Participation of each child, continuous Quality Improvement process;

4 STAR - Additional Quality Standards;

5 STAR - Higher standards, Accreditation by an approved entity

DUE TO FORMATTING ISSUES, THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK

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

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

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(2): Increasing the number and percentage of Children with High Needs who are enrolled in Early Learning and Development Programs that are in the top tiers of the TQRIS.										
Targets: Number and percent of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	1,463	61%	1,463	61%	1,600	67%	1,700	71%	1,800	76%
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	3,842	37%	4,362	42%	4,673	45%	4,985	48%	5,192	50%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1,389	25%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	0	0%	1,156	25%	2,510	50%	3,765	75%	5,021	100%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	0	0%	1,693	25%	3,387	50%	5,082	75%	6,775	100%
Programs receiving CCDF funds	5,202	27%	5,735	29%	6,022	31%	8,317	48%	6,639	34%
Other 1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	279	25%
<i>Describe:</i>	Home Visiting									
Other 2	0	0%	765	30%	1,276	50%	1,772	48%	1,914	75%
<i>Describe:</i>	State Funded Preschool, CYFD PreK									

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Type of Early Learning and Development Programs in the State	Baseline			Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four		
	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%	# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool	2,365	1,463	61%	2,365	0	0%	5,127	0	0%	5,407	5,407	100%	5,541	3,103	56%
<i>Specify:</i>	Pre K PED														
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	10,385	3,842	37%	9,155	3,662	40%	9,155	3,662	40%	9,155	3,662	40%	10,478	4,700	44%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	5,556	0	0%	13,478	0	0%	13,478	0	0%	13,478	5,430	40%	14,074	7,683	54.6%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	5,021	0	0%	5,021	0	0%	5,021	0	0%	341	1,176	29%	4,192	4,192	100%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	6,775	0	0%	6,775	0	0%	6,775	0	0%	826	826	100%	7,734	7,734	100%
Programs receiving CCDF funds	19,417	5,202	27%	17,993	5,844	32%	17,084	3,346	20%	17,328	8,317	48%	18,573	3,715	20%
Other 1	1,117	0	0%	1,489	0	0%	1,950	0	0%	3,158	0	0%	5,305	3,501	66%
<i>Describe:</i>	Home Visiting														
Other 2	2,552	0	0%	1,276	0	0%	3,198	672	21%	3,686	1,772	48%	3,005	1,442	48%
<i>Describe:</i>	State Funded Preschool, CYFD PreK														

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

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

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

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

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

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

PED's data are actuals and were gathered from both the NM PreK database and PED STARS student information system.

All preschool children in Title 1 and prechool programs and IDEA, Part B, Section 619 classrooms are children with high needs.

Home visiting is implementing a CQI system called "Onda". Onda (*latin for undo=wave/ripple*) uses the principle that everything we do and think affects the people in our lives and their reactions in turn affect others. Through the New Mexico Home Visiting Onda-CQI process, we hope to achieve a systemic change in the program and practices that will "ripple" to benefit overall our children and their families. Currently, porgrams are participating in CQI, which is a main component of the Home Visiting FOCUS criteria. Participating in FOCUS has been added to the Home Visiting contracts and programs will have one year to enroll in FOCUS after signing the contract.

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

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

PED met all targets.

CYFD has developed several strategies to recruit, support and coordinate participation of Head Start and Early Head Start programs in FOCUS. The process of validation for the New Mexico Assessment System to meet the requirements set forth by the Head Start Performance Standards is almost complete. In addition, CYFD is in the process of hiring the CYFD Head Start Collaboration Office Director that will support programs in their participation in the State's initiatives including FOCUS.

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

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

Child Trends is conducting a validation process of New Mexico's FOCUS TQRIS and Child Care criteria. Once the validation information gathering has been finalized, a final report will be presented by Fall, 2017. In addition Child Trends is working with all three Departments: PED, CYFD and DOH in the validation and alignment of the FOCUS criteria and effectiveness in assessing quality at each level.

The FIT Program is working with Child Trends to develop an evaluation for the FIT FOCUS criteria to address three target areas:

Feasibility and Implementation of the FOCUS criteria and outcomes for practitioners and families. In addition, the FIT Program is evaluating our IFSP Quality Indicator with support from the national technical assistance group funded by the Office of Special Education Programs, US Department of Education. They are assisting us in

evaluating the results of the implementation of the IFSP Quality Rating Scale for short, intermediate and long term outcomes. For this study, the FIT program is currently conducting administrator interviews and practitioner surveys to collect data on the perceptions of how the IFSP Quality Rating Scale and related technical assistance has influenced or changed practitioner practices and the degree of program support that is need to develop high quality IFSPs. A family survey is under development.

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

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

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

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

Promoting Early Learning Outcomes

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

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

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

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

Early Learning Guidelines

To ensure that our children continue their path of success in school and in life, the Early Learning Guidelines (ELG) are being reviewed and updated. Community dialogue was held across the state to allow stakeholders to participate in the process.

The proposed updates to the ELGs were developed by members of the University of New Mexico, Children, Youth and Families and Public Education Department with assistance from a national early childhood research entity (West Ed).

The proposed updates were based on several factors:

- 1) Alignment with the Kindergarten Entry expectations
- 2) Feedback from ELG users
- 3) New research in child development and learning
- 4) Need for language clarification
- 5) Alignment with Common Core State Standards

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

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

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

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

In a joint effort, New Mexico has worked with Child Trends to address the following research questions:

- What are the experiences of directors and teacher who receive FOCUS consultation?
- What activities in FOCUS are working well to support programs?
- How effective are the FOCUS Essential Elements of Quality working to identify high-quality practices, such as promoting the full participation of each child and intentional teaching?
- How well does the FOCUS verification and rating process working to identify programs at different levels of quality?
- What are the experiences of directors and teacher who receive FOCUS consultation?
- What activities in FOCUS are working well to support programs?
- What improvements can be recommended for the system?

To answer the research questions, Child Trends' collected data from programs participating in FOCUS. Data collection included program observations, interviews, surveys, and assessments of children's development. Child Trends recruited 67 programs as part of the sample, which included 73 Preschool classrooms and 38 Toddler Classrooms, with a total of 430 children participating. The results of the study will be shared on the [New Mexico Kids website](#) when they are available at the end of 2017.

Analysis was also conducted to determine levels of quality in the implementation of the Authentic Observation Documentation and Curriculum Planning (AODCP) process, child gains, classroom quality, and how quality levels of AODCP implementation relate to child outcomes and classroom quality.

Health Promotion (Section C(3) of Application)

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

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

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

New Mexico addressed health and safety requirements specified in the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014, providing an overview of health and safety training requirements for center based and home-based child care settings meeting the new Federal requirements. This was an opportunity to build out quality in Health Promotion as it relates to health standards.

The New Mexico Early Learning System (NMELS)

The priority for NMELS was to provide on-line access to the federally mandated offering, Health and Safety Orientation, to approximately 13,000 educators statewide. The English version of NMELS went live in September and the Spanish version followed in October. NMELS made the online version of the Health and Safety Orientation available to all early childhood educators in New Mexico. To date, the NMELS has 10,782 users, including educators who have attended FOCUS trainings over the past four years. Of those 10,782 users, 2,725 have completed the on-line English version of the Health and Safety Orientation and 91 have completed the online Spanish version. The NMELS also captured face-to-face offerings of the Health and Safety Orientation, and to date 4,660 educators have completed the face-to-face training.

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d)

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

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d): Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual statewide targets.					
Baseline and Annual Targets					
	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
Number of Children with High Needs screened		28,000	28,500	29,000	29,500
Number of Children with High Needs referred for services who received follow-up/treatment	1,650	1,700	1,750	1,800	1,850
Number of Children with High Needs who participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well child care	4,000	4,250	4,500	4,750	5,000
Of these participating children, the number or percentage of children who are up-to-date in a schedule of well child care					

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d): Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual statewide targets.					
Actuals					
	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
Number of Children with High Needs screened					
Number of Children with High Needs referred for services who received follow-up/treatment	1,650	1,700	1,700		
Number of Children with High Needs who participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well child care	4,000	4,000	4,000		
Of these participating children, the number or percentage of children who are up-to-date in a schedule of well child care					

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d) Data Notes

Please 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.

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d) Target Notes

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

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

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

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

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

Development of Dual Language competencies in the areas to addresses the knowledge and skills that early childhood educators need in order to support children and families.

Ensuring the following:

- Cultural Competence Plan
 - Staff evaluation and support
 - Family involvement
 - Culturally appropriate practices
 - TA to support improvement

Providing a series of Full Participation Course Trainings, ELG Cohorts Family Engagement Series

The PED Preschool FOCUS criteria clearly delineates expectations for the Full Participation of each and every child and his/her family.

PED has developed a series of Full Participation trainings to promote family engagement, culturally and linguistically-appropriate practices, inclusion of each and every child, and social-emotional development. These trainings are a FOCUS requirement and build from PED's highly successful December 2015 Full Participation Institute.

Early Childhood Education Workforce

Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and progression of credentials.

(Section D(1) of Application)

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

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

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

Higher Education Taskforce

Task Force will began to examine the competencies that guide the entire professional development system and accompany the Early Childhood licensure. Additionally, our two-year and four-year institutions are developing a common core content and creating a statewide common catalog of courses. This universal curriculum in early childhood teacher preparatory programs is anchored in the teacher competencies and are articulated in the common core content, consisting of 21 professional courses with universal course titles, course descriptions, and course competencies. Suggestions and/or recommendations will be provided for possible class assignments.

Center for Development and Disability

The Center for Development and Disability, University of New Mexico, the training and technical assistance entity that provides support to the Early Intervention Programs, has aligned training content with the criteria of the FIT FOCUS work and participates in the development of training strategies to promote consistent messaging about the Essential Indicators in the FIT FOCUS criteria.


NM Pyramid Partnership for Social-Emotional Competences

Integration of the Pyramid Framework with other related promotion, prevention, intervention, and treatment efforts is designed to assure New Mexico practitioners learn how best to promote social emotional wellness and to understand the impact of nurturing relationships on children's capacity to learn. Over the last 12 months, a Master Cadre of 10 trainers strive to bring additional high quality professional development to the field of early learning. The Master Cadre has offered several multi-day "train the trainer" sessions based on the work of the federally-funded Center on the Social Emotional Foundations for Early Learning (CSEFEL).

To date, over 400 individuals from New Mexico have participated in "train the trainer" events to ensure that training is available on the Pyramid Framework to all early childhood practitioners in every corner of New Mexico. In addition to the work of the Master Cadre, a cross sector leadership team, known as the New Mexico Pyramid Partnership, is guiding the initiative with the intent of developing and sustaining a statewide, collaborative professional development system that further utilizes the Pyramid Framework.

Scholarships T.E.A.C.H.

The Race to the Top grant has provided a huge impetus to increased education in the early care and education programs for children birth to 5 in New Mexico, through special PhD and Master's cohorts, as well as through greatly increasing the numbers and the diversity of educators seeking Associate and Bachelor degrees in Early Childhood Education. The scholarships are helping early childhood programs have more qualified staff and more effective programs for New Mexico's children.

Some of the educators who are taking advantage of T.E.A.C.H. scholarships funded by Race to the Top are New Mexico PreK education assistants or teachers, educators working in programs involved with the new FOCUS 

Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (also funded by Race to the Top), parent educators and parent-teachers working with Spanish speaking parents and children, family child care home educators and teachers working in programs that are preparing to get involved with FOCUS, home visitors, early interventionists, and early childhood special education teachers in the public schools.

Testimonials for Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge Funded T.E.A.C.H. Scholarships

Kathy Theriot, who grew up in Roswell, NM was working in social services with adolescents when a friend told her of the opportunity to join the field of early intervention as a home visitor, and to engage with children and families on the opposite end of the developmental continuum. She was a little intimidated at first because it had been awhile since she had studied child development. But when her director, a graduate of the TEACH program, encouraged her to enroll in an Infant Family Studies Certificate program with the support of TEACH and she learned more about the certificate and the scholarship while attending a FIT conference, she leaped at the opportunity.

Her studies in the certificate program have dramatically changed her perspective on child growth and development from an evaluative model using milestones and checklists of discreet skills to a much broader holistic view that includes social development and places more importance on the quality of relationships.

Having earned the Infant Family Studies certificate, Kathy feels more confident professionally and is happy where she is, working with children and families and gaining more experience. One of her professional goals is to develop skills as a reflective practitioner.

Kathy is appreciative of the opportunity to better herself and see her colleagues benefit as well in a community of learners. She is grateful to her TEACH counselor for helping her navigate the scholarship process and college classes and achieve her certificate in three semesters.



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

(Section D(2) of Application)

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

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

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

The RTT grant has enhance the involvement of early childhood educators of children ages birth to 5 in seeking degrees in early childhood education. The diversity of the early childhood educators eligible for T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood® Scholarships has been expanded due to the grant and now includes home visitors, Part C Early Intervention personnel, and early childhood special education preschool staff. 284 Scholarships supported by Race to the Top are listed below by distribution category:

Funders/Categories	Scholars	Percentage
RTT PED Scholars	29	10%
RTT Home Visitors	23	8%
RTT DOH Early Intervention	26	9%
RTT PhD cohort at NMSU	13	5%

RTT PhD cohort at Walden	1	0.4%
RTT CYFD Childcare	193	68%
Total	285	100%

Training and Consultation Competencies

Integrated Learning Approach

New Mexico contracted with Global Learning Partners, Inc. for the implementation of a training and consultation model, the Integrated Learning Approach (ILA). An advisory group of six anchors was formed. This group of six experienced New Mexico Early Childhood Services trainers and consultants worked with and advised Global Learning Partners throughout the length of the project. The group:

- Identified Key Trainers and Consultants to participate in the pilot of the customized courses.
- Established High Level Training for Trainers and for Consultants based upon the agreed upon competencies in the early childhood field.
- Customized course(s) to draw upon a developed, flexible and widely tested approach to adult learning called Dialogue Education.

The New Mexico ILA seeks to impact change in the field of Early Childhood by transforming professional development opportunities into dialog rich, learning-centered events that respect and value the prior experiences of the adult learner.

Participants in the course build on their current practices, discovering new ways to create training and consulting events, ensuring that each event is relevant, engaging and immediately applicable. By the end of July 2017, approximately 180 individuals will have completed the course and be using the ILA in their work as a facilitator of adult learning.

The course was designed for professionals in various early childhood programs to support alignment across the state. They will also be offered on-line in effort to increase access to learning opportunities.

NM Pyramid Partnership for Social-Emotional Competences

To date, over 400 individuals from New Mexico have participated in “train the trainer” events to ensure that training is available on the Pyramid Framework to all early childhood practitioners in every corner of New Mexico. In addition to the work of the Master Cadre, a cross sector leadership team, known as the New Mexico Pyramid Partnership, is guiding the initiative with the intent of developing and sustaining a statewide, collaborative professional development system that further utilizes the Pyramid Framework.

PED provides training in critical areas as a part of the FOCUS requirements. Over 400 participants have completed the 3-day Pyramid Social-Emotional Development training and over 440 participants have completed the 3-day LETRS-Early childhood literacy training.

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

In the tables below, indicate State progress toward meeting ambitious yet achievable targets for: Increasing the number of postsecondary institutions and professional development providers with programs that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and the number of Early Childhood Educators who receive credentials from postsecondary institutions and professional development providers that are aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

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

Baseline and Annual Targets					
	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
Total number of "aligned" institutions and providers	18	20	21	21	21
Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider	274	375	400	475	500

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.

Actuals					
	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
Total number of "aligned" institutions and providers	18	20	20	21	21
Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider	274	565	570	763	780

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

The data is reported by the Office of Child Development (OCD), Child Development Certificate (CDC), Associates of Arts (AA) and Bachelor of Arts (BA) tracking systems, and by institutions of Higher Education (the number of degrees awarded).

Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(1) Target Notes

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

All targets met.

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

In the tables below, indicate State progress toward meeting ambitious yet achievable targets for: Increasing the number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who are progressing to higher levels of credentials that align with the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework.

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.										
Baseline and Annual Targets										
Progression of credentials (Aligned to Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework)	<i>Number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who have moved up the progression of credentials, aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, in the prior year</i>									
	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
<Select Progression>	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Credential Type 1	18,613	25%	21,000	27%	22,000	28%	24,000	29%	26,000	30%
<i>Specify:</i>	45 Hour									
Credential Type 2	168	0.05%	225	0.06%	300	0.06%	350	0.08%	400	0.09%
<i>Specify:</i>	Child Development Certificate									
Credential Type 3	134	0.05%	145	0.05%	150	0.05%	155	0.05%	160	0.05%
<i>Specify:</i>	Vocational Certificate									
Credential Type 4	196	0.13%	300	0.14%	400	0.15%	500	0.16%	600	0.17%
<i>Specify:</i>	Associate Degree									
Credential Type 5	57	0.05%	125	0.12%	200	0.13%	300	0.14%	350	0.15%
<i>Specify:</i>	Bachelor's Early Childhood									
Credential Type 6	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<i>Specify:</i>	Bachelor's Family Infant Toddler Studies									
Credential Type 7	20	0.02%	0	0%	45	0.03%	55	0.04%	65	0.05%
<i>Specify:</i>	Master's Degree									
Credential Type 8										
<i>Specify:</i>										
Credential Type 9										
<i>Specify:</i>										
Credential Type 10										
<i>Specify:</i>										
Credential Type 11										
<i>Specify:</i>										
Credential Type 12										
<i>Specify:</i>										
Credential Type 13										
<i>Specify:</i>										

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

Actuals

Progression of credentials (Aligned to Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework)	<i>Number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who have moved up the progression of credentials, aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, in the prior year</i>									
	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
<Select Progression>	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Credential Type 1	18,613	25%	19,568	26%	20,658	27%	1,517	20%	1,001	10%
<i>Specify:</i>	45 Hour									
Credential Type 2	168	0.05%	231	0.07%	329	0.1%	289	0.1%	744	70%
<i>Specify:</i>	Child Development Certificate									
Credential Type 3	134	0.05%	148	0.06%	161	0.07%	167	0.1%	12	0.8%
<i>Specify:</i>	Vocational Certificate									
Credential Type 4	196	0.13%	372	0.25%	466	2.5%	502	3%	473	4.5%
<i>Specify:</i>	Associate Degree									
Credential Type 5	57	0.05%	156	0.14%	160	0.14%	198	2%	253	2.14%
<i>Specify:</i>	Bachelor's Early Childhood									
Credential Type 6	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	27	0.04%
<i>Specify:</i>	Bachelor's Family Infant Toddler Studies									
Credential Type 7	20	0.02%	36	0.03%	40	0.05%	44	0.5%	48	6%
<i>Specify:</i>	Master's Degree									
Credential Type 8										
<i>Specify:</i>										
Credential Type 9										
<i>Specify:</i>										
Credential Type 10										
<i>Specify:</i>										
Credential Type 11										
<i>Specify:</i>										
Credential Type 12										
<i>Specify:</i>										
Credential Type 13										
<i>Specify:</i>										

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

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

The data is actual as reported by the Office of Child Development database that includes the 45 hour Entry level Course, the New Mexico Child Development Certificate, the Associate Certificates tracking system, the Home Visiting Tracking system, the PreK teacher tracking and by institutions of High Education.

Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2) Target Notes

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

All targets were met with the exception of the 45 hour course due to the course being a part of the Child Development Certificate and it is counted towards the necessary coursework to obtain the certificate. New Mexico has entered into a contract with the New Mexico Association for the Education of Young children (NMAEYC) to provide T.E.A.C.H. scholarships to enhance current state efforts on supporting the early childhood professional development. RTT-ELC funds are being used to increase scholarships to those whom T.E.A.C.H. scholarships were previously unavailable, including early intervention staff, college faculty, mentor/trainers, parents, educators and home visitors.

As traditionally done, T.E.A.C.H. scholarships are offered to early care and education teachers and directors of early learning programs. Scholarships are also used to provide for a cohort of New Mexico students to obtain a Masters degree in early childhood education from Erikson Institute in Chicago, IL.

Measuring Outcomes and Progress

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

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

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

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

Validity and Reliability

- 1. Descriptive information about the tested population:** Synthesis of general information collected from teachers, during testing, about the demographic characteristics of the sample of children tested.
 - a. 5,186 children participated in KOT field testing. Of these, teachers reported the following characteristics:
 - i. 49% were female and 51% were male.
 - ii. 64% were eligible for free/reduced lunch, and 36% were not eligible.
 - iii. 50% were Hispanic, 27% were White, and 17% were American Indian/Alaska Native.
- 2. Inter-rater reliability:** Rates of agreement calculated by comparing (a) judgments made by kindergarten teachers about students' performance after viewing a video clip during KOT training and (b) judgments made by master scorers after viewing the same video clips. Judgments were linked to three sample indicators used during teacher training for administration of the KOT field test.
 - a. Rates of agreement between teachers and the master scorers were as follows:
 - i. *Training Indicator 13:* 88% of teacher ratings were consistent with the consensus rating from the team of master scorers.
 - ii. *Training Indicator 14:* 64% of teacher ratings were consistent with the consensus rating from the team of master scorers.
 - iii. *Training Indicator 15:* 87% of teacher ratings were consistent with the consensus rating from the team of master scorers.

In terms of rates of agreement, those for Training Indicators 13 and 15 are very close to meeting the 90% threshold sought in similar assessment contexts. The PED may want to

consider factors contributing to the relatively lower rate of agreement found for Training Indicator 14.

3. Differential item functioning (DIF): Analyses conducted using item response theory modeling to explore possible performance differences, across subgroups, that are not related to the construct of interest (i.e., kindergarten readiness). Subgroups examined included those based on gender, race/ethnicity, and free/reduced-price lunch eligibility status (used as a proxy for socioeconomic status). Item difficulty parameters were estimated separately for each subgroup. Cross-subgroup differences that exceeded a given threshold were flagged for further review by the PED.

a. Across all indicators, evidence of DIF emerged only for the first two indicators on the field test, 1.1 and 2.1, both in the domain of Physical Development, Health, and Well-Being.

i. Indicator 1.1: Coordination and Strength: In the KOT field test, an advantage that is unrelated to ability on the intended construct emerged, favoring (a) free/reduced-price lunch -eligible students, as compared to non-eligible students; (b) American Indian/Alaska Native students, as compared to White students; and (c) Hispanic students, as compared to White students.

ii. Indicator 2.1a: Manual Coordination for Cutting and Writing: In the KOT field test, an advantage that is unrelated to ability on the intended construct emerged, favoring American Indian/Alaska Native students, as compared to White students.

4. Internal consistency of the indicators in each domain: Examination of another indicator of reliability, the strength of the relationship, or the coherence among the items on each subsection (domain) of the KOT field test. Analyses were conducted among the indicators in each domain and reported as a Cronbach's alpha (a decimal between 0 and 1).

a. Internal consistency coefficients are provided below, by domain:

i. Physical Development, Health, and Well-Being (2 indicators): 0.62

ii. Literacy (10 indicators): 0.93

iii. Numeracy (5 indicators): 0.85

iv. Scientific Conceptual Understanding (2 indicators): 0.73

v. Self, Family, and Community (5 indicators): 0.88

vi. Approaches to Learning (2 indicators): 0.77

In the same way that the reliability of a test increases with test length, the internal consistency of most test sections also tends to improve as additional related items, or indicators, are added. The findings summarized below followed that general pattern.

a. The internal consistency coefficients are highest for those domains with the greatest numbers of indicators: Literacy (0.93); Self, Family, and Community (0.88); and Numeracy (0.85).

b. The internal consistency coefficients are lowest for those domains with only two indicators in each: Physical Development, Health, and Well-Being (0.62); Scientific Conceptual Understanding (0.73); and Approaches to Learning (0.77).

c. The coefficient alpha is particularly low for the domain of Physical Development, Health, and Well-Being. Because DIF also emerged in that domain, the PED may want to carefully examine those indicators, as they may not be measuring the domain as intended.

5. Information about classification patterns across indicators: Calculation of the frequencies for each score point for each indicator. Bar graphs describing the distribution of score points were provided for each indicator in each domain.

a. The indicator-level findings suggest that the most frequently assigned rating in the KOT field test was a score point of 4. This score point received the highest percentages

of ratings for 60% (15) of the 25 indicators used during field testing, while score points 3 and 5 each received the highest percentages of ratings for 20% of the indicators (5 indicators each). Participating teachers far less frequently assigned score point 6 and rarely assigned score point 7.

6. Indicator-level descriptive statistics: Reporting of the mean and standard deviation for each indicator based on observations of children collected during KOT field testing.

- a. The data linked to Indicators 1.1 and 1.2 were unusual; these indicators from the domain of Physical Development, Health, and Well-Being are the only indicators with a mean rating of 5 (*Making Progress for K*) instead of 4 (*Accomplished for 4-Year-Olds/ First Steps for K*). In addition, it is interesting to note that no child received a rating of 7 on Indicator 27.1.

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

Full Implementation

The Public Education Department (PED) completed the Kindergarten Observation Tool (KOT) first full implementation during the K-3 Plus (25 day) and Beginning of Year (30 day) windows, with all final data being submitted by October 15, 2016. 1,447 teachers completed their participation in the KOT, observing and submitting Final Ratings for 22,073 students statewide. During the full implementation phase of the KOT project, the PED provided technical assistance, support, and guidance to 89 school districts, 23 state charter schools, and numerous district charter schools.

"It helps the teachers in identifying each child's needs and providing necessary supports to children and teachers while providing families with information about their children's learning and development."

KOT Development

The KOT underwent additional refinement following the completion of the field test phase in the fall of 2015. 351 Teachers from 39 districts and 7 charter schools fully participated in the field test and provided valuable feedback that further refined the KOT. The PED released a series of surveys and hosted a number of focus groups to obtain information for the purposes of: refining indicator selection, editing rubric structure and language, and improving KOT professional development. The field test participants also generated ideas to ensure that the tool is designed in a way that would support teachers in truly understanding their students within the first 30 instructional days of school.

Revisions to the language and structure of the rubrics were made based on the feedback from the field. Language was revised to provide teachers with more clearly defined performance level descriptors in order to more easily distinguishing between performance levels when rating children using the KOT Essential Indicators. Additionally, the performance level "First Steps for 4s" was added to the KOT rubrics. This revision increased the number of performance levels to 6, providing more accurate ratings for children performing below the lowest performance level during the field test.

"When used properly the KOT observational rubric system allows teachers to know where their students are and to plan and implement strategies to address those areas of need."

KOTA v2.0 Development

Key improvements to the Kindergarten Observation Tool Application (KOTA) and its' server were made prior to full implementation based on field test participants' feedback. Primarily, teachers requested a page to submit all KOT ratings for a single child at one time, and to increase the speed at which the KOTA functioned. For these reasons, the Observation by Student page was developed to allow submissions of all indicators for a single

student at one time and page functions throughout the KOTA were streamlined to minimize the number of postbacks on each page. Both of these improvements, coupled with an improved server, drastically decreased the amount of technological issues during KOT administration.

"I enjoyed the KOT at the beginning of the year. I thought the online observation tool, where you select their scores, was very helpful."

Research and Data Analysis

As part of the contract with the PED to develop the KOT, WestEd was tasked with running a series of psychometric analyses that would yield the following information: (1) descriptive information about the tested population, (2) inter-rater reliability, (3) differential item functioning (DIF), (4) internal consistency of the indicators in each domain, (5) information about classification patterns across indicators, and (6) indicator-level descriptive statistics. The findings from these analyses are presented in the Status of New Mexico Children: The New Mexico Kindergarten Observation Tool and detailed in the "Understanding the Status of Children's Learning and Development at Kindergarten Entry (Section E(1) of Application)" section of the APR. Data from KOT field testing was used to conduct a set of analyses that would yield the following information:

1. Descriptive information about the tested population
2. Inter-rate reliability
3. Differential item functioning (DIF)
4. Internal consistency of the indicators in each domain
5. Information about classifications patterns across indicators
6. Indicator-level descriptive statistics

The PED has also enlisted the help of Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) Southwest to examine the construct validity of the KOT to determine whether there is support for the intended domain structure (six domains) and, if not, determine the internal structure of the KOT items that is best supported by the data.

Psychometric Analysis

7. What latent constructs are measured in the KOT instrument?
8. For each latent construct measured in the KOT, how do the items relate to each other?
9. What is the relationship between KOT scores and DIBELS Next scores for students participating in the KOT pilot program?
10. Do any of the items exhibit differential item functioning for subpopulations of students? If so, what is the direction and magnitude of the bias?
11. Are the rating categories appropriately ordered for each item in the KOT?

Content Review

12. Is the KOT a comprehensive and evidence-based measure of kindergarten readiness?

Item Interpretation Analysis

13. How do kindergarten teachers participating in the KOT pilot in New Mexico interpret the items in the KOT?
14. What proportion of the variance in KOT scores can be attributed to the teacher and classroom?

Strategies to Address Challenges

To address the issue of manual roster uploads and updates, the PED IT staff is working to redesign the KOTA, and rostering process. This will ensure that much of the rostering issues are resolved and can be handled on-site, rather than at PED.

The issue of concurrent initiatives is an area that continues to be addressed. One primary goal is to align the

initiatives and show the cross-section of the two assessments as well as the curriculum. Alignment documents are being generated to show teachers how the data from the two assessments can be used to make quality instructional decisions in the classroom.

Sustainability efforts are ongoing at the PED. The PED has hired a firm to create a sustainability plan and aid in legislating for funding to retain efforts from RTT-ELC to improve early childhood education throughout our state.

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

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

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

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

In January, 2016, contract negotiations with selected software development vendor concluded (eScholar, LLC), and a kick off meeting was held. Project deliverables, assumptions, and project framework were discussed. Technical and Project Management strategy sessions followed the kickoff meeting.

The ECIDS project management plan was developed in Microsoft Project to track project tasks and deliverables in line with NM State Department of Information Technology (DoIT) IT project guidelines. Project manager's monthly reporting was initiated and a "Project Status Dashboard" report was also created to facilitate discussion and drive database development and implementation. A shared project document repository was created and work began to produce the following relevant documentation: Issues/Action Items log; Project Team Directory; Change Request Log; Risk Register; Configuration Management Items; Decision Log; Task List; Meeting Folders; Monthly Status Reports, and; Project Management Plan folder.

A multi-agency "ECIDS IT Project Team" was formed with technical leads from each source data agency and regular Monday project meetings were established to include technical leads and software development vendor. Senior project managers' midweek and end-of week update meetings were set up on a recurring basis, and recurring bi-weekly meetings were scheduled for the ECIDS Executive Leadership and Data Governance Committees.

A series of data mapping meetings were initiated among the database architects and source data agencies to begin mapping Essential Data Elements to the CEDS V5 data dictionary (expanded to include Department of Health required data fields not education related). This data modeling began the development effort for the Unique ID (UID) component of the overall ECIDS data system while data mapping and development of the Complete Data Warehouse (CDW) product would begin later in the year. Data elements potentially containing Personal Identifying Information or Personal Health Information were identified within the data dictionary and brought before the Data Governance Committee for consideration and approval.

April through June 2016 saw good progress on the project starting with the procurement of the ECIDS database

server hardware to house the DEV, TEST and PROD environments based on developer's technical specifications. A series of meetings among the 7 ECIDS source data agencies IT staff network were conducted to determine best method for the ETL (extract, transform and load) procedures to enable uniform data collection and easy entry of the Essential Data Elements by Participating State Agencies and Participating Programs into the ECIDS Unique ID system and data warehouse. Architecture diagrams were developed at this point and data sharing agreements were finalized among participating agencies to cover both PII and PHI data in order to meet the Data System Oversight Requirements and comply with the requirements of Federal, State, and local privacy laws.

Security planning began in this phase to define user roles and permissions for the Unique ID system and UID training was conducted for the initial set of end-users. Other security requirements regarding the ETL process (i.e. data systems' access) were also worked out. A Risk Management working group was formed to meet regularly to identify and address project risk.

The data governance working group went to work to begin determining inter-agency questions and the relationships among primary data domains, or "profiles" that will be used to generate said questions (e.g. Child & Family Profile, State Program Profile).

UID data mapping meetings also continued through this period, culminating in the deployment of the ECIDS Unique ID data extracts to the TEST then PROD environments and performing the initial ID assignments for all source data in June.

Work continued through the summer with the data governance working group drilling down to the data elements that will be used to inform the data profiles defined. A list of high level inter-agency questions was created to satisfy initial ECIDS reporting requirements to generate information that is timely, relevant, accessible, and easy for Early Learning and Development Programs and Early Childhood Educators to use for continuous improvement and decision making. Help was enlisted from New Mexico State epidemiologists in the area of GIS and defining geo-code elements to include in the ECIDS data warehouse for mapping purposes.

The second half of 2016 was very busy with end-users (each respective agency) resolving near matches, and together resolving duplicate or shared IDs. ECIDS Unique IDs were also assigned for historical data for all data sources.

The platform was expanded as the electronic data management (eDM) software and the CDW product were loaded into the TEST environment.

The ECIDS project focused heavily during this period on 'source to CDW integration' and the process of defining the templates that will build the CDW data model. This process requires a series of detailed CDW data mapping meetings with source agencies that started in the fall and will continue into 2017. The CDW data mapping will ultimately facilitate the exchange of data among Participating State Agencies by using standard data structures, data formats, and data definitions such as Common Education Data Standards to ensure interoperability among the various levels and types of data.

Overall, throughout 2016, much progress was made on the Early Childhood Integrated Data System development project. As with most projects of this scope and level of complexity, the progress made has not been without challenges. We are confident, however, as we work through the development process, that the strong commitment of the vendor, the project team members and the participating agencies' leadership will successfully see the project through to implementation.

We look forward to providing a reporting platform to bring together a wide range of data so teachers and childcare directors, parents, and policymakers can make data-informed decisions related to the care and education of young children in the State of New Mexico.

Data Tables

Commitment to early learning and development.

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

Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income¹ families, by age		
	Number of children from Low-Income families in the State	Children from Low-Income families as a percentage of all children in the State
Infants under age 1	19,966	56.8%
Toddlers ages 1 through 2	40,595	57%
Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry	62,132	56.8%
Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families	122,693	56.8%

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

Data Table A(1)-1 Data Notes

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

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

2 U.S. Bureau of the census, 2015 American Community Survey 1-year Estimates, Table B17024.

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

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

Special populations: Children who	Number of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who...	Percentage of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who...
Have disabilities or developmental delays ¹	9,634	5%
Are English learners ²	50,095	4.9%
Reside on "Indian Lands"	15,142	7.69%
Are migrant ³	241	0.03%
Are homeless ⁴	6,400	3.9%
Are in foster care	844	0.45%
Other 1 as identified by the State	14,377	8.8%
<i>Describe:</i>	Infants Who Were Low and Very Low Weight at Birth	
Other 2 as identified by the State		
<i>Describe:</i>		

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

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

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

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

Data Table A(1)-2 Data Notes

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

Total FIT served in FIT in FY16 = 14,074

-The number of English language learners was estimated by taking the estimated percentage of children age 5-17 in households where a language other than English is spoken at home and English is spoken less than "very well" (4.9%) and applying that percentage to the estimated population of children age 0-5 years in New Mexico in 2015 (163,373).

-Children residing on Tribal Lands was estimated by taking the percentage of children age 0-5 in New Mexico who were living on tribal lands at the time of the 2010 decennial census (7.69%) and applying that percentage to the estimated population of children age 0-5 years in New Mexico in 2015 (163,373).

-Children from birth to kindergarten entry who were low or very low weight at birth was estimated using the actual percentage of low and very low birth weight infants born to New Mexico resident mothers between 2011 through 2015 (8.8%) and applying that percentage to the estimated number of children age 0 through 5 in the 2015 New Mexico population (163,373).

-Data Sources:

- o English language learners - U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table B16004
- o Children living on tribal lands - U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2010 decennial census total population count data for tribal areas within New Mexico.
- o Low birth weight percentage - New Mexico Department of Health, Bureau of Vital Records and Health Statistics, Birth Certificate Data
- o Estimated number of children age 0 to 5 in New Mexico - Geospatial and Population Studies Program, University of New Mexico

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

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

Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age				
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Infants under age 1	Toddlers ages 1 through 2	Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry	Total
State-funded preschool	0	0	4,552	4,552
<i>Specify:</i>	CYFD/PED State funded PreK child counts for the identified investment zones.			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	UNM Continuing Education PreK database December 2016			
Early Head Start and Head Start¹	612	1,217	7,448	9,155
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Program Information Report 2013			
Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619	2,377	10,833	4,494	9,332
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	New Mexico FIT KIDS and PED Data - Dec 1st 2013 Count			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	0	530	6,530	7,734
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	PED STARS Data 2014-2015			
Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	196	865	991	2,052
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	CYFD Child Care Assist. Family Automated Client Tracking System December 2014			
Other 1	1,381	898	991	2,400
<i>Specify:</i>	CYFD Home Visiting Program Children Served in identified investment zones.			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	2014 UNM Continuing Education HV database			
Other 2	982	4,696	0	5,678
<i>Specify:</i>	New Mexico FIT KIDS Data - December 1 2016 Count			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	FIT KIDS 2016			
Other 3				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
Other 4				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
Other 5				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				

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

Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age				
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Infants under age 1	Toddlers ages 1 through 2	Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry	Total
Other 6				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
Other 7				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
Other 8				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				

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

Data Table A(1)-3a Data Notes

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

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

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

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

Number of Children							
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Number of Hispanic Children	Number of Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Asian Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Black or African American	Number of Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Children of Two or more races	Number of Non-Hispanic White Children
State-funded preschool	5,002	1,151	110	204	0	0	2,079
<i>Specify:</i>	Includes CYFD and PED PreK Programs						
Early Head Start and Head Start ¹	5,401	1,465	137	91	137	92	1,832
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	8,484	1,125	92	228	19	201	2,814
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	2,444	442	26	77	7	87	1,162
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	3,230	967	35	74	0	0	886
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	13,791	1,136	84	647	35	0	2,880
Other 1	3,608	611	77	103	0	70	836
<i>Describe:</i>	CYFD Home Visiting Program						
Other 2							
<i>Describe:</i>							

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

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

Number of Children

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

Data Table A(1)-3b Data Notes

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

The PreK program is dually administered by PED and CYFD. In this section of the APR, both departments reported their numbers under the state funded preschool category.

The Head Start and Early Head Start data obtained from the state's program information report includes children under 3 (Early Head Start, Migrant, and Seasonal and Tribal Head Start within New Mexico).

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

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

Funding for each Fiscal Year					
Type of investment	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start and Head Start¹	0	0	0	0	0
State-funded preschool	\$14,164,364	\$14,950,000	\$19,236,600	\$24,500,000	\$21,000,000
<i>Specify:</i>	PreK PED				
State contributions to IDEA Part C	\$14,968,594	\$14,500,000	\$16,419,669	\$19,680,600	\$19,517,600
State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry	\$41,286,755	\$41,250,000	\$19,236,600	\$31,889,667	\$31,610,201
Total State contributions to CCDF²	\$5,966,830	\$5,402,319	\$5,402,319	\$5,402,319	\$5,402,319
State match to CCDF Exceeded / Met / Not Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
<i>If exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded</i>					
TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs³	\$16,371,836	0	\$4,050,000	\$12,100,000	\$16,350,000
Other State contributions 1	\$2,538,200	\$5,531,231	\$6,674,150	\$7,572,450	\$7,234,050
<i>Specify:</i>	Home Visiting				
Other State contributions 2	\$1,650,300	\$1,793,339	\$1,948,750	\$2,097,300	\$2,122,300
<i>Specify:</i>	Quality Child Care (Training and Technical Assistance, Planning Time, Inclusionary Specialists & T.E.A.C.H.)				
Other State contributions 3	\$14,164,364	\$14,985,000	\$11,750,300	\$13,612,350	\$13,085,000
<i>Specify:</i>	State Funded Preschool: PreK CYFD				
Other State contributions 4					
<i>Specify:</i>					
Other State contributions 5					
<i>Specify:</i>					
Other State contributions 6					
<i>Specify:</i>					

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

Funding for each Fiscal Year

Type of investment	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
Other State contributions 7					
<i>Specify:</i>					
Other State contributions 8					
<i>Specify:</i>					
Total State contributions:	\$111,111,243	\$98,411,889	\$84,718,388	\$116,854,686	\$116,321,470

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

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

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

Data Table A(1)-4 Data Notes

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

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

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

Total number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program¹					
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Baseline	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Year Four
State-funded preschool (<i>annual census count; e.g., October 1 count</i>)	4,591	4,591	4,300	4,847	4,552
<i>Specify:</i>	New Mexico Pre-Kindergarten FY 15				
Early Head Start and Head Start² (<i>funded enrollment</i>)	11,057	9,155	9,122	9,155	10,478
Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619 (<i>annual December 1 count</i>)	10,036	9,634	9,750	10,886	14,074
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA (<i>total number of children who receive Title I services annually, as reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report</i>)	6,775	6,996	7,591	7,060	7,734
Programs receiving CCDF funds (<i>average monthly served</i>)	12,757	17,993	17,084	1,959	2,052
Other 1	1,077	1,489	1,919	2,060	2,400
<i>Describe:</i>	Home visiting FY 13				
Other 2					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 3					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 4					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 5					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 6					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 7					
<i>Describe:</i>					
Other 8					
<i>Describe:</i>					

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

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

Data Table A(1)-5 Data Notes

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

The New Mexico Early Learning Guidelines and the FOCUS provide:

Common Early Learning Standards, standardized criteria for a common, authentic, observation documentation curriculum-planning process.

During 2016, NM-ELG completed significant revisions as a result of the implementation of the Kindergarten Observation Tool and the validation process of the NM Assessment System by Child Trends.

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

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

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

Data Table A(1)-6 Notes

Enter text to explain or clarify information as needed.

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

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

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

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

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

Data Table A(1)-7 Notes

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

Budget and Expenditures

Budget Summary Table Narrative

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

There is no discrepancy between the State's approved budget and expenditures in Year Four.

Budget Summary Table Explanation of Changes

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

New Mexico does not plan substantive changes to the Early Learning Challenge budget in the upcoming year.

Project Budget 1

Project Name: Grants Management

Project Budget Narrative

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

The expenditures were in alignment with the State's approved budget and expenditures for Year Four.

The Training and Technical Assistance budget is being spent down for identified needs in Year Four and Year Five.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

There are no major changes the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year. Unexpended funds from Year Four will be rolled over into Year Five as per the approved No Cost Extension.

Project Budget 2

Project Name: Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System

Project Budget Narrative

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

TQRIS continues to move forward and no discrepancy between the State's approved budget/expenditures for Year Four.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

There are no major changes in the budget, however, the ongoing projects unexpended funds for 2016 will rollover to 2017.

Project Budget 3

Project Name: Early Childhood Investment Zones

Project Budget Narrative

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

The Early Childhood Investment Zones project concluded on December 31, 2016. The remaining dollar balance will be reallocated to Project 4 (Workforce Development) which is part of the approved No Cost Extension.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

There are no substantive project budget changes.

Project Budget 4

Project Name: Workforce Development

Project Budget Narrative

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

In order to complete Project 4 (Workforce Development) which was approved in the No Cost Extension, the budget will be adjusted by an additional \$487,499.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

The budget for Project 4 is being increased for Year 5 due to monies not spent on budgeted projects (Project 3 and Project 5).

Project Budget 5

Project Name: Early Childhood Data

Project Budget Narrative

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

The budgeted monies and expenditures for Project 5 were in alignment for Year 4.

The NM ECIDS database warehouse contract was awarded and work commenced in March, 2016.

Through a single identifier assigned to each child, the integrated system will pull data across all early learning programs to identify short and long term outcomes of early learning interventions for continuous improvement in programs and to ultimately achieve positive outcomes for each child from preschool through high school and beyond.

The work of the Family Infant Toddler (FIT) Program regarding the Early Childhood Integrated Data System has begun in Year 4 and will align with the work conducted in the building the data warehouse by PED in Year 5 (No Cost Extension).

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

There are no substantive project budget changes. All Year 4 unexpended funds will roll over into Year 5 as per the approved No Cost Extension.

Project Budget 6

Project Name: Kindergarten Entry Assessment

Project Budget Narrative

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

The budgeted monies and expenditures for Project 5 were in alignment for Year 4.

Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

There are no substantive project budget changes. All Year 4 unexpended funds will roll over into Year 5 as per the approved No Cost Extension.

Project Budget 7

Project Name: _____

***NEW MEXICO'S RTT-ELC APPLICATION INCLUDED 6 PROJECTS.
PAGES 80-102 HAVE BEEN DELETED.***

RTT-ELC Summary of Actual Expenditures

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$24,796.00	\$285,532.00	\$444,664.21	\$407,460.00	\$1,162,452.21
2. Fringe Benefits	\$9,158.00	\$82,038.00	\$156,794.60	\$146,471.00	\$394,461.60
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$5,891.00	\$39,546.94	\$11,330.00	\$56,767.94
4. Equipment	\$50.00	\$27,208.00	\$23,168.60	\$90,782.00	\$141,208.60
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$19,577.00	\$10,359.68	\$15,386.00	\$45,322.68
6. Contractual	\$458,529.00	\$4,460,462.00	\$9,386,560.15	\$10,614,453.00	\$24,920,004.15
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$16,112.00	\$29,765.35	\$0.00	\$45,877.35
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$492,533.00	\$4,896,820.00	\$10,090,859.53	\$11,285,882.00	\$26,766,094.53
10. Indirect Costs*	\$23,231.00	\$43,800.00	\$139,387.89	\$139,883.00	\$346,301.89
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$7,675.00	\$13,653.00	\$15,021.34	\$46,892.00	\$83,241.34
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$523,439.00	\$4,954,273.00	\$10,245,268.76	\$11,472,657.00	\$27,195,637.76
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$1,231,846.00	\$63,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,294,846.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$1,755,285.00	\$5,017,273.00	\$10,245,268.76	\$11,472,657.00	\$28,490,483.76

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Actual Expenditures for Project 1 - Grant Management

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$4,029.00	\$36,268.00	\$91,203.00	\$110,394.00	\$241,894.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$1,059.00	\$12,936.00	\$34,652.00	\$47,288.00	\$95,935.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$3,949.00	\$29,602.00	\$7,832.00	\$41,383.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$692.00	\$6,424.32	\$0.00	\$7,116.32
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$40,000.00	\$40,000.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$5,088.00	\$53,845.00	\$161,881.32	\$205,514.00	\$426,328.32
10. Indirect Costs*	\$23,231.00	\$43,800.00	\$139,387.89	\$139,883.00	\$346,301.89
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$7,675.00	\$13,653.00	\$15,021.34	\$46,892.00	\$83,241.34
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$35,994.00	\$111,298.00	\$316,290.55	\$392,289.00	\$855,871.55
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$63,000.00	\$63,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$126,000.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$98,994.00	\$174,298.00	\$316,290.55	\$392,289.00	\$981,871.55

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Actual Expenditures for Project 2 - New Mexico Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System - FOCUS TQRIS

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$13,714.00	\$53,222.40	\$54,417.00	\$121,353.40
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$1,870.00	\$18,857.84	\$19,225.00	\$39,952.84
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,076.12	\$3,498.00	\$8,574.12
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$676.00	\$0.00	\$845.00	\$1,521.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$18,885.00	\$3,159.21	\$9,192.00	\$31,236.21
6. Contractual	\$2,594.00	\$2,533,750.00	\$6,716,438.80	\$6,012,789.00	\$15,265,571.80
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$570.00	\$0.00	\$570.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$2,594.00	\$2,568,895.00	\$6,797,324.37	\$6,099,966.00	\$15,468,779.37
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$2,594.00	\$2,568,895.00	\$6,797,324.37	\$6,099,966.00	\$15,468,779.37
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$1,138,846.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,138,846.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$1,141,440.00	\$2,568,895.00	\$6,797,324.37	\$6,099,966.00	\$16,607,625.37

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Actual Expenditures for Project 3 - Early Childhood Investment Zones

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$76,521.00	\$89,703.39	\$186,949.00	\$353,173.39
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$76,521.00	\$89,703.39	\$186,949.00	\$353,173.39
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$76,521.00	\$89,703.39	\$186,949.00	\$353,173.39
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$15,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$15,000.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$15,000.00	\$76,521.00	\$89,703.39	\$186,949.00	\$368,173.39

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Actual Expenditures for Project 4 - Professional Development

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$32,720.00	\$341,788.00	\$544,260.00	\$542,466.00	\$1,461,234.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$32,720.00	\$341,788.00	\$544,260.00	\$542,466.00	\$1,461,234.00
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$32,720.00	\$341,788.00	\$544,260.00	\$542,466.00	\$1,461,234.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$15,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$15,000.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$47,720.00	\$341,788.00	\$544,260.00	\$542,466.00	\$1,476,234.00

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Actual Expenditures for Project 5 - Data System

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$20,767.00	\$235,550.00	\$300,238.81	\$242,649.00	\$799,204.81
2. Fringe Benefits	\$8,099.00	\$67,232.00	\$103,284.76	\$79,958.00	\$258,573.76
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$1,942.00	\$2,918.57	\$0.00	\$4,860.57
4. Equipment	\$50.00	\$26,532.00	\$23,168.60	\$89,937.00	\$139,687.60
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$776.15	\$6,194.00	\$6,970.15
6. Contractual	\$423,215.00	\$1,312,864.00	\$1,621,352.41	\$3,088,544.00	\$6,445,975.41
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$16,112.00	\$29,195.35	\$0.00	\$45,307.35
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$452,131.00	\$1,660,232.00	\$2,080,934.65	\$3,507,282.00	\$7,700,579.65
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$452,131.00	\$1,660,232.00	\$2,080,934.65	\$3,507,282.00	\$7,700,579.65
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$452,131.00	\$1,660,232.00	\$2,080,934.65	\$3,507,282.00	\$7,700,579.65

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Actual Expenditures for Project 6 - Kindergarten Readiness Assessment

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,950.25	\$0.00	\$1,950.25
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$195,539.00	\$414,805.55	\$743,705.00	\$1,354,049.55
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$195,539.00	\$416,755.80	\$743,705.00	\$1,355,999.80
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$195,539.00	\$416,755.80	\$743,705.00	\$1,355,999.80
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$0.00	\$195,539.00	\$416,755.80	\$743,705.00	\$1,355,999.80

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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