2013 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

Massachusetts

Race to the Top
Early Learning Challenge

Annual Performance Report

Massachusetts

2013

Table of Contents

*Note: All information in this document was prepared and submitted by the **Grantee** as their annual performance report (APR). For reference, the instructions and prompts from the approved APR form are included in italics throughout the document. Check marks in tables indicate the Grantee selected the option. A blank cell in a table indicates that the Grantee did not provide data or did not select the option.*

Race to the Top
Early Learning Challenge

APR Cover Sheet

General Information

1. PR/Award #: S412A120017

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

3. Grantee Address: EEC, 51 Sleeper St., 4th floor, Boston, MA 02210

4. Project Director Name: Thomas Weber

      Title: Commissioner

      Phone #: (617) 988 - 6612   **Fax #:** (617) 988 - 2451

      Email Address: Tom.Weber@massmail.state.ma.us

Reporting Period Information

5. Reporting Period: 1/1/2013 **to** 12/31/2013

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): 07/01/2013 to 06/30/2016

        Approving Federal agency: ☑ ED ☐ HHS ☐ Other

Certification

The Grantee certifies that the State is currently participating in:

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

☑ Yes ☐ No

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

☑ Yes ☐ No

The Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) program

☑ Yes ☐ No

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

Signed by Authorized Representative

Name: Thomas L. Weber

Title: Commissioner, Department of Early Education and Care

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.

Much progress was made in 2013 to bolster early education with the implementation of Massachusetts Early Learning Plan. Funding from the Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) grant was used to support program quality, educator quality, family and community engagement, screening and assessment, and infrastructure. The following describes key **accomplishments** made in each category.

Program Quality
- A total of 631 programs received QRIS Program Improvement Grants to increase quality.
- Completion of the MA Alignment Study with clear recommendations on how the state can improve its early learning standards.
- Completion of guidelines for Early English Language Development Standards, which were approved by the Board of the Department of the Early Education and Care (EEC) in December 2013.

Educator Quality
- Launch of the Resources for Early Learning website, the state's first digital hub of early education resources for families and educators.
- The first cohort of students in the Post Master's Certificate Program graduated in December 2013.
- 151 individuals from across the state participated in the 2012-2013 Early Educators Fellowship Initiative.

Family and Community Engagement
- Massachusetts has received national recognition for its RTT-ELC initiative to engage statewide museums and libraries in STEM early education.
- Over $800K was awarded to local communities to support evidence-based literacy programs and over 7,000 families received evidence based literacy programming in 2013.
- Over 1,200 families have received financial literacy education to improve their financial skills.

Screening and Assessment
- 1,160 children have received a developmental screening through the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ).
- There are 77 school districts participating in MA Kindergarten Entry Assessment (MKEA), an increase of 74% from 2012.
- Over 400 public school kindergarten teachers and administrators attended MKEA conference in October 2013 to learn more about formative assessment.

Infrastructure
- Boston, Springfield, Lowell, Pittsfield, and Somerville are executing strategic plans to improve their birth to third grade infrastructure so that children receive high quality early education.
- Interagency partners are fully staffed and have provided statewide trainings that reached over 1,100 individuals.
- The Early Childhood Information System (ECIS) went live in July 2013 with real time data to inform policy.

Lessons Learned
- Findings from the MA Alignment Study showed that the state's early learning standards lack strength in the area of social and emotional development and approaches to learning and play domains. MA should prioritize revising its preschool standards to incorporate these domains.

- Kindergarten teachers need more professional development to fully understand the value of formative assessment and how to do authentic observations of children.

Challenges
- The departure of the EEC Commissioner in spring 2013 and the appointment of a new Commissioner in fall 2013 significantly impacted project timelines and some of the performance measure targets were not met. EEC spent 2013 to re-assess and refine grant activities, including restructuring staff to accommodate for this leadership change.
- The spend-down rate of the budget has been slower than anticipated given delayed project starts times and payments to vendors.

Strategies to Address Challenges
- Additional fiscal staff were hired 2013 and new program staff will be hired in early 2014 to manage activities within the MA Early Learning Plan.
- An in depth analysis of all grant activities is currently underway to ensure grant funds are allocated most efficiently.
- Develop sustainability plans for each grant activity.

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).

Governor Deval Patrick and his administration continued to make closing the academic achievement gap and ensuring that all children are proficient in reading by third grade, a top education priority. In 2013 he introduced a budget recommendation that called for historic investments in education, in particular early learning opportunities for at-risk children from birth to age five. His vision of early education and care as the critical entry point for an education pipeline that supports students on a pathway to lifelong success, continues to serve as the framework for the Massachusetts Early Learning Plan.

In March 2013, Undersecretary of Education Tom Weber was appointed Acting Commissioner. He became Commissioner in September 2013. Commissioner Weber has focused on engaging constituencies in the process of implementing the Massachusetts Early Learning Plan and other improvements to make the system of early learning in the Commonwealth even stronger. He regularly speaks with the Secretary of Education and EEC Board members, other state agency leaders, legislators, advocates, programs, educators, families, and other stakeholders in the field about the Governor's priority of closing the achievement gap. His meetings and dialogues include exchanges about promising practices and accomplishments in the region, future action plans, and recommended areas for growth and additional investment.

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.

The state continues to involve many stakeholders in the implementation of the Massachusetts Early Learning Plan. The following is a list of 2012 stakeholders that continued to be involved in 2013:
- EEC Board
- EEC Advisory Council
- Massachusetts Association of Early Education and Care (MADCA)
- Strategies for Children
- United Way of Massachusetts Bay and Merrimack Valley
- Validation of Educator Competencies Advisory Committee (project 8.2-8.4)
- Post-Masters Certificate Program Advisory Committee (project 8.6)
- Peer Assistance and Coaching Advisory Panel (project 8.7)
- Brain Building in Progress Advisory Committee (project 11.1)
- Media Based Resources for Early Learning Advisory Committee (project 12)

In 2013, EEC formed a few new stakeholder groups to advise some of the RTT-ELC activities:
- QRIS Working Group
- QRIS Professional Development Review Team
- QRIS Validation Study Advisory Board

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.

The following describes the key 2013 executive orders, policies and legislation that impact Massachusetts' RTT-ELC grant.

State Budget
- Governor Deval Patrick and the Legislature have routinely demonstrated a commitment to early education in their budget recommendations despite challenging fiscal times. There was an increase in funding for additional childcare vouchers to reduce the waitlist and funding for research studies. Including the prior year funds in the Income Eligible Account as well as funds awarded for a rate reserve, the EEC FY14 total appropriation is approximately $509 million.
- *State Fiscal Year 2014:* The FY14 General Appropriations Act (GAA) established a Special Commission on Early Education and Care to make recommendations on improving early education and care operations and finance in Massachusetts. The Commission was charged with reviewing state practices related to program quality, health and safety; workforce development and retention; and financing and submitted its findings and recommendations to the legislature. The Commission submitted its recommendations to the legislature on December 31, 2013.

Policies
- *Approval and Submission of Massachusetts' Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) State Plan for Federal Fiscal Years 2014-2015:* EEC held three public hearings across the Commonwealth on the proposed Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) Plan for federal fiscal years 2014-2015 and also solicited written comments. EEC submitted its 2014-2015 CCDF Plan to the Administration of Children and Families (ACF) by July 1, 2013. It became effective on October 1, 2013.
- *Approval of Draft Pre-Kindergarten Science, Technology, and Engineering Learning Standards:* EEC developed a set of learning standards for all preschool programs in the Commonwealth that are consistent with the curriculum frameworks developed by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE).
- *Approval of Early English Language Development Guidelines:* These guidelines correspond with the World Class Instructional English Language Development (ELD) Standards framework for Kindergarten through Grade 12 and correspond to states' Early Learning Standards and Head Start's Early Learning and Child Outcomes.

Legislation

The MA state legislature enacted into law the following bills that relate to the Department of Early Education and Care:
- *Fingerprint-Supported Background Checks for Educators:* On January 11, 2013 Governor Patrick signed "An Act Relative to Background Checks." This bill authorized the Department of Early Education and Care (EEC) and school districts to conduct fingerprint-supported state and national criminal history background checks on all teachers, school employees and early education providers in Massachusetts.

Prior to the enactment of this law, school districts and early education providers were allowed only to conduct name-based Criminal Offender Record Information (CORI) checks covering criminal history record information for crimes committed in Massachusetts. These CORI checks did not include any criminal history record information for crimes committed outside the Commonwealth.

- *Early Education and Care and Out-of-School Time Capital Fund*: On November 14, 2013, Governor Patrick signed legislation to provide for a $1.4B capital outlay program that included $45M over four years for the purpose of developing facilities for licensed early care and education and out of school time programs. The Early Education and Out of School Time Capital Fund will provide grants for facilities improvement in programs serving low-income families.

Participating State Agencies

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

There have been no changes to the participation and commitment by the state agencies. The Department of Mental Health (DMH), Department of Children and Families (DCF), Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD), Department of Public Health (DPH) and the Office of Refugees and Immigrants (ORI) are still collaborating with EEC to execute the goals and objectives in the Massachusetts Early Learning Plan.

Information about progress made with participating state agencies can be found in the "Engaging and Supporting Families" (Section C(4) of Application) Section of the annual report.

High-Quality, Accountable Programs

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

During the current year, has the State made progress in developing or revising a TQRIS that is based on a statewide set of tiered Program Standards that include—

(1) Early Learning & Development Standards	
Yes or No	Yes
Early Learning & Development Standards that currently apply to:	
State-funded preschool programs	✓
Early Head Start and Head Start programs	✓
Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:	✓
Center-based	✓
Family Child Care	✓

(2) A Comprehensive Assessment System	
Yes or No	Yes
A Comprehensive Assessment System that currently apply to:	
State-funded preschool programs	✓
Early Head Start and Head Start programs	✓
Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:	✓
Center-based	✓
Family Child Care	✓

(3) Early Childhood Educator qualifications	
Yes or No	Yes
Early Childhood Educator qualifications that currently apply to:	
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	✓

Developing and Adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS) (Continued)

(4) Family engagement strategies	
Yes or No	Yes
Family engagement strategies that currently apply to:	
State-funded preschool programs	✓
Early Head Start and Head Start programs	✓
Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:	✓
Center-based	✓
Family Child Care	✓

(5) Health promotion practices	
Yes or No	Yes
Health promotion practices that currently apply to:	
State-funded preschool programs	✓
Early Head Start and Head Start programs	✓
Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	✓
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program:	✓
Center-based	✓
Family Child Care	✓

(6) Effective data practices	
Yes or No	Yes
Effective data practices that currently apply to:	
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	✓

The State has made progress in ensuring that:	
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.

EEC learned through the pilot QRIS Validation Study that many of the QRIS standards were difficult to measure. In response to this finding, EEC's Program Quality Unit worked with our partners at the University of Massachusetts Donahue Research Institute, along with regular collaboration with the Early Learning Challenge Technical Assistance program staff, state QRIS lead staff, local partners, and other community stakeholders on QRIS evaluation, revisions, and policy development. Review of the standards and QRIS policies occurred between April 2013 and September 2013 in all three program types: Center based/School based, Family Child Care, and After School and Out of School Time programs. In September 2013, EEC established a QRIS Working Group and a QRIS Professional Development Review Team. Both of these groups are comprised of individuals who represent the wide sector of the early education and care community. These groups will review the initial TQRIS standard revisions that have been identified by EEC's Program Quality Unit, and will make additional recommendations based on the prospective impact to the field. In 2013, EEC, along with the support of the QRIS Working Group, the QRIS Professional Development Review Team, the EEC Board, and federal, state and local partners, has made the following progress in revising its QRIS standards and policies:

Environment Rating Scales (ERS): EEC has developed and vetted policy changes on the observation, technical assistance and scoring process for the Environment Rating Scales (ERS) tools. Changes proposed to training and technical assistance will require increased training requirements for programs and providers in the lower tiers of QRIS, offer an individualized technical assistance visit for programs in the middle tier, and assess programs with a reliable rater visit in the upper tiers. This change in policy will allow programs to advance on the program quality continuum, from knowledge acquisition (Level 2), individualized technical assistance (Level 3) and then program assessment (Level 4). Another proposed policy change to the ERS will shift the number of classrooms observations from 100% to 60%. The decision to randomly sample classrooms for reliable rater observations will continue to allow EEC to adequately assess program quality, however it will be done in a more cost effective manner. A third ERS policy change being proposed is a modification to the scoring process. Current policy is rigid and the inflexibility is not allowing many of our quality programs to advance in the system.

The proposed policy will continue to consider an overall score, increasing as the program moves up in the tiers, however EEC will no longer consider the item scores in the ERS, and instead will consider the subscale scores. This change in policy will allow Program Quality Specialists to provide more targeted technical assistance and support programs in the quality areas they are most challenged. The state strategy moving forward includes presenting the proposed policy changes to the EEC Board in January 2014 for a vote and then implementing the policy thereafter.

QRIS Field Survey: EEC has contracted with the University of Massachusetts Donahue Research Institute to conduct a QRIS field survey to 1,500 randomly selected providers. The purpose of the survey was to gather input and feedback about how the QRIS is working for participating centers, schools, and family child care providers,

as well as the ways in which the system and support for the system can be improved. Administration of the confidential survey of randomly selected early education and care programs began on December 18, 2013 and will conclude in January 2014. The state strategy for this survey will be to collect and synthesize the data and write a formal report by March 2014. EEC plans to use the results of the survey to continue to make improvements to QRIS resources and supports through the grant period.

QRIS Rating Policy: In 2013, EEC began to develop a formal rating policy in collaboration with EEC's legal department. This policy includes the process for verification, re-rating and rating appeals. EEC is currently vetting this policy through the QRIS Working Group and EEC Advisory Council. Once a draft rating policy has been developed, EEC will thoroughly vet the policy with the field and other stakeholders. EEC expects to complete the vetting process and formally adopt a rating policy by April 2014.

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.

The state has made progress in increasing the number of programs participating in QRIS however it did not meet all the performance measure targets (see data table for Performance Measure (B)(2)(c)).
- The state exceeded the target for increasing the number of UPK programs in QRIS by 10. In FY2013, there were 226 UPK programs that participated in QRIS (the year 2 target was 216).
- Only 130 Inclusive Early Learning Environments (fund 391) programs participated in QRIS in the reporting year. In state fiscal year 2014, there were 135 programs/schools that received Inclusive Early Learning Environments funding. The total number of funded programs/schools may change from state fiscal year to state fiscal year.
- The state met the year two target of 219 Head Start programs participating in QRIS.
- There were only 98 programs funded by IDEA part B that participated in QRIS in the reporting year. The state did not meet the performance measure target in this category.
- Likewise, the state did not meet the target of getting 56 Title I funded programs into QRIS in the reporting year. There were 24 Title I programs in QRIS.
- There were 3,393 CCDF funded programs participating in QRIS in calendar year 2013. In the 2012 annual performance report for Performance Measure (B)(2)(c), the number of programs funded by CCDF were based on estimates from monthly billing data. For the 2013 report, CCDF numbers were based on annual subsidy data from the Early Childhood Information System (ECIS).
- There were 9 license exempt programs that participated in QRIS in 2013.

In order to fully engage the early education and care community, EEC has instituted several activities that facilitated increased participation in the QRIS including:

- EEC began to facilitate monthly QRIS orientation sessions in each of the five regional offices, immediately following the licensing renewal meetings. Over five hundred QRIS Technical Assistance meetings were held by Program Quality Specialists for Center Based educators and program staff, Family Child Care providers, Public School and License -Exempt educators and program staff, and After School/Out of School Time educators and program staff.
- The five Program Quality Specialists have provided targeted technical assistance via phone and email support, as well as in-person site visits to over 600 Center Based/School Based and After School/Out of School Time programs, over 1500 Family Child care providers, and over 75 Public School and License Exempt programs.

One strategy the state plans to investigate is the feasibility of tiered funding to promote greater participation in QRIS.

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 & Development Program in the State	**Baseline**		**Year 1**		**Year 2**		**Year 3**		**Year 4**	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	192	89%	216	100%	216	100%	216	100%	216	100%
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	112	51%	145	66%	221	100%	221	100%	221	100%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	29	6%	102	20%	229	45%	356	70%	508	100%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	18	11%	34	20%	56	33%	112	66%	128	100%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	1,088	26%	8,406	100%	8,406	100%	8,406	100%	8,406	100%
Other 1	25	33%	26	35%	27	40%	33	45%	37	50%
Describe:	License-exempt									
Other 2	25	15%	50	30%	164	100%	164	100%	164	100%
Describe:	Inclusive Early Learning Environments									
[1] Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.										

Actuals Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs									
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Baseline			Year 1			Year 2		
	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%
State-funded preschool	216	192	89%	166	166	100%	226	226	100%
Specify:	Universal Pre-Kindergarten (UPK)								
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	221	112	51%	214	214	100%	219	219	100%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C									
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	508	29	6%	504	70	14%	504	98	19%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	170	18	11%	172	28	16%	172	24	6.6%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	8,406	1,088	26%	8,469	3,287	75%	4,410	3,393	80%
Other 1	75	25	33%	75	136	79%	75	9	39%
Describe:	License-exempt								
Other 2	164	25	15%	164	69	48%	164	130	96%
Describe:	Inclusive Early Learning Environments								
[1] Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.									

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.

Baseline numbers and targets are from the RTT-ELC grant application.

UPK: The total number of Universal Pre-Kindergarten programs in FY2013 is 226: 7 programs were level 4 in QRIS; 153 programs were level 3 in QRIS; 57 programs were level 2 in QRIS; and 9 programs were level 1 in QRIS.

IPLE 391: 144 programs/schools received IPLE 391 funding during calendar year 2013. QRIS participation data percentages are based on the number of programs funded during the specified state fiscal year (SFY) which is different from the original estimate (164) submitted with the RTT-ELC grant application. Year One correction: In SFY13 141 programs/ schools received 391 IPLE funding, of these 69 (48%) were participation in QRIS. In SFY14 135 programs/ schools received 391 IPLE funding. 130 (96%) were participation in QRIS as of December 31, 2013. Please note as a grant funded program the number of funded programs/schools may change from SFY to SFY.

Head Start: This data is from the FY 2013-2014 Head Start Participation in the Massachusetts. QRIS, and only includes those programs that are required to be in QRIS. This includes HS Center Based programs and Family Center Based programs; it does not include Home-Based programs as they are not required to participate in QRIS. The number of grantees in FY2013 is lower due to the impact of the sequestration.

IDEA, Part B: The total number of schools with pre-K classrooms receiving IDEA Part B funding is 505; of which 98 classrooms are QRIS. The percentage of 19% is calculated based on these numbers. This data comes from the Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Education (school year 2013-2014).

Title I: The total number of School Wide Title I schools in school year 2013-2014 is 364. The participation percentage rate is based on number of QRIS programs in schools receiving these School Wide Title I funds.

CCDF: Children age 0-5 per calendar year in active billing subsidy and voucher programs. Data from the Early Childhood Information System (ECIS). In the 2012 annual report, CCDF numbers were based on estimates from monthly billing data. For the 2013 annual report, CCDF numbers were based on annual subsidy data from ECIS.

License Exempt: Data from the Early Childhood Information System (ECIS).

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.

The state plans to implement the following strategies to ensure measurable progress will be made to increase the number of early learning and development programs to participate in QRIS.

- EEC will be hiring additional staff (Program Quality Specialists) to provide QRIS technical assistance and other support to early education programs.
- EEC has revised its policy on the Environment Rating Scales (ERS) to encourage greater participation at higher levels of QRIS.
- EEC established a QRIS Working Group for Program Administrators and a QRIS Working Group for Educators to provide input on QRIS policy development such as the Environment Rating Scales policy and QRIS level 1 requirements for public school programs. The engagement of these working groups will improve stakeholder buy in with QRIS and increase understanding of QRIS and its value to children and families.
- EEC will make improvements to the QRIS online system to improve functionality and make it more user friendly as the field has expressed concerns about the current online application system.
- As part of the QRIS Program Improvement Grants (project 2.5), an online QRIS community will be developed so that best practice information can be shared among programs. In addition, coaches and mentors will be recruited and trained to assist grantees.
- EEC will continue to communicate with programs and QRIS coaches and mentors about QRIS and its benefits through public forums, trainings, electronic communications, and the Brain Building in Progress campaign.
- The state plans to investigate the feasibility of tiered funding to promote greater participation in QRIS.

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

Has the State made progress 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 that:

System for Rating & Monitoring	
Includes information on valid and reliable tools for monitoring such programs	Yes
Has trained monitors whose ratings have an acceptable level of inter-rater reliability	Yes
Monitors and rates Early Learning and Development Programs with appropriate frequency	Yes
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)	No
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	Yes

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.

EEC's Program Quality Unit began facilitating ongoing inter-rater reliability meetings in August 2013. Twice a month, members of the Program Quality Unit meet and review the QRIS standards as a team. Protocols have been developed that will increase inter-rater reliability, ensure greater consistency of program quality monitoring and measures, and enhance efficiency of the rating process. Standardized site visit procedures and protocols for documentation review have been completed.

Improved processes and protocols have allowed the granting process timeline to improve significantly. The average processing time for a level 2 application has been reduced from 247 days in 2012, to 9 days in 2013.

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?

Policies and Practices Supporting Program Quality	
Program and provider training	Yes
Program and provider technical assistance	Yes
Financial rewards or incentives	Yes
Higher, tiered child care subsidy reimbursement rates	Yes
Increased compensation	No

Number of tiers/levels in the State TQRIS
4

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

	State-funded preschool programs	Early Head Start	Head Start programs	Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	Center-based Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	Family Child Care Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program
TQRIS Programs that Moved Up at Least One Level	66[1]	0	67	49[2]	7	138	613
TQRIS Programs that Moved Down at Least One Level	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

[1]UPK 50 programs, ILPE/391 grant 16
[2]IDEA part B

Has the State made progress in developing high-quality benchmarks at the highest level(s) of the TQRIS in the following areas?

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

Please provide more detail on your development of high-quality benchmarks at the highest level(s) of the TQRIS. Please describe the State's strategies to ensure that measurable progress will be made in developing high-quality benchmarks at the highest level(s) of the TQRIS by the end of the grant period.

EEC has begun to enhance supports for program quality along the continuum. Educators and family child care providers in the lower tiers (Levels 1 and 2) will be supported largely through group and on-line trainings, along with support from coaches and mentors that are staffed by our Educator and Provider Support grantees. Verification of our Level 1 and Level 2 applications will continue to be done by EEC Program Quality Specialists, and technical assistance visits to programs and providers in the lower tiers will be done on an as needed basis only.

Shifting much of the support for programs and providers in the lower tiers to EEC's partners has allowed the EEC Program Quality Specialist to provide individualized technical assistance. The Program Quality Specialists' expertise in the quality standards, professional development requirements and measurement tools supports programs in focused development (Level 3) while also preparing them for assessment by Reliable Raters (Level 4).

Level 4	• Full Integration • Program Assessment
Level 3	• Focused Development • Individualized Technical Assistance
Level 2	• Self-Assessment with Verification • Knowledge Acquisition
Level 1	• EEC Licensed or Meets Licensing Requirements

EEC will begin granting Level 3 program in March 2014, following the approval of the Environment Rating Scales Policy changes and adoption of a formal QRIS Rating Policy. The state expects to begin granting our Level 4 programs in June 2014.

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

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

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1): Increasing the number of Early Learning and Development Programs in the top tiers of the TQRIS.

Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Baseline	Targets				Actuals	
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 1	Year 2
Total number of programs covered by the TQRIS	1,345	8,187	8,647	8,647	8,647	4,489	4,410
Number of Programs in Tier 1	1,111	222	722	922	1,022	2,099	1,820
Number of Programs in Tier 2	86	4	9	17	43	1,075	1,344
Number of Programs in Tier 3	84	1	2	3	5	156	324
Number of Programs in Tier 4	9	1	2	3	4	23	24
Number of Programs in Tier 5							

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

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

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

Type of Early Learning & Development Programs in the State	Targets — Number and percentage of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS									
	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	4,308	70%	6,193	100%	6,193	100%	6,193	100%	6,193	100%
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	9,614	58%	10,751	65%	12,405	75%	14,059	85%	6,193	100%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	2,045	13%	3,721	25%	7,441	50%	11,162	75%	14,882	100%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	662	4%	2,963	25%	5,926	50%	8,889	75%	11,852	100%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	13,153	89%	14,846	100%	14,846	100%	14,846	100%	14,846	100%
Other 1	2,911	48%	3,301	55%	1,892	65%	4,501	75%	6,002	100%
Describe:	Inclusive Preschool Learning Environments (IPLE, 391 grant)									

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

	Baseline			Year 1			Year 2		
Actuals **Number and percentage of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS**									
Type of Early Learning & Development Programs in the State	**# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State**	**#**	**%**	**# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State**	**#**	**%**	**# of Children with High Needs served by programs in the State**	**#**	**%**
State-funded preschool	6,193	4,308	70%	5,844	5,844	100%	3,456	3,456	96%
Specify:	UPK								
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	16,540	9,614	58%	16,469	10,770	65%	16,086	16,086	100%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C									
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	14,882	2,045	13%	14,915	3,594	24%	14,915	1,271	36%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	11,852	662	4%	11,167	1,164	10%	11,167	914	37%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	14,846	13,153	89%	61,655	7,966	15%	61,655	37,113	67%
Other 1	6,936	2,911	48%	6,002	1,915	27%	6,936	2,090	65%
Describe:	Inclusive Preschool Learning Environments (IPLE, 391 grant)								

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

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.

All baseline data and target percentages are from the RTT grant application.

UPK: The percentage rate is based upon the total number of Universal Pre-Kindergarten (UPK) programs in FY2013 that were level 2 or higher in QRIS. The total number of UPK programs is 226: 7 programs were level 4 in QRIS; 153 programs were level 3 in QRIS; 57 programs were level 2 in QRIS; and 9 programs were level 1 in QRIS. There was a lower number of programs that applied for the UPK grant because only programs at a QRIS level 3 were eligible to apply for UPK funding in FY13.

IPLE 391: Inclusive Preschool Learning Environments data reported enrollment for the data available 93% of Fund Code 391 grantees for 2009-2010. The original application: RTT-ELC measures included QRIS participation @ all QRIS levels as "Top Tier" (L1-L4) to assess the # of children of high need in top tier QRIS programs. 2010 NIEER data used as baseline for Number for IPLE/391 high needs children; Enrollment information reflects total enrollment as reported by programs at time of QRIS Application. This estimate may exceed the number of children funded by IPLE, as QRIS participation focuses on full program participation vs. delegate IPLE classrooms - as all children enrolled will benefit from high quality programs; i.e. 100% of children enrolled where considered

high needs in these settings. A total of 135 IPLE/391 funded programs were participating in QRIS as of 12.31.2013. 76 are IPLE/391 "top tier programs" (L2-L4- self-assessed). These programs/schools reported that 2,090 (65%) of the 3,182 reported "high needs" children were enrolled were during RTT _ELC Year. This figure may not reflect the children with IEPs enrolled (1,181) if the disability or developmental delay was the child's only identified risk factor.

Head Start: This data is from the FY 2013-2014 Head Start Participation in the Massachusetts QRIS, and only includes those programs that are required to be in QRIS (includes HS Center Based programs and Family Center Based programs). It does not include Home-Based programs as they are not required to participate in QRIS. The number of grantees in FY2013 is lower due to the impact of the sequestration.

IDEA part B: number of high needs children in public preschool programs in QRIS with self-assessed rating of level 2 to level 4. The percentage of high needs children in top tiers of QRIS is 36% (calculated based on the total number of 3,572 high needs children in QRIS programs at all levels).

Title I: number of high needs children in public preschool programs in QRIS (with self-assessed level 2-4) receiving school wide Title I funding. The percentage of high needs children in the top tiers of QRIS is 37% (calculated on a total number of 2,457 high needs children in QRIS programs at all levels).

CCDF: CCDF data reporting from the Early Childhood Information System (ECIS). Children age 0-5 per calendar year in active (billing) subsidy and voucher programs in QRIS levels 2 and 4. Baseline figure for CCDF is calendar year 2011. QRIS numbers baseline through year 2 revised in 2013 Annual Report to reflect these top tiers. In the 2012 annual report, CCDF numbers were based on estimates from monthly billing data. For the 2013 annual report, CCDF numbers were based on annual subsidy data from ECIS.

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 grant targets by the end of the grant period.

The state plans to implement the following strategies to ensure measurable progress will be made to increase the number of high needs children participating in the highest levels of QRIS.

- EEC will be hiring additional staff (Program Quality Specialists) to provide QRIS technical assistance and other support to early education programs.
- EEC has revised its policy on the Environment Rating Scales (ERS) to encourage greater participation at higher levels of QRIS.
- EEC established a QRIS Working Group for Program Administrators and a QRIS Working Group for Educators to provide input on QRIS policy development such as the Environment Rating Scales policy and QRIS level 1 requirements for public school programs. The engagement of these working groups will improve stakeholder buy in with QRIS and increase understanding of QRIS and its value to children and families.
- EEC will make improvements to the QRIS online system to improve functionality and make it more user friendly as the field has expressed concerns about the current online application system.
- As part of the QRIS Program Improvement Grants (project 2.5), an online QRIS community will be developed so that best practice information can be shared among programs. In addition, coaches and mentors will be recruited and trained to assist grantees.

- EEC will continue to communicate with programs and QRIS coaches and mentors about QRIS and its benefits through public forums, trainings, electronic communications, and the Brain Building in Progress campaign.
- The state plans to revise its Universal Pre-Kindergarten (UPK) grant strategy in FY15 and FY16 to increase the number of high needs children being served in higher level QRIS programs.
- The state is exploring the feasibility of revising the Head Start State Supplemental grant strategy to require Head Start programs to demonstrate movement into higher levels of QRIS.
- The state plans to investigate the feasibility of tiered funding to promote greater participation in QRIS.

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.

EEC hired a public institution of higher education (IHE) to conduct a study of the MA QRIS that a) validates, using research-based measures, whether the tiers in QRIS accurately reflect differential levels of program quality; and b) assesses, using appropriate research designs and measures of progress, the extent to which changes in quality ratings are related to progress in children's learning, development, and school readiness. The validation study plan calls for the implementation of an at-scale study, preceded by a pilot study to develop and test study procedures and protocols.

The pilot study was conducted from October 2012 through June 2013. Pre-pilot planning activities included the development of a measurement map and instruments to collect data related to the QRIS standards and child outcomes; submission of study for Institutional Review Board (IRB) review and approval; and the training for key study personnel on the environment rating scales that will be used. The purpose of the pilot was to develop and test specific instruments that could be used for the at-scale study, and assess procedures for both communicating with providers and collecting the required data. Instruments included:
- Program Information Questionnaire: to collect information related to program affiliation and accreditation, enrollment and classrooms, staffing, and program fees and expenses.
- Director Interview Protocol: directors were interviewed on the following topics: program information, staff training and development, curriculum and assessment policies, program services and community involvement, and administrator experience and qualifications.
- Teacher Survey: to collect information related to the standards as it relates to classroom practice and teachers' perceptions of program-wide practice, as well as to the background information, such as teacher education and experience.
- Parent Survey: to collect background information about the child and family and information related to the standards that pertain to family and community engagement.
- To measure children's development, the study plan identified two types of strategies that would be used. The first involved direct one-on-one assessment of children's skills and abilities. The second involved the use of teacher ratings to obtain additional information about children's progress along domains that cannot be easily ascertained via direct assessment, such as social skills and approaches to learning. Existing measures of each type were adapted in the development of pilot study instruments to reflect the specific nature of the pilot study and its context, while customized data collection forms were also developed for each.

Overall, the results of the pilot study were encouraging. Many of the strategies outlined in the research plan were successfully implemented and should be able to be replicated in the at-scale study with some modification and refinement. Pilot study procedures resulted in 100% response rates for all program and classroom-level data, which included a program information questionnaire, a director interview, and classroom-level teacher surveys. Processes for the collection of direct child assessments (94% completion rates) and teacher rating assessments (94% completion rates) were also very successful.

<u>Implications for At-Scale Study</u>

Through the pilot study it became evident that the Massachusetts QRIS system was still in a relatively early stage of implementation and was not ready for the type of validation activity outlined in the original study plan. EEC is in the process of reviewing the system and its standards, further developing its verification processes, and offering training and support to the field. The comprehensive nature of the QRIS and characteristics of some of its standards, such as those addressing multiple constructs, standards, and imprecise measures, make the system somewhat difficult to implement and burdensome for providers. To accommodate these changes, as well as allow time for new providers to enter the system and be verified, the at-scale phase of the validation study will be delayed until Fall 2014 (the original start date was Fall 2013).

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

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

Promoting Early Learning Outcomes

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

Has the State made progress in ensuring that its Early Learning and Development Standards:

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

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.

Massachusetts is engaged in several activities to improve its early learning and development standards. The following describes the progress the state has made in this area.

Massachusetts Alignment Study (project 6.2)

Starting in 2012, EEC partnered with Sharon Lynn Kagan, Catherine Scott-Little, Jeanne Reid, and their teams at Teachers College, Columbia University, and the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, to conduct an 18-month analysis of the content and alignment of the Massachusetts early learning and development documents. The study included an evaluation of the ways in which the current early learning standards for young children, ages birth to five, are aligned with the state's kindergarten standards and other national standards documents, notably the Head Start Child Development and Early Learning Framework (HSCDELF), which applies to children enrolled in the nation's Head Start program, and the kindergarten-level Common Core standards. Additionally, the study focused on understanding if the MA standards for young children are aligned with the formative assessments it may be using to gauge the development of their competencies and learning.

The MA Alignment Study concluded in October 2013 and the following suite of analytic reports was completed:
- *Deliverable I:* Content Analysis of the Early Learning and Development Standards (Infants, Toddlers, Preschool, and Kindergarten)
- *Deliverable II:* Alignment Analyses of the Early Learning and Development Standards and the Head Start Child Development and Early Learning Framework (Toddler vs. Preschool, Preschool vs. Kindergarten, and Preschool vs. the HSDCELF)
- *Deliverable III:* Alignment Analyses of the Massachusetts Preschool Standards and Three Assessments for the Same Age Group
- *Deliverable IV:* Alignment Analyses of the Massachusetts Kindergarten Standards and Two Assessments for the Same Age Group

The results presented in the four deliverables affirm that Massachusetts has a solid set of early learning standards for infants, toddlers and preschool; but could strengthen and improve their alignment by being

attentive to the domains of Social & Emotional Development and Approaches Toward Play & Learning, as well as to Physical Development & Motor Skills. One recommendation is to pay more attention to the cognitive processes, particularly in the preschool and kindergarten standards. In addition to these recommendations, the standards across all age levels could be improved by attending explicitly to English Language Learners, and to the current understanding of children's abilities in mathematics at very early ages. Many areas of misalignment were found between the standards and the HSCDELF, which generally covers more areas of early learning than the preschool standards. The results were mixed in terms of how well the three assessments used in preschool and the two assessments used in kindergarten align with the respective Massachusetts standards.

Recommendations from MA Alignment Study

The recommendations fall under four broad themes: (1) standards revision; (2) standards implementation; (3) professional development enhancement; and (4) data collection and use. Massachusetts will use these recommendations to inform future policies and develop strategies to improve its early learning standards and professional development for early educators. Specifically, the state plans to revise its preschool learning standards in 2014 and 2015 to include more components of Social & Emotional Development and Approaches Toward Play & Learning.

Standards Revision
- The results suggest that some revisions are necessary to create a more holistic set of standards. The preschool and kindergarten standards should be revised to reflect the integrated and multi-domain nature of early learning. Currently there are the lack of standards in the area of Approaches Toward Play & Learning in the preschool and kindergarten standards, and the insufficient attention accorded to the area of Social & Emotional Development at the same age levels.
- The state should include standards in supporting children who are learning English as a second language.
- Massachusetts should start its revisions with the preschool standards, which are couched in a pivotal spot between the infant/toddler standards and kindergarten standards, and alongside the HSCDELF in many preschool programs. Using the HSCDELF to think about the domains and content that could be included in the standards might be a good place to start. Not only is the HSCDELF quite comprehensive, but it also represents some important areas that are absent from the Massachusetts standards. The revised set of preschool standards could then be used as a metric against which alignment with the older infant/toddler and kindergarten standards could be addressed.
- It is recommended that once the content of the revised standards has been determined, then the content of each assessment should be carefully considered for its alignment to the revised standards. The state may then decide to include one or more instruments that are most closely aligned with the standards within its assessment system.

Standards Implementation
- As Massachusetts considers the refinement of its standards, it must also hasten to create a clear implementation plan that specifies how it intends to use its standards. Such a plan should be collaboratively developed across the two departments EEC and ESE. It should also delineate a sequencing of efforts so that implementation efforts are carried out logically. For example, standards-based professional and curriculum development should be ensconced prior to the use of assessments for high-stakes decision making about children. Planning for the effective use of standards as a cornerstone for educational improvement and continuity is at the heart of creating an effective early learning system. Effective planning for the use of standards will support the comprehensive, aligned, and coordinated approach to early childhood education that Massachusetts envisions. In so doing, the state could provide national leadership with its prescient approach to this foundational goal.

Professional Development Enhancement
- Programs serving infants and toddlers, preschool educators, and kindergarten teachers, as well as administrators within all levels of the early childhood system, need professional development on the standards themselves so that they are familiar with the content. Professional development is also needed on how to intentionally plan and implement learning experiences based on the standards.
- Massachusetts should also strengthen professional development for the appropriate and accurate use of assessment processes. In particular, professional development is needed on how to conduct standards-based observational assessment. The provision of such professional development will improve the quality of data collection and help embed the use of assessment in the practice of early care and education. Regardless of what assessment(s) the state chooses to employ, building capacity for observational assessment in the field will lay the groundwork for an effective standards and assessment system.
- When the time is right, the state will also need to provide professional development on the assessment(s) instruments being used in programs.

Data Collection and Use
- There are two major ways that data related to standards can and should be collected and used. First, Massachusetts should continue its commitment to incorporating rigorous analyses into its programmatic plans. Having this kind of data provided in these alignment studies should be normative for a progressive state. Through such analyses, Massachusetts can be assured of obtaining information directly relevant to the state. A standards-based research agenda should be conceptualized and considered as a high priority for the future.
- Second, it is important that when data are collected on young learners, they accord and respect the standards. Across agencies, data must be collected, but rather than collecting diverse and inconsistent data elements, often redundantly expending time and resources, a consolidated and standards-based approach to data collection should be considered. Such an approach should examine the standards to see if the data being solicited are linked to, and consistent with them. Such a review would not only alleviate redundancy and its attendant costs, but also reduce the challenge of data collection design, implementation, and analyses. Standards are an essential tool for creating a data-driven, efficient, and continuous system of early learning.

Sequencing the Recommendations
- The revision of the standards should be the priority and be guided by the analyses represented in the suite of studies. While the revision process is underway, the state should enhance its professional development to prepare the field to use the standards and early childhood assessment instruments effectively and reliably. Data collection and use, already underway in Massachusetts, should continue and expand to support the state's efforts to strengthen its early childhood policies and programs. Overall, it is critical that Massachusetts consider how the standards can be infused into multiple systems so that they become a cornerstone of a solid birth-to-third-grade system for early care and education.

Early English Language Development Standards (project 6.4)

In the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, more than 1 in 4 children under age 6 live in households that speak a language other than English. In order to prepare children for school success, a focus on early learning for Dual Language Learners (DLLs) and meaningful engagement of their parents and communities is essential. In FY12, EEC engaged with the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) group from the University of Wisconsin to develop Early English Language Development Standards (E-ELDS). The E-ELDS are designed for early education programs that serve Dual Language Learners ages 2.5 to 5.5 years.

The E-ELDS are aligned with the State's Early Learning Standards, including the Head Start Child Development and Early Learning Framework, and WIDA's K-12 English Language Development Standards (ELDS) implemented by the Department of Elementary and Secondary (ESE).

In December 2012, early childhood stakeholders and experts provided feedback on the draft standards developed by WIDA, specifically on the Model Performance Indicators (MPIs), resource development, and resource dissemination. WIDA conducted a full day working session for over 40 participants on the draft E-ELDS. The standards include social emotional and physical development, and cover the domains of early literacy, math, social studies, and science.

The EEC Board approved the E-ELDS to be use in the state's early education and care system in November 2013. In 2014, EEC will collaborate with WIDA to provide a variety of professional development opportunities for educators to:

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

Below is a description of the 2014 professional development offerings.

- **CONFERENCE:** Supporting Young Dual Language Learners' School Readiness and Beyond (February 27, 2014). This is a free one-day event focusing on the importance of supporting, instructing and assessing DLLs and English Language Learners (ELLs) from Birth through Grade 12 to ensure school readiness and success. An overview of WIDA's Early English Language Development Standards: Massachusetts Guidelines to support DLLs will be provided.
- **WEBINAR 1:** Language in Play: Introduction to the Early English Language Development (E-ELD) Standards (March 13, 2014). This webinar will provide a more in-depth view of each component of the E-ELD Standards Framework. Each component will be reviewed and implications for use as well as implementation in various early education and care programs will be discussed.
- **WEBINAR 2:** Understanding Language Growth: The E-ELD Performance Definitions (March 27, 2014). This webinar will provide a detailed examination of the Performance Definitions. Topics include: 1) Foundational concepts and research that guided development of the E-ELD Performance Definitions; 2) Similarities and differences with WIDA's Kindergarten to Grade 12 English Language Development Standards Framework; and 3) Consideration for the use of the Performance Definitions in planning curriculum and monitoring growth of early English language development.
- **WEBINAR 3:** Playing with Language: Understanding and Using the Model Performance Indicator (MPI) Strands (April 10, 2014). This webinar will build a deeper understanding of the MPI strands. Topics include: 1) the connection between the Early English Language Development (E-ELD) Standards: MA guidelines to support DLLs and the MPIs; 2) identifying element of a MPI Strands; 3) Using MPI Strands in everyday practice; and 4) Implications for Instruction and Assessment.
- **REGIONAL TRAIN the TRAINERS WORKSHOPS** (Spring/Summer 2014): Participants will have an opportunity to learn about the newly adopted Early English Language Development Standards: Massachusetts Guidelines to Support DLLs while further developing facilitation skills.
- **PARENT/FAMILIES FOCUS GROUPS** (Spring/Summer 2014): Parents will have an opportunity to learn about the newly adopted Early English Language Development Standards: Massachusetts Guidelines to Support DLLs. Parents will also learn about the importance of maintaining and developing home language and the role language plays in school readiness.

Preschool Science, Technology, and Engineering (STE) Learning Standards and Guidelines

EEC developed Pre-Kindergarten Science, Technology, and Engineering*(STE) Learning Standards to inform the development of STEM curricula in early education programs for preschool children from 2 years and 9 months through 5 years old. The standards are developmentally appropriate for children in this age range and connect to the Science and Technology/Engineering Standards for preschool through grade 2 being developed by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE). Furthermore, these standards align with EEC's existing regulations, early learning standards and guidelines, as well as the Head Start outcomes frameworks. This project is funded by SAC and CCDF. *(Preschool mathematics standards were already developed in March 2011 as a part of the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, therefore, are not included in this project.)

In October 2013, the EEC Board approved proposed STE Standards for Pre-Kindergarten and have aligned them with ESE's proposed revised Science Standards. EEC has worked with early education experts from Wheelock College to develop Pre-Kindergarten Science, Technology, and Engineering (STE) Learning Standards which emphasize the importance of science, technology, and engineering in pre-kindergarten curricula. The proposed STE Standards have been designed to:
- Connect with the Curriculum Framework for English Language Arts (ELA) and Literacy, the Curriculum Framework for Mathematics, and the Head Start Child Development and Early Learning Framework;
- Align with existing guidelines, including the Early Learning Guidelines for Infants and Toddlers; the Guidelines for Preschool Learning Experiences; and the Kindergarten Learning Experiences;
- Incorporate three of the domains established in A Framework for K-12 Science Education -- practices of science and technology, cross-cutting concepts, and disciplinary core ideas; and
- Identify learning outcomes and highlight content in the context of practices and cross-cutting ideas.

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

Has the State made progress in implementing a developmentally appropriate Comprehensive Assessment System working with Early Learning and Development Programs to:

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

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.

The Massachusetts Early Learning and Development Assessment System (MELD) (project 3) measures child growth and development from birth to third grade. In 2013, the state has engaged in a variety of activities to further the comprehensive assessment system.

Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) Screening (project 3.1, 3.5, and 3.7)

- Since January 2013, approximately 1,160 children have been screened using the ASQ and ASQ-SE (social emotional) developmental screening tool based on online database information, through the state's network of local family and community engagement providers, also known as the Coordinated Family and Community Engagement (CFCE) grantees. These 96 CFCE grantees were trained in using the ASQ and have strengthened their skills in having meaningful conversation with families about their child's progress across five developmental domains. For example, if the child's ASQ scores are below the cutoff, CFCE staff provides the family with information and referrals to other supports, such as developmental assessment and evaluation, Early Intervention, public preschool special education, and any other resources to support the parent and child. Additionally, the ASQ kit includes activities that parents and families can do to support their child's progress in any of the developmental domains.
- EEC, in collaboration with the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD), organized four trainings across the Commonwealth. Each training covered topics such as the impact of homelessness on children's development, how to work with families experiencing homelessness, how to use the ASQ screening tool itself, and how to connect families to CFCEs for more information and resources for their child's development. Approximately 150 homeless shelter and agency staff attended the trainings, representing 64 agencies across the Commonwealth. Each agency received an ASQ kit in English at the training sites, and ASQ kits in Spanish were purchased and shipped to applicable agencies. EEC utilized an existing partnership with Boston Children's Hospital staff, who volunteered their time and skills to facilitate all aspects of each training.
- Additional ASQ and ASQ-SE trainings will be planned for 2014.

Massachusetts Kindergarten Entry Assessment (MKEA) (project 3)

- As of December 2013, there are 77 school districts participating in MKEA, which represents a 74% increase from 2012. Approximately 20,000 kindergarten children have been assessed.
- In October 2013, over 450 teachers and administrators participated in a statewide MKEA conference on formative assessment. The conference was a success as participants came away with a better understanding of the practice of authentic observations and how they can be used to help inform assessment. The keynote speaker was Stephanie Cox Suarez from Wheelock College, a known expert on early childhood assessment. The conference had five breakout sessions:
  - ο Using observation as a tool: a deeper dive into the practice of observation-based assessments.
  - ο How to conduct effective student observation in EC settings/strategies for integrating the assessment/tool into classroom practice: learn how to make observation part of the on-going instructional practices of a classroom.
  - ο Skills necessary to support classroom observation: the skills and competencies necessary to become an objective and effective observer of children's development and learning.
  - ο Linking learning standards and observation of play: the important linkage between the state's early learning standards, observational data and on-going support of children's' learning and development based on the data.
  - ο Using formative assessment data to inform instruction: how to use the data to inform instruction and support children's development and learning.
- EEC amended the RTT-ELC budget to include more funding for professional development. In December 2013, EEC contracted with a new vendor to provide assessment training in collaboration with the state's existing workforce infrastructure. This infrastructure includes the five Educator and Provider Support (EPS) grantees that provide regional professional development, as well as the six Readiness Centers that provide comprehensive support to educators from birth to higher education. In 2014, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) will be established in each region to support ongoing work in assessment

practices. The state is in the process of planning the next MKEA conference for Cohort 3 on April 7, 2014.

Common Metric Project (project 9)

- The focus of the Common Metric Project was to develop a common metric for early learning assessment tools given that the state is using multiple assessment tools for the MKEA (as opposed to a single statewide tool). In February 2013, EEC requested an amendment for this project due to unanticipated changes in the scope of work and vendor.
- Massachusetts amended the Common Metric Project to be a research study to determine the feasibility of developing a common measure for child growth based on commonly used assessment tools. Through the initial implementation and assessment of this project, Massachusetts learned that starting with a feasibility study was an important first step in the process to help determine how large a sample size is really needed to conduct the analysis to create a common metric.
- EEC received the results of the Common Metric Project study in June 2013. Major findings from the study include:
  - ο The three formative assessment tools (Teaching Strategies Gold, Work Sampling System, High Scope COR) do not do a sufficient job of summarizing children's growth in each of the five key developmental domains (cognitive, language, social, physical, approaches to learning) and that there is substantial overlap between items and the domains in which they are related.
  - ο The study recommended moving away from considering these tools for the purpose of measuring children's growth and development and for the purpose of program evaluation, and instead, focus on existing instruments that are less subject to teacher rater error. Limitations of this project include the large amount of missing data, lack of sufficient data from kindergarten children, the ordinal level of measurement (measurements were ranked as first, second, etc.), and teacher rater effects.
  - ο A final recommendation was to find ways to improve the data collection process and in particular to ensure the data are entered properly, without missing items, and with full demographic data available at the time of the assessment. The second phase of this project proposed developing a common statistical metric and an associated tool to measure children's skills, knowledge and abilities across five domains when they enter kindergarten. The goal of this second phase would be to make a recommendation regarding the use of population-based measures that can be easily administered to large groups of preschool-aged children, for the purpose of measuring children's developmental progress at kindergarten entry.
- Given the results of the Common Metric Project and the difficulty in developing a common measure, the state decided not to continue with this project.
- Instead, the state has chosen to change the original MKEA plan in 2014 and 2015 in order to meet the RTT-ELC grant requirements of a statewide kindergarten entry assessment. School districts participating in MKEA Cohort 3 in 2014 and Cohort 4 in 2015 will no longer have the option of choosing between two assessment tools (Teaching Strategies and Work Sampling); instead, they will be required to use only one tool (Teaching Strategies). Additionally, a sample of the school districts in Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 that have chosen the Work Sampling System tool will be required to do a pilot of the Teaching Strategies tool so that EEC can collect statewide kindergarten assessment data. EEC will provide training on Teaching Strategies for these cohorts. The state will submit a formal amendment of the change to the MKEA plan to the federal program officer for approval in the March-April 2014 timeframe.

National Governor's Association (NGA) Policy Academy on Building a Foundation for Student Success: State Strategies to Improve Learning Outcomes from Early Childhood to Third Grade

- In June 2013, Massachusetts was one of six states selected to participate in the National Governor's Association (NGA) Policy Academy on Building a Foundation for Student Success: State Strategies to

Improve Learning Outcomes from Early Childhood to Third Grade. The state received a $25,000 grant to participate in the 18-month policy academy, which aims to build greater awareness and commitment to a birth to third grade strategy that specifically focuses on enhancing early learning standards (strengthening social emotional component and alignment with state's definition of college and career readiness) and developing a comprehensive birth to third grade assessment system (increase alignment of pre-k and kindergarten assessment policies).

- The NGA Policy Academy team includes representatives from the state's education agencies, including the Executive Office of Education (EOE), EEC, ESE, and the Department of Higher Education (DHE), as well as the Readiness Centers and various nonprofit advocacy groups. The team convenes on a monthly basis to execute the NGA Policy Academy work plan. In December 2013, the team met to analyze the preschool standards and incorporate additional social emotional development components as well as developed a draft of a birth to third grade definition of college and career readiness that aligns with the state's K-12 definition of college and career readiness.
- In Spring 2014, the state will host a symposium on the NGA Policy Academy work, with an anticipated audience of over 300 individuals from early childhood, elementary, secondary and higher education, as well as nonprofit advocacy groups.

Assessment Initiatives with the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE)

- Massachusetts is a participant in the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness of College and Careers (PARCC), with ESE as the lead agency on this initiative.
- Massachusetts is also an advisory state to Maryland and Ohio in the Enhanced Assessment Grant (EAG). As one of seven states in MD-OH EAG consortium, Massachusetts will draw from research and best practices to improve the quality, validity, and reliability of state academic assessments; measure student academic achievement using multiple measures; chart student progress over time; and evaluate student academic achievement through the development of comprehensive academic assessment instruments. Lessons learned from MD-OH EAG work will inform Massachusetts as the state evaluates and improves its current assessment policies.

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

Has the State made progress in:

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

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

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

- <u>Museums and Libraries Partnership for Parent, Family and Community Engagement:</u> In partnership with EEC, the Boston Children's Museum (BCM) is implementing a statewide strategy to increase the capacity of museums and libraries to support the optimal development of all children through intentional family engagement activities and early learning opportunities. The partnership focuses on four areas: early literacy; school readiness, including preparation for kindergarten; interest and awareness of STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Math); and public awareness of the importance of early education and care through the state's Brain Building in Progress communications initiative.
- <u>Financial Literacy Education:</u> EEC partnered with the Massachusetts Community Action Programs (MASSCAP) to develop a Financial Literacy Education online course (with a training module) to support families in gaining long-term economic independence and self-sufficiency skills, so that they can provide stable and healthy learning environments for young children.
- <u>Evidence Based Family Literacy:</u> The Evidence Based Literacy grant provides support to 24 existing Coordinate Family and Community Engagement (CFCE) grantees to enhance their implementation of evidence-based early literacy programming for children and families in their communities.
- <u>Adult Family Literacy:</u> In collaboration with the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE), EEC awards Supporting Family Literacy grants of $5,000 per year for three years to five Adult Community Learning Services Programs.
- <u>Media-Based Literacy Support for Families and Educators:</u> In partnership with the WGBH Educational Foundation, EEC has created the Resources for Early Learning website (www.resourcesforearlylearning.org). This new comprehensive digital hub features a media-based English Language Arts (ELA) and Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) preschool curriculum, professional development modules, online educational games, and other digital tools for educators and parents.
- <u>Brain Building in Progress (BBIP):</u> In partnership with United Way of Massachusetts Bay and Merrimack Valley, EEC launched the Brain Building in Progress (BBIP) campaign on the importance of investing in early childhood. It is focused on raising the public's awareness about the importance of investing in the early years, based on current research focused on how connections between early experiences and later educational outcomes directly relate to future economic prosperity.

- Brazelton Touchpoints: In partnership with Boston Children's Hospital, EEC offered in depth training on the Brazelton Touchpoints model to the CFCE grantees to support families in promoting positive child development.

Below is a summary of the 2013 accomplishments in each of these activities.

Museums and Libraries Partnership for Parent, Family and Community Engagement (project #4.4)
- Since 2012, there has been a growth of museums and libraries that have joined the partnership. Currently there are 54 museums and 61 libraries that are active partners, and the list continues to grow.
- Boston Children's Museum (BCM) has created a bimonthly newsletter, which reaches nearly 300 individuals, to share content and gather information about what project participants are doing with the training and materials disseminated through this partnership.
- Training for museum and library partners on the core areas of STEM and School Readiness has been completed. STEM Kits were developed and disseminated to approximately 50 museums and 50 libraries in 2013. Kits are currently being used in a variety of ways, including: story hours in libraries; STEM focused activities in museums, coupled with science or math story hours; and/or paired with other science and math activities.
- There were 108 participants in the "Countdown to Kindergarten" trainings for museums and libraries held throughout Massachusetts during summer 2013.
- The Boston Children's Museum Vice President Jeri Robinson was invited to present at the convening of "Museums and the Learning Ecosystem, the Future of Education", hosted by the American Alliance of Museums, Center for the Future of Museums in Washington, DC. She presented on a panel, "Museums and Education, Changing the Paradigm" as an example/ member of the Communities of Innovative Practitioners. The talk was entitled: "Empowering STATEWIDE museums and libraries as integral education partners."
- The September 2013 issue of the National Association for Education of Young Children (NAEYC) Journal, Young Children, included a story about a model Kindergarten classroom at the 1893 World's Fair. The article describes Boston Children's Museum's Kindergarten classroom exhibit and mentions our "Pop-Up Kindergarten Classroom Kit."
- In November 2013 at the statewide STEM Conference hosted by Governor Patrick, Boston Children's presented on the museums and libraries partnership to an audience of over 100 individuals.

Financial Literacy Education (project 4.1)
- Over 185 participants attended the five regional trainings held in 2013. Participants included CFCE grantees, EPS grantees, Head Start, Child Care Resources and Referral contractors, and other community stakeholders.
- Since the launch of this project in 2012, community agencies have provided financial literacy education to over 1,200 families.

Evidence Based Family Literacy (project 4.2)
- There were 24 organizations that received grants (over $800K) to implement the following evidence-based literacy models/practices in their communities: Raising A Reader, Every Child Ready to Read @ your Library, CELL model (Center for Early Literacy Learning), Read and Rise (Scholastic model) and Dialogic and Interactive reading models- using PEER and CROWD sequences
- EEC created an online literacy monthly reporting tool to collect monthly data for each of the grantees. In 2013:
  - ο 7,743 children received evidence-based literacy programming
  - ο 5,784 parents received evidence-based programming
  - ο 1,443 sessions/activities were delivered by the grantees

Adult Literacy (4.3)

- In collaboration with IBM Corporation, EEC was able to award 58 IBM KidSmart Early Learning Program computers and associated educational software to 13 programs serving some of the neediest preschool children in 2013. EEC continues to provide technical assistance to the five grantees that are providing family literacy services to adult learners.
    - Two grantees provide "stand alone" programs to assist parents of young children in supporting and encouraging their young children's language and literacy development. These services are provided separate from their regular adult literacy classes, and parents may or may not have access to the IBM Reading Companion program.
    - Three grantees provide their Family Literacy services in conjunction with their other adult literacy services, and parents regularly use the IBM Reading Companion to improve their reading and speaking skills.

Media-Based Literacy Support for Families and Educators (project 12)

- In September 2013 EEC, in partnership with the WGBH Educational Foundation, unveiled Phase 1 of Resources for Early Learning, a media-rich digital hub featuring educational resources, developed by a team of experts, educators, and parents.
- Content for educators of preschoolers (ages 3-5) includes a nine -unit, comprehensive Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) and English Language Arts (ELA) curriculum (based on the MA Early Learning Curriculum), that provides a media-based approach to help children develop their academic, social, and emotional skills.
- The digital hub content also includes twelve professional development video-based trainings to explore essential best practices for early childhood education, and offers instruction for both individuals and facilitated groups.
- For parents of infants and toddlers, the website includes parent activities and parenting education videos. These quick, easy, and fun activities for families of children ages birth to three provide exciting, everyday learning experiences. The parenting education videos, designed for parents of infants and toddlers, offer advice, tips, and suggestions on how to enhance children's learning, for individuals and facilitated groups.
- For children, the website contains playlists of videos and other media that corresponds to each curriculum unit and week. Educators can choose to have children watch or listen to the media on their own or as part of a group activity.
- In November 2013, WGBH began Phase 2 of the digital hub, which focused on: developing content for educators of infants and toddlers (birth-3) and resources for parents of preschoolers (3- to 5-years-old); raising awareness about the website through presentations and trainings; and planning for the text message campaign to begin in 2014.

Brain Building in Progress (project 11)

United Way serves as the main organizer and manager of the campaign, engaging constituents throughout the state in various efforts. As such, the Brain Building in Progress campaign has offered many opportunities for the public to be exposed to the brand and messaging, including the development of a website (www.brainbuildinginprogress.org), social media presence, and community events including Brain Building in Progress week.

- In FY 2013, United Way expanded the Brain Building in Progress campaign by developing a set of core messages about quality, building upon the messaging work and relating it to QRIS components of in easily accessible language. These core messages have served as the content that is embedded into all activities and products. Messages include: "Make Any Moment a Brain Building Moment"; "Look for

Brain Building Zones"; "Build Your Knowledge: The More We Know, The More We'll Help Children Grow"; "Make the Connections that Build Young Brains"; and "Lead So That Young Children Succeed".

- Brain Building in Progress materials were created, including: a Leadership bookmark, Making Connections bookmark, and Brain Building Zones magnet. These resources were shared with families across the Commonwealth through EEC's Coordinated Family and Community Engagement (CFCE) grantees.
- The United Way enhanced efforts in bringing technology-based information to parents. United Way explored the feasibility of technology-based products for parents that connect them to local resources. These included: texting campaign, the development of an interactive resource locator, and events calendar for the website, and a Facebook page.
- In April 2013, the Brain Building in Progress week occurred with activities throughout the state including the Read with Me: Brain Building in Progress multi-agency event in Lowell; Week of the Young Child in Boston, co-sponsored by the Boston Children's Museum and WGBH; and various other events such as a Brain Building in Progress Fair hosted by the Chinese Church, a Family and Community Fair in Lynn, and a Brain Building Festival in Northampton.

Brazelton Touchpoints (project 4.5)

The Brazelton Touchpoints model provides a common language of child behavior and development that enables families, communities, and care providers to work more effectively together for the benefit of children. This model also reinforces parents' roles as the first teacher of their children.

- Ten regional trainings (three days each) were completed from Fall 2012 to Summer 2013.
- A total of 207 participants have completed the training. Participants included the CFCE grantees and their grant partners, the Department of Children and Families (DCF) staff, and EEC staff.
- After the trainings, EEC staff reported feeling more confident and better equipped to support early educators who want terminate a child because of behavioral issues or parent interactions; now, they are able to work with the educator to find a positive solution.
- Massachusetts is being recognized as a Brazelton Touchpoints State.

Birth to Grade Three Strategy Development (project 5.3)

Massachusetts has embraced birth to third grade alignment as a comprehensive strategy that seeks to improve young children's access to high quality birth to grade three programs and strengthens the capacity of elementary schools to sustain student learning gains in the early elementary school years. By integrating these two efforts, the state aims to enable children to be proficient in reading and math, and to develop the social and emotional skills that support academic success by the end of third grade.

In order to ensure that transition planning occurs for children moving from early learning and development programs to elementary schools, Massachusetts is focusing on building and enhancing partnerships between community early education, school-age programs, and public schools to ensure alignment of curriculum, assessment, professional development and transitions for children and their families. EEC is collaborating with the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) to link the work being done in public schools to maximize the investment in our children.

EEC has invested RTT-ELC funds to help communities improve child outcomes through a comprehensive birth to third grade strategy. The Birth to Grade Three Community Implementation/Planning grants focus on strengthening the existing birth to third grade infrastructure within targeted local communities (i.e., low-performing school districts, Gateway cities, and Home Visiting communities).

In 2012, EEC awarded the Birth to Grade Three Community Implementation/Planning grant to five communities: Lowell, Boston, Springfield, Somerville, and Pittsfield.

EEC has partnered with private non-profit to assist with the implementation of the state's birth to third grade strategy. This non-profit is analyzing the early learning partnerships between public and private organizations that support children birth to grade three, such as public schools, private early education and care programs, and business leaders within a community who are interested in the early education agenda. They will also identify the ways that changes in the partnerships are impacting programs, educators and children.

Below is a summary of 2013 progress made in Lowell, Boston, Springfield, Somerville, and Pittsfield with Birth to Grade Three alignment:

Lowell: Piloting a Comprehensive Quality Improvement Model in Two Challenging Communities
- Lowell piloted a classroom observation system using CLASS that included Family Child Care Programs and grade 1 to 3 classrooms.
- Professionals were trained in Teaching Strategies Gold and received coaches for their classrooms and programs to assist in implementation.
- This pilot was established to create consistency in program quality and collect child assessment data to inform school readiness.
- Lowell added mathematics to its professional development offerings, in addition to the literacy activities.

Boston: Expanding a Proven Preschool Model across Sectors through District/Community Collaboration
- Four public school classrooms and three private community programs expanded their use of the Opening the World (OWL) curriculum in an effort to align child experiences across community-based and Boston Public School programs.
- Teachers and providers received a full day professional development training on the instructional materials and received classroom coaching.

Springfield: Drawing on a History of Early Literacy Work to Deepen Collaborative Professional Learning
- Springfield organized a fall conference where Kristie Kauerz was the keynote speaker. She spoke about her work in birth to third grade alignment.
- Monthly Professional Learning Communities (PLC) occurred in 2013 where educators from public and private early childhood programs met to discuss professional development practices.
- 305 student volunteers from the Engaged the Minnesota Reading Corps provided literacy activities to Springfield Public Schools children at risk of low reading proficient. 40 teachers and volunteers received training on literacy activities.
- Stephanie Jones and Nonie Lessaux from the Graduate School of Education at Harvard University provided Springfield with technical assistance to support their birth to third grade alignment efforts.
- The community organized a family engagement activity on Read and Write with Me to improve literacy and writing skills.
- Springfield has posted on-line resource materials for families, teachers and administrators.

Somerville: Translating Strong Community and District Commitment through Asset Mapping and Professional Development
- The Somerville Advisory Committee developed benchmarks for their birth to third grade plans and created a community resource database.
- Two groups were formed to support educators in helping children to transition into kindergarten.
- The Early Literacy Coaching Program with launched using the Early Language and Literacy Classroom Observation (ELLCO) tool. Eight sites around Somerville receive on site coaching twice a week.
- 30 teachers received professional development training on the Teaching Strategies Gold tool as part of their participation in MKEA.

- 80 children participated in the summer learning adventure program to expose young children to the kindergarten experience in the public schools.
- Somerville planned a literacy fair and facilitated literacy play groups through the Parent Child Home Program.

Berkshire County/Pittsfield: Aligning and Deepening the Impact of a Structured Community-Driven Initiative
- Pittsfield expanded their literacy summer program that served 258 students.
- Teachers and administrators received professional development on Work Sampling.
- There were eight workshops by the Parent Child Home Program on helping families build positive attachments with their children.
- Teachers in public and community based programs were offered two free courses at the local community college to improve their skills.
- Pittsfield organized multiple parent engagement events (including parent cafes) that were attended by 500 families in the community.

Interagency Partnerships (project 7)

In addition to the activities described above, EEC has partnerships with the state's health and human services agencies to support young children and their families. The following describes progress made in 2013 with the Interagency Partnerships (project 7).

Department of Children and Families (DCF) (project 7.1)

An interagency partnership with the Department of Children and Families (DCF) was established to promote early childhood and child development within the child welfare system. DCF is committed to incorporating research and best practices in early childhood development and education into and across all aspects of our work with children and families involved in the child welfare system. This work involves revising existing and creating new policies and procedures for DCF social workers and other staff; enhancing training for new and current DCF staff; providing greater access to quality early education and care programs for DCF-involved families and foster parents; increasing awareness among all stakeholders (internal and external) about the importance of early childhood experiences and relationships, especially for children at risk of abuse and neglect; and providing concrete support and information for our parents/families to help them support their children's healthy, positive development. Through this partnership, DCF will help to: safely stabilize families with very young children and prevent the need for out-of-home placement; more rapidly reunify families with very young children when out-of-home placement is necessary; and improve school readiness among young children involved with the child welfare system. Below is a summary of progress made in 2013.
- Successfully completed the hiring process for two new, highly qualified and fully dedicated early childhood staff. The Early Childhood Program Coordinator and Early Childhood Policy Analyst are focused on embedding child development into the policies and practices of the agency through professional development, the revision of policies as needed and by offering technical assistance to the field.
- In partnership with Wheelock College, established a new Early Childhood Mental Health Certificate Program for social workers to increase their expertise in meeting the social and emotional needs of young children and their families in various settings. Program is currently in the second year of the first class and three DCF staff are participating.
- Established a new, required full day in-service training day for new DCF Social Workers on the Foundations of Health and Well-Being in Child Welfare, which has a primary focus on early childhood education, brain development, school readiness and success, and trauma informed care.

- Created a new Early Education and Care section of the DCF (internal) Intranet to catalogue and post resource materials on early childhood and child development for use by DCF staff and to provide to families.
- Partnered with Professor Jeff Liebman at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government to design and implement a management/research study of the impact of access to child care for children and families involved in the child welfare system. Project kicked-off in September 2013.
- The newly hired RTT early childhood staff and the Education Manager partnered to revise the agency's Education Policy to reflect the importance of education from cradle to career.

Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) (project 7.2)

The interagency partnership between EEC and the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) is focused on aligning and improving access to early education and care services for children experiencing homelessness. Project goals include: increasing collaboration between DHCD, EEC and community organizations that serve children experiencing homelessness (ages birth to five); developing and implementing a system for screening all children, including a referral system for those children who need additional services; connecting families experiencing homelessness with local services; identifying service gaps for re-housed families and those experiencing homelessness and their children; data sharing; and providing professional development on child development to staff working with these families. The following describes accomplishments in 2013.
- Over 300 families have received bilingual information on local early education resources from MASS 211.
- Both EEC and DHCD collaborated, along with Boston Children's Hospital, to provide trainings on the Ages and Stages Questionnaire developmental screening tool to over 130 staff representing 64 agencies across the state.
- DHCD secured a donation of over 2,000 children's books from two non-profit organizations (First Books and the Institute for Children, Poverty and Homelessness). These books address the topic of homelessness from a young child's perspective in a sensitive, nurturing and non-judgmental manner.
- Connected over 50 families to local Child Care and Resource Center for childcare services across the state.
- Pamphlets on "How to Talk to Your Baby", created by EEC, were distributed to over 200 families experiencing homelessness.
- Collaboration teams are being established with staff from a variety of community organizations to develop early education strategies and services for children experiencing homelessness currently living in motels and hotels.

Department of Mental Health (DMH) (project 7.3)

EEC, in partnership with the Department of Mental Health (DMH), has worked to strengthen the comprehensive statewide system of mental health supports for children and families that are available throughout the Commonwealth. Below describes accomplishments made in 2013.

Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation: Grantee Technical Assistance

To address the mental and behavioral health needs of children and their families, EEC and DMH have been engaged in collaborative oversight efforts in the provision of early childhood mental health consultation services to early learning centers regionally and throughout the Commonwealth. Co-designed with EEC, a new procurement tool for early childhood mental health consultation services began in FY14.
- Connected Local System of Care System statewide coordinators to the system of Early Childhood Mental Health Services grantees.

- Strengthened the participation of Early Childhood Mental Health Provider Services grantees in the broader systems of mental health systems by beginning with mental health delivery of care systems inclusive of MCPAP and CBHI.
- Implemented new professional development opportunities that model teamwork between the early childhood mental health consultation service providers and early childhood educators in addressing prevention and intervention with emotional and behavioral challenges. (See Professional Development section below.)
- Initiated integration of the consultation and technical assistance capacities of the DMH Early Childhood Psychiatrist through new collaborative activities, which increase ways to work within and in collaboration with mental health systems of care. These activities aim to expand treatment options including referral for children with intensive mental health needs, and ways to better understand and manage behaviors that lead to separation and termination from programs for children with intensive mental health needs.

Massachusetts Child Psychiatry Access Project (MCPAP)
- Developed an Interagency Service Agreement (ISA) with the Massachusetts Executive Office of Health and Human Services (EOHHS) and its Medicaid office that commits the Secretariat to expand the capacity of a major mental health state system for children to address the unique needs of the early childhood population, along with the commitment to introduce an evidenced base practice (EBP) into primary care that will introduce ways for parents to develop skills to address their children's challenging behaviors.
- Developed template and created first baseline set of data to track encounters and services provided in 95% of pediatric practices statewide to the birth to six population through expanded capacities within MCPAP.

Professional Development, Technical Assistance and Outreach: EEC State Partners & EEC Grantees

The purpose of trainings is to increase the awareness and understanding of mental health issues in young children and their families, and to increase knowledge of community resources. The ISA addressed a plan will include at least eight trainings annually. DMH has fulfilled the completion of eight trainings this calendar year plus five trainings held statewide through the Communities of Practice forum, which was available to EEC partners and grantees. There was an additional training at a quarterly meeting of Coordinated Family and Community Engagement (CFCE) staff.
- Topic: *Infant and Toddler Mental Health, Part 1* The workshops introduced participants to core principles of infant and toddler mental health, and was designed for EEC staff and grantees, including licensors. This was attended as well by early education professionals in the mixed delivery of care.
  ○ Number attended: 294
- Topic: *Parents Helping Parents* for CFCE grantees.
  ○ Number attended: 54

Professional Development, Technical Assistance and Outreach: Early Education Professionals

The purpose of these trainings is to increase skills within the classroom for young children with challenging behaviors, and for helping parents with their own challenges as well as their children's to be successful. Training topics included a range of early childhood mental health issues, including but not limited to: recognizing behaviors which may indicate a mental health issue; intervention strategies for non-clinicians/first responders; procedures to assist families in accessing specialized community resources; behavior management techniques; identifying and accessing mental health resources available for young children through DMH; promoting healthy social and emotional development and positive behaviors and strategies for addressing negative behaviors; and cultural competency.

Additionally, DMH has worked with EEC to align trainings for early education professionals with QRIS, which has been accomplished for all trainings that have been provided since July 2013 and that will be provided going forward.

- Topic: *Helping all Parents be Successful.* Provided through the Communities of Practice statewide series in each of five EEC regions to early education professionals in the mixed delivery system. Attendees included public school personnel, EEC staff and grantees, Mass 211 Staff, and community representatives.
  - ο Number attended: 224
- Topic: *TOPS: Top of the Pyramid Skills Training/CSEFEL Pyramid Model Training* for Early Education Professionals and Early Childhood Mental Health Consultants.
  - ο Number attended: 38

Stakeholder Involvement/ Collaboration Across Agencies

- DMH was a founding agency of the Cross Training group consisting of all RTTT partner agencies. It is considered that the curriculum that DMH and DPH developed collaboratively TOPS: Top of the Pyramid Skills Training/CSEFEL Pyramid Model Training—is the prime successful effort and example of collaboration. One of five regional trainings is completed and two others are planned for early 2014. DMH is planning a cross cultural training for early education professionals with the Office of Refugee and Immigration on the risks of trauma for children and families with refugee and immigrant experience. Trainers who will conduct this training in Spanish have been identified.
- DMH has initiated several projects with the Children's Behavior Health Initiative (CBHI) in order to increase the capacity of mental health systems of care for children to be responsive and accessible to young children within EEC systems. These include:
  - ο Final draft of early childhood mental health guide for early educational professions;
  - ο Focus group with behavioral health agencies providing early childhood services in order to explore where and how to expand early childhood clinical mental health expertise;
  - ο Participation in Infant/Early Childhood Mental Health (IECMH) Interagency Systems work group with EOHHS, DPH, CBHI, DCF, and EEC to create strategies to address public policy issues needed to expand the availability of early childhood mental health treatment options. This has led to draft MOU between DMH and DPH on ways each agency will address and collaborate on Infant/Early Childhood Mental Health (I/ECMH).

Department of Public Health (DPH) (project 7.4)

The interagency partnership between EEC and the Department of Public Health (DPH) focuses on building a system of health supports for young children and their families. DPH provides training, technical assistance, and policy development to promote healthy social-emotional development of children, prevent risk factors from impacting children's well-being, and address challenging behaviors. DHP helps to enhance program and educator competence to provide children with stronger social-emotional skills and resilience, as well as exhibit fewer challenging behaviors that could lead to preschool expulsion. DPH also provides guidance to early education programs on developing and implementing quality health and safety policies and practices to ensure that children will be healthier and safer, and that coordinated care for children with chronic illness will be improved and assured.

DPH coordinates with EEC and other state agencies on early identification and coordinated responses to family risk factors through cross-training, policy development, and data sharing. Goals include earlier identification of children at risk and supporting an enhanced provision of coordinated services to families, which aim to address these risk factors and help ensure children will succeed in school and in life.

To further support RTT-ELC activities, EEC and DPH have utilized federal Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) program funding to strengthen the state's early childhood system of care and improve child outcomes through the Massachusetts Home Visiting Initiative (MHVI). MHVI has prioritized 17 communities across the state given the high needs populations that exist in these communities and towns. These communities include Boston, Brockton, Chelsea, Everett, Revere, Lynn, Lawrence, Lowell, Fall River, New Bedford, Worcester, Southbridge, Springfield, Holyoke, Pittsfield and North Adams. This collaboration between EEC and DPH allows the state to offer universal home visiting to all families of newborns in these high need communities.

One of the activities embedded in the DPH-EEC partnership is The Mass Children at Play (MCAP) project. MCAP's goals of promoting physical activity and preventing obesity have made progress on developing guidelines for child care based on the MA School Nutrition Standards for Competitive Foods and Beverages, and promoting the First Lady's Let's Move Child Care initiative to all Massachusetts child care/family child care centers via email and mass mailings.

EEC also partners with the Children's Trust and their successful Healthy Families Massachusetts home visiting program to reach more families with high needs children. Given that Massachusetts is an affiliated site of Help Me Grow, EEC and DPH are offering the ASQ/ASQ-SE screening toolkits so that parents can learn more about their child's development and help them understand that they are their child's first teacher.

EEC, in partnership with the Department of Mental Health (DMH) (Activity 7.3) and the Department of Public Health (DPH), has been working to strengthen the comprehensive statewide system of mental health supports for children and families that are available throughout the Commonwealth.

2013 DPH partnership highlights and successes include:

Staff
- Coordinated with EEC regional offices to hire and orient five DPH staff, including the Early Childhood Mental Health and Health Specialists, and three QRIS RN Health Advisors who are placed in EEC regional offices.
- QRIS RN Health Advisors (Activity 2.4) provided technical assistance to EEC licensing staff and child care programs on a range of health and safety related topics, including infectious disease prevention, safe sleep, immunization requirements, supporting children with special health care needs, access to child care health consultation, and cleaning and disinfecting. Three major areas of technical assistance included: 1) assisting QRIS Level 2 applicants with interim child care health consultation visits; 2) child care programs on health and safety issues and 3) creating collaborative relationships with regional agencies to build health and safety capacity in child care programs.
- Six-part time registered nurse trainers were hired by Early Intervention Regional Consultation vendors.

Trainings
- In 2013, RN trainers provided 196 trainings on medication administration in child care (MACC) modules to 99 programs, reaching 1,310 educators statewide. Additionally, this included the revision of the MACC asthma module to include a "scripted story", social emotional support for children, educators and families; and published an asthma guidance document for child care programs.
- Provided four trainings on developmental and social-emotional screening using the ASQ and ASQ-SE tool for 61 CFCE staff across the state and Thrive in Five parent screeners.
- Cross Training workgroup led by DPH brought EEC, DPH, DMH, DCF, ORI, DHCD, and DTA representatives to coordinate and align training and consultation needs and resources across both RTT and other grants (MECCS, LAUNCH/MYCHILD) to reduce gaps and duplication of efforts. The Cross Training workgroup

provided feedback on the development of an online training on early learning/brain building/and early learning guidelines for state agency staff to be hosted on state's training hub.

- Seven trainings on CSEFEL and infant family groups brought together 81 cross systems participants, including DTA and homeless shelter staff. Training on CSEFEL was also provided for Boston Children's Museum floor staff.
- The pilot of the Early Childhood Trauma cross-trainings in three sites for 85 cross-systems participants. Three additional trainings were scheduled across the state in November 2013 to address the 72 person waitlist; a total of 78 individuals attended these trainings.

Interagency Agreements
- Finalized a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between WIC and Head Start on common health and nutrition messages, and developed a guidance document that aligned EEC's nutrition guidelines with DPH's updated School Nutrition Guidelines.

Office of Refugees and Immigrants (ORI) (project 7.5)

EEC has partnered with the Office of Refugees and Immigrants (ORI) to support early learning and school readiness for immigrant and refugee children and their families. Through this partnership, ORI will engage immigrant and refugee communities to increase the awareness of early education benefits and services, strengthen licensed early education programs that serve this population, and provide technical assistance in effective policies for dual language learners and provide outreach and interpreter services.

In 2013, ORI partnership highlights and successes include:
- In collaboration with the Massachusetts Immigrant and Refugee Advocacy Coalition (MIRA) and the Multilingual Action Council (MAC) at Wheelock College, ORI sponsored a series of trainings on "New Start: Supporting Multilingual Young Children and Immigrant and Refugee Families", for the Coordinated Family and Community Engagement Grantees (CFCE), Child Care Resources and Referral Agencies (CCR&Rs), MASS 2-1-1, Family Child Care (FCC) System Providers, Head Start and ORI's service providers. The trainings offered knowledge on immigration policy as it impacts children and families, cultural competency, and child development and educational principles in the context of multilingual homes and multicultural environments.
- Approximately 300 people participated in these five regional trainings.

Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge Leadership Summit (project 1.4)

On October 23, 2013, EEC hosted the Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) Leadership Summit. Over 100 individuals from the early education field, state legislators, and education, health and human service agencies attended the summit. The morning program consisted of keynote remarks by Secretary Malone and Commissioner Weber, a showing of the new RTT overview video, and a panel discussion highlighting six RTT projects (MKEA, Readiness Centers, Museums and Libraries Project, Brain Building in Progress, QRIS Program Improvement Grants and the Post-Master's Certificate Program). There was rich discussion about the importance of birth to third grade alignment, specifically linking K-12 education to early childhood. The afternoon program consisted of a keynote address from Dr. Michael Rich (Director of the Center on Media and Child Health at Boston Children's Hospital) and four breakout sessions on digital tools for early learning (facilitated by WGBH producers). In spring 2014, EEC will plan three additional regional events for the public so that families and educators can learn about RTT.

Early Childhood Education Workforce

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

Has the State 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:

Supporting Early Childhood Educators	
Providing and expanding access to effective professional development opportunities that are aligned with your State's Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework	Yes
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:	Yes
Scholarships	Yes
Compensation and wage supplements	
Tiered reimbursement rates	Yes
Other financial incentives	Yes
Management opportunities	
Publicly reporting aggregated data on Early Childhood Educator development, advancement, and retention	
Setting ambitious yet achievable targets for:	Yes
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	Yes
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	Yes

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.

Below is a description of RTT-ELC grant funded initiatives that support the workforce and furthers their knowledge, skills and competencies in providing high quality early education services.

Post Master's Certificate Program (project 8.6)

EEC partnered with an institution of higher education (IHE) to develop a Post Master's Certificate in Early Education Research, Policy, and Leadership (PMC) to launch a new generation of early childhood leaders in Massachusetts. The purpose of the PMC is to improve the knowledge, skills, and abilities of early childhood educators from public and private programs, specifically in the areas of data, research, policy, and leadership. The courses provide advanced study in early education research methods, policy, leadership, organizational change, and the science of child development and early learning. The intention of the PMC is to support early childhood educators with Master's degrees currently working in EEC-licensed or license-exempt programs with the means to further their own knowledge, skills, and abilities while working to inform policy at the local,

regional, and state level. The coursework designed for the PMC is in alignment with EEC's Core Competency Areas, QRIS Standards, the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) Advanced Standards (AS) within NAEYC's Six Professional Preparation Standards, and Division of Early Childhood Advanced Personnel Preparation Standards.

Through the RTT-ELC grant, EEC intends to fund three cohorts (15 students each) for the PMC program, which is delivered in a blended format and covers the full cost of student tuition and fees, books, and a stipend. The schedule for the PMC cohorts is as follows:
- Cohort 1: January 2013 - November 2013
- Cohort 2: September 2013 - August 2014
- Cohort 3: September 2014 - August 2015

In addition, educators are offered a wide range of support services, including the development of an individualized professional development plan, academic and career advising, mentoring, and individualized tutoring and academic supports.

The following describes progress made with the PMC program in 2013.
- There was an overwhelming response for the first cohort of students. With an applicant pool of 50 candidates, only 15 were chosen. All but two candidates did not complete the certificate program with their cohort. One candidate deferred completion of the certificate for personal reasons and will finish their remaining courses with Cohort 2. One candidate was accepted into a doctoral program. Two out of thirteen candidates are intending to apply to doctoral programs in the future.
- PMC graduates have been and will continue to be encouraged to participate on EEC working groups closely related to their own interests and PMC research projects. Two of the Cohort 1 graduates will be participating on the QRIS Professional Development Working Group.
- The IHE hosted a Leadership Forum on November 2, 2013 to honor the first cohort of PMC graduates. The Forum, where EEC Commissioner Thomas Weber and early childhood expert Stacie Goffin were keynote speakers, was well received. Each of the graduating candidates presented their research project. Cohort 2 candidates were also invited to participate in the Leadership Forum. Classes for Cohort 2 began in September 2013.
- The implementation of the PMC program has been very positive. The next steps for this program will be to get more institutions of higher education to both offer the PMC program in the future as well as to accept an articulation of the PMC into their doctoral or CAGS programs. The PMC program will continue to be offered at the local IHE beyond the life of the RTT-ELC grant. Getting students with regional representation may be difficult if courses are offered solely at the Boston campus (currently face to face courses are held at a partner institution in central Massachusetts). The replication of the PMC program at other colleges or universities across the Commonwealth would help to make the program accessible to a greater number of educators. The anticipated cost of the program without RTT-ELC grant funds is approximately $8,000 per student. To help sustain this initiative, there needs to be a greater number of doctoral and CAGS programs across the state that will accept the PMC.
- One hundred and sixty-eight educators started the application process for Cohort 2; 55 applications were reviewed to select 15 candidates for Cohort 2.

Validation of Educator Competencies (project 8)

In 2012, EEC contracted with a vendor to conduct the Validation of Educator Competence Study to validate educator competencies in social emotional development, literacy, numeracy and evaluate the effectiveness of digital strategies in increasing teacher competency and parent involvement in children's development.

The concept of the study is centered on four goals:

- To measure the relationship between the quality of classroom practices with children from birth to age five in a variety of settings and children's developmental outcomes.
- To identify the importance of particular classroom practices for children's development.
- To identify the structural elements, professional development, and instructional supports (including digital strategies) associated with educator competence.
- To identify the structural elements and parental supports associated with parental engagement.

The vendor selected early education and care sites from sites participating in the Massachusetts Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) as of November 2012 using a stratified random sampling approach. Sites were stratified by region (i.e., Central MA, Metro, Metro Boston, Northeast, Southeast and Cape, Western MA) to ensure equal numbers of sites across regions within a provider-type group. The vendor then randomly selected educators within the sites that had agreed to participate in the study. This report is reflective of the 60 early education and care settings that participated in the study in phase I (2013).

Between March and September 2013, the vendor collected data within these sites using classroom observations; surveys of educators, site administrators, and parents; and indirect assessments (educator reports) of children's skills related to social-emotional development, language and literacy, and numeracy.

Preliminary research findings include:
- **Overall Educator Competency:** On average, most classrooms have medium levels of quality as measured by Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Pre-K and Class Toddler.
- **Social Emotional Support:** On average, the quality of emotional and behavioral support provided by educators in both preschool and toddler classrooms, including family-based providers, approached high quality as measured by CLASS.
- **Instructional Support:** Areas in need of improvement were found in the instructional support domain, with one half of the preschool classrooms and one fourth of the toddler classrooms scoring in the low range. However, compared to classrooms previous study, the Multistate Study of Preschool and State-Wide Early Education Programs classrooms in Massachusetts scored higher on all measured dimensions of the CLASS Pre-K.
- **Educator Competency in Literacy:** Overall, educators demonstrated a basic level (scored of three out of five) of competency in literacy practices, as measured by the Early Language and Literacy Classroom Observation (ELLCO) Pre-K tool. Educator competency in literacy, as measured by the ELLCO Pre-K tool, was slightly higher for educators in center-based settings compared with those in family-based child care.
- **Educator Competency in Numeracy Practices:** Educator's competency in numeracy, as measured by the Classroom Observation of Early Mathematics Environment and Teaching (COEMET), was significantly higher for educators in center-based child care compared with those in family-based child care. Overall, educators demonstrated a low level (scored of two out of five) of competency in numeracy or early mathematics practices, as measured by COEMET.
- **Educator Competency in Use of Digital Strategies:** Most educators have access to at least one type of technology in the classroom, but fewer educators reported using digital strategies for content-specific (social-emotional, language, literacy, or numeracy) learning activities (which could include use for planning purposes or direct use in the classroom).

In 2014, the study will continue with data collection to gather additional information from 60 early education and care sites (38 center-based child care sites, 20 family-based child care sites and two after school sites). All of the sites that participated in the first year of the study will be contacted by the vendor in January to schedule observations and select new children for participation in the second year of the study.

Peer and Coaching (project 8.7)

The goal of the Peer Assistance and Coaching (PAC) project is to combine the promise of coaching as an effective strategy and the reality that the existing early childhood teachers and directors may be well-equipped to support one another's practices. Massachusetts PAC is promoting the use of training and coaching methods that give teachers opportunities to see and try out effective practices, and receive feedback about these efforts to improve those educator competencies. Research has shown the importance of teacher- or caregiver-child interactions that are emotionally supportive, responsive to children's individual and developmental needs, and rich in their provision of support for children's exploration and understanding of new concepts. This initiative aims to promote career advancement, professionalization, and accessible professional development opportunities in the field of early education. PAC is intended to improve the education, training, and compensation of early childhood educators, which will promote effective practice and alignment with EEC's workforce core competencies, increase workforce retention, and strengthen adult-child interactions among high-needs children.

The PAC model involves collaboration among Consultant Teachers (CTs), Mentees, and the Mentees' Program/Instructional Leaders. Mentees are expected to have supervision and/or support to promote ongoing growth. The CTs all participate in intensive training to improve their content and coaching skills. This includes pre-service training and ongoing development through the formation of regional CT professional learning communities (PLCs). The Mentee receives support from both the Program/ Instructional Leader and the CT, resulting in improvement in practice. The program will, in turn, have educators who are better able to meet the needs of children and families, and staff who are motivated to implement changes in practice. The following is progress that was made in 2013:

- An advisory panel was selected through a competitive process to advise EEC and its vendor on the development of the model in Massachusetts. The panel meets quarterly and is comprised of content experts in coaching and mentoring from the field. The model was developed, finalized and implemented with input and feedback from the panel.
- Contracts were awarded to vendors to support the implementation of the model, including management, PLC facilitation, training, cloud-based instructional platform support and reliable observations to collect evaluative data.
- Through a competitive process, 15 CTs and 15 Mentees were selected to participate in the first cohort.
- The first several trainings on the CLASS tool and on relationship-based coaching have been held for the CTs. Trainings are scheduled each month throughout the school year.
- Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) have been established in each of the state's five regions. The first PLCs were held in each region in November and facilitated by EEC's Educator and Support (EPS) Grantees, who are tasked with providing professional development and coaching/mentoring statewide for EEC.
- The first round of CLASS observations has been completed and observers met with the Mentees and their CTs to review the results. CTs and Mentees have begun filing action plans based on the CLASS observations and other reviews. CTs also file an online report after each in-person visit with their Mentee.
- The technology for the online cloud-based video support have all been installed in the Mentee classrooms and the Mentees and CTs were provided with web-based and in-person training from the vendor on use of the technology. Mentees have begun video-capturing their classroom practices and uploaded them to the platform for review by their CTs. Mentees will be expected to capture at least 2 samples of practice per week during the course of the project.
- Cohort 2 is expected to include 50 CTs and 50 Mentees, and Cohort 3 is expected to increase to 75 pairs of CTs and Mentees.

Business Planning (project 2.8)

EEC has partnered with a vendor to develop a business planning course to assist early educators in both home-based and center-based settings to ensure the strength and vitality of the program. Programs that are able to implement sound business practices will be better positioned to retain talented staff who can provide high quality early education for young children. The business planning course is focused specifically in helping programs to receive higher scores on the Program Administration Scale (PAS) and Business Administration (BAS), so that they can meet higher level criteria on the QRIS to demonstrate improved program quality. The following are highlights from 2013.

- The vendor organized a team of local and national experts to develop the business planning curriculum.
- The course will award 1.2 Continuing Education Units (CEUs) and participants of the course will have a sound business plan in place once they complete the course.
- A training of trainers will be conducted in January 2013 for the Educator and Provider Support (EPS) grantees and Family Child Care (FCC) systems for the delivery or the course to the field.
- In 2014, EEC is planning to procure a vendor to provide additional trainings to qualified trainers within the EPS, Readiness Centers, FCC systems, and independent consultants to build state capacity on business planning.

QRIS Technical Assistance Online Courses (project 2.1)

In 2012, EEC contracted with an institution of higher education (IHE) to develop online courses to support early educators in their understanding of QRIS and assist them to advance in QRIS. The course modules were based on the five QRIS standards:

- Curriculum and Learning
- Safe, Healthy Indoor and Outdoor Environments
- Workforce Development and Professional Qualifications
- Family and Community Engagement
- Leadership, Administration and Management

The course modules produced by the IHE were incomplete. Despite many efforts by EEC to work with the vendor to complete the courses; only two courses were completed. In Fall 2013, EEC decided to terminate the contract with the IHE. EEC is in the process of finding a new vendor to complete the remaining QRIS online courses. EEC will translate the two completed courses into Spanish and conduct train the trainer sessions on these courses so that early educators can access face to face professional development.

Higher Education for English Language Learners (project 8.5)

In 2012, EEC contracted with an institution of higher education (IHE) to develop a program for educators who are English language learners (ELL) to access higher education while providing the immediate content needed to improve practice with children birth to age five, who are engaged in formal early education and care. Specifically, this program targets family child care providers, paraprofessionals in public and private programs whose primary language is not English, with the goal of equipping them to effectively assist dual language learners by achieving higher academic coursework and credentials themselves.

In 2013, the IHE began working with the first cohort of Spanish-speaking family child care providers. This cohort will conclude the program in February 2014.

The following are lessons learned from the first cohort of students:

- Allow time for student repetition, processing, reading, studying, preparing, and small group work. Giving students realistic suggestions on how to effectively find and manage time to for studying, which has

proven to be a difficult obstacle. One approach found to be effective is to have students share their own approaches and solutions.

- Develop students English-language skills through building in a requirement or component that focuses on conversation, reading, etc.
- Test applicants' proficiencies in their native language as well as in English.
- Include mentors in program planning to support ELL students.
- Utilize small groups to foster discussions on both academic content and also to establish professional relationships for best practices development and execution moving forward.
- Include practical application of academic learning to daily practice.
- Utilize small English conversation groups.
- Develop curricula for content classes and English support classes that are, if not complementary, at least aligned.
- Co-teach as appropriate.
- Teach college-level courses in the students' native language. Teaching college-level courses in the students' native language ensures that students will fully understand the material. Additionally, it allows an appropriate faculty member the ability to assess student progress from a holistic perspective.

Below is a summary of Individual Professional Development Plans (IPDP) goals from students:
- Acquire necessary training and/or coursework to advance to the next level in the QRIS system (Level 2 and/or Level 3). All students have completed formal training in a formative assessment tool and have worked on understanding how to implement and connect a formative assessment tool to curriculum development.
- Advance knowledge in areas 5, 6 and 7 of the core competencies (Learning Environments and Curriculum; Observation, Assessment and Documentation; Program Planning and Development). Students have the goal of increasing program quality. Some students have the further goal of formalizing their curriculum. Students are implementing assessment tools identified by the Quality Improvement System. Practical application of content acquired through ECE coursework is a focus.
- Advance coursework towards Associate's Degree.
- Advance knowledge of English by taking courses or seminars.

EEC is in the process of evaluating this project based on lesson learned and challenges with the current IHE to deliver the program through 2015.

The following are 2014 strategies EEC plans to implement with the new vendor to continue building on this project.
- Organize a Higher Education Faculty Institute with Deans and high level administrators on the topic of higher education for ELLs in the early education field.
- Develop a Career Lattice for ELL students entering into college.
- Hold focused working groups across the state of early education stakeholders to brainstorm and develop next steps for supporting ELL students on a career pathway.
- Conduct research and a literature review on models of supporting ELL students entering into a college career pathway.
- Write formal reports to guide EEC in the work of supporting ELL students to get their college degrees.

Early Educators Fellowship Initiative (EEFI) (project 5.1)

The Early Educators Fellowship Initiative (EEFI) is a community-based leadership series for early education and care providers in public and private programs from birth to grade three. The purpose of EEFI is to organize,

equip and empower Massachusetts educators who will then build high-quality learning environments for our earliest school-ready children, in partnership with families and communities. This Fellowship facilitates:

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

Embedded in EEFI are seven specific strategies:

1. A focus on building community
2. Attention to the impact and use of knowledge
3. Building partnerships by constructing network links for organizations
4. Providing web-based resources
5. Research and evidence-based learning experiences
6. Embedded opportunities for reflection
7. Access to national leaders and key experts who serve as models and mentors as Massachusetts builds its system and professional capacity of its workforce

The FY13 EEFI Cohort consisted of 20 cross-sector teams of 151 individuals from communities across the state. Teams worked together throughout the Fellowship, in and outside the scheduled meetings, to address specific needs and concerns that were pertinent and relevant to their individual communities and programs and create an action plan that would enable them to address their stated issues as a community of early educators. Teams were provided tools to facilitate and guide their community-based meetings in-between fellowship sessions.

The vendor intentionally worked to build state-wide and local learning communities for the purpose of creating and building a "shared identity" among "all early educators" regardless of sector (public school, Head Start, family child care, etc...). Not only were the Fellows members of cross-sector teams from the same community, each Fellowship meeting included time for informal and formal networking. Activities were designed to help participants interact by similar job roles as well as community teams. In addition, participants were given access to tools and resources necessary to become fluent in transferring quantitative data into qualitative results. These elements were brought together with the intent to give participants and teams the opportunity to assess, reflect, and develop identifiable goals and action plans based on the information they learned from the speakers and small group discussions.

Four meetings were held during the FY13EEFI series:

- The first session included Keynote Speaker Debbie Lee Keenan of the Eliot-Pearson School at Tufts University who spoke on "Creating an anti-bias program: The leader's role."
- Dr. Karen Mapp of Harvard Graduate School of Education spoke at the second session on "The role of family engagement from birth through age eight in promoting school success."
- The third session featured Dr. Sharon Lynn Kagan, the Virginia and Leonard Marx Professor of Early Childhood and Family Policy and Co-Director of the National Center for Children and Families at Teachers College, Columbia University, and Professor Adjunct at Yale University's Child Study Center, who spoke to the Fellows about "Taking early learning standards from theory to change to practice."
- The last session featured Keynote Speaker Dr. Jacqueline Jones, the former Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and Early Learning under Secretary Arne Duncan for the U.S. Department of Education. Dr. Jones spoke about "Using assessment to individualize teaching."

In Fall 2013, EEC put the project out to bid and selected a new vendor to manage the EEFI series for 2014.

Performance Measure (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.

		Targets				Actuals	
	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 1	Year 2
Total number of "aligned" institutions and providers	1,017	1,098	1,179	1,260	1,341	1,670	815
Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider	26	32	38	49	58	37	36

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

None.

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.

None.

Performance Measure (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.

Targets										
Progression of credentials (Aligned to Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework)	*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*									
Progression: High to Low	**Baseline**		**Year 1**		**Year 2**		**Year 3**		**Year 4**	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Credential Type 1	4,001	10%	4,076	10%	4,226	10%	4,451	11%	4,751	11%
Specify	Child Development Associate/ ECE Certificate									
Credential Type 2	1,020	2%	1,270	3%	1,570	4%	1,920	5%	2,320	6%
Specify	Associate's Degree in ECE									
Credential Type 3	557	1%	657	2%	832	2%	1,057	3%	1,357	3%
Specify	Bachelor's Degree in ECE									
Credential Type 4	103	0.2%	153	0.4%	203	0.5%	253	1%	303	1%
Specify	Post Graduate Degree in ECE (MEd & PhD)									

Actuals						
Progression of credentials (Aligned to Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework)	*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*					
Progression: High to Low	**Baseline**		**Year 1**		**Year 2**	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Credential Type 1	4,001	10%	4,639	10%	4,748	13%
Specify	Child Development Associate/ ECE Certificate					
Credential Type 2	1,020	2%	1,224	0.5%	1,503	21%
Specify	Associate's Degree in ECE					
Credential Type 3	557	1%	784	0.5%	1,023	30%
Specify	Bachelor's Degree in ECE					
Credential Type 4	103	0.2%	1,089	2%	1,340	23%
Specify	Post Graduate Degree in ECE (MEd & PhD)					

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

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

Baseline numbers, percentages, and targets from RTT-ELC application were based on the general population earning a degree in early childhood/related field. These calculations were not specific to those individuals working in an EEC early childhood program ("our workforce").

Credential type 1: Increase from 2012 to 2013 is 3% for a total of 13%.

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.

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

The total number of IHEs in Massachusetts that award credentials to the early education and care workforce has been reduced to 43 from 57. Massachusetts' RTT-ELC grant application based the number of IHEs and graduation rates on 57 IHEs. The initial number of institutions of higher education (IHE) that Massachusetts was using as a baseline now has been revised to reflect only those that serve the early childhood workforce. The state will submit an amendment to modify the targets for (D)(2)(d)(1). The reason for the reduction in IHEs is due to the fact that some IHEs were no longer offering credentials to the early education workforce. Table (D)(2)(d)(1) and Table D(2)(d)(2) now only include IHEs that award credentials at the certificate, associate, bachelor, or master level to early childhood educators working in EEC child care settings (ages 0-5) and those that award bachelor or master level credentials to educators seeking ESE PreK-2 licensure. This creates a decrease in the total number of IHEs.

Of the 43 IHEs referenced above, 36 of these institutions award credentials to early childhood educators intending to work in a child care setting (not the public school system). These 36 IHEs are aligned with EEC's Core Competencies. The majority of Massachusetts' colleges and universities with degree programs in early childhood education are designed to serve educators seeking ESE's PreK-2 licensure. EEC is working with the Massachusetts' Regional Readiness Centers and the Massachusetts Department of Higher Education (DHE) to capture the degree program codes for all majors under the early childhood degree umbrella.

The data included in the table above is not a complete set of data and may not represent all IHEs. The Massachusetts Department of Higher Education (DHE) does not receive information from IHEs regarding graduation rates until two-three semesters after graduation occurs. This does not fit EEC's timeline for reporting graduation rates.

The Council for Professional Recognition which issues the Child Development Associate (CDA) has not returned EEC's communications regarding the number of Massachusetts educators that were awarded the CDA this past year.

Strategies to ensure measurable results will be made in these performance measures:

- EEC is working with the Department of Higher Education, the Readiness Center Networks and EEC's Educator and Provider Support grantees on data management in efforts to secure accurate graduation data for the correct degree programs.
- EEC will do strategic planning and infrastructure planning with the EPS grantees and Readiness Centers to gather more accurate and complete educational degree data in EEC's Professional Qualifications Registry (PQR). PQR is a database which collects information on individuals in the early education workforce. Currently, PQR information is self-reported and not always verified. The state will implement strategies to encourage the workforce to provide more comprehensive education data and update this information on a regular basis.
- EEC is also working to secure data earlier than is reported to other state and federal entities.
- EEC is working to determine appropriate Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) that award credentials to early childhood educators at each institution to be more inclusive of the entire early childhood workforces, including related degree programs (i.e. family and community engagement).

Measuring Outcomes and Progress

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

Has the State made progress in developing a common, statewide Kindergarten Entry Assessment that:

Kindergarten Entry Assessment	
Is aligned with the State's Early Learning and Development Standards and covers all Essential Domains of School Readiness	Yes
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	Yes
Is administered beginning no later than the start of the school year in the third year of the grant to children entering a public school kindergarten (e.g., the 2014-2015 school year for Round 1 grantee states, the 2015-2016 school year for Round 2 grantees). States may propose a phased implementation plan that forms the basis for broader statewide implementation	Yes
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	
Is funded, in significant part, with Federal or State resources other than those available under this grant, (e.g., with funds available under section 6111 or 6112 of the ESEA)	

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

The Massachusetts Kindergarten Entry Assessment (MKEA) covers the following domains:
- Social-Emotional
- Physical - gross motor
- Physical - fine motor
- Language
- Literacy
- Cognitive
- Mathematics

Massachusetts is primarily using Teaching Strategies Gold as it is a formative assessment tool which is researched based, reliable and valid*. Observation and documentation of children begins within the first few days when children enter kindergarten and continues throughout the school year. Checkpoints are done at a minimum of two times a year. A checkpoint is a time to reflect and report on the assessment process. Checkpoints provide teachers with an opportunity to simply finalize a decision on levels for each item based on the information that a teacher has been observing and collecting during that time period. Massachusetts has set the first mandatory checkpoint in the fall to better understand children's school readiness upon entering kindergarten. The second mandatory checkpoint is done in the spring.

The state will recruit school districts to participate in MKEA Cohort 3 in the beginning of 2014 and then provide professional development training on how to do authentic classroom observation and how to use the Teaching Strategies Gold tool in spring and summer 2014. Cohort 3 will begin observing children and gathering formative assessment data in fall 2014.

*To meet the RTT-ELC grant requirements of a statewide kindergarten entry assessment, Massachusetts will alter the original MKEA plan for 2014 and 2015. School districts participating in Cohort 3 in 2014 and Cohort 4 in 2015 will no longer have the option of choosing between two assessment tools (Teaching Strategies and Work Sampling), instead, they will be required to use only one tool (Teaching Strategies Gold). Additionally, the school districts in Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 that have been using the Work Sampling System will be required to use the Teaching Strategies tool in sample. The state will submit a formal amendment of the change to the MKEA plan to the federal program officer for approval in the March-April 2014 time frame.

Progress on the administration of MKEA include:
- In Cohort 1 there are 19 school districts and in Cohort 2 there are 58 school districts for a total of 77 school districts participating in MKEA. This represents a 74% increase from the number of school districts participating in 2012. Over 20,000 kindergarten children have been assessed.
- 19 school districts that elected to participate in Cohort 1 include:

District	Assessment Tool Selected
Everett Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Holyoke Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Lawrence Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Lowell Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Ludlow Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Lynn Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Old Rochester Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
South Hadley Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Southbridge Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Springfield Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Ware Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Watertown Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Boston Public Schools	Work Sampling System
Brookline Public Schools	Work Sampling System
Chelsea Public Schools	Work Sampling System
New Bedford Public Schools	Work Sampling System
Northampton Public Schools	Work Sampling System
Pittsfield Public Schools	Work Sampling System
Worcester Public Schools	Work Sampling System

- There are currently 58 school districts participating in Cohort 2. They are:

District	Assessment Tool Selected
Adams-Cheshire Regional School District	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Attleboro Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Avon Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Ayer-Shirley Regional School District	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Berkshire Hills Regional School District	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Beverly Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Brockton Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Carver Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Central Berkshire Regional School District	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Cohasset Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Dracut Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Erving Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Fall River Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Fitchburg Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Foxborough Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Framingham Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Frontier Regional School District	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Gardner Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Granby Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Greater Lawrence Community Action Council	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Haverhill Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Hull Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Malden Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Mansfield Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Marblehead Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Marlborough Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Maynard Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Narragansett School System	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Nashoba Regional School District	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Norfolk Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
North Andover Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Norton Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Norwood Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD

District	Assessment Tool Selected
Peabody Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Pembroke Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Pioneer Valley Regional School District	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Plainville Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Quabbin Regional School District	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Salem Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Scituate Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Triton Regional School District	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Winthrop Public Schools	Teaching Strategies GOLD
Acushnet	Work Sampling System
Belchertown	Work Sampling System
Berlin-Boylston Public Schools	Work Sampling System
East Longmeadow Public Schools	Work Sampling System
Farmington River Regional School District	Work Sampling System
Hawlemont Regional School District	Work Sampling System
Ipswich Public Schools	Work Sampling System
Mashpee Public Schools	Work Sampling System
Milton Public Schools	Work Sampling System
Mohawk Trail Regional School District	Work Sampling System
Orange Public Schools	Work Sampling System
Rowe Public Schools	Work Sampling System
Seven Hills Charter School	Work Sampling System
Somerset Public Schools	Work Sampling System
South Shore Charter Public School	Work Sampling System
Southern Berkshire Regional School District	Work Sampling System

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.

- In October 2013, over 450 individuals participated in a statewide MKEA conference on formative assessment. The conference was a success as attendees came away with a better understanding of the practice of authentic observations and how it can be used as an assessment tool.
- The state is in the process of planning the next MKEA conference on April 7, 2014 for Cohort 3.
- Kindergarten teachers and administrators expressed a high need for more professional development to assist them in formative assessment best practices (not just on how to use Teaching Strategies or Work Sampling System). To address their needs, EEC amended the RTT-ELC budget to include more funding for professional development. EEC contracted with a new vendor, Collaborative for Educational Services (CES), to provide assessment training in collaboration with the state's existing workforce infrastructure.

This infrastructure includes the five Educator and Provider Support (EPS) grantees that provide regional professional development, as well as, the 6 Readiness Centers that provide comprehensive support to educators from birth to higher education. In 2014, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) will be established in each region to support ongoing work in assessment practices.

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

Has the State 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:

Early Learning Data Systems	
Has all of the Essential Data Elements	Yes
Enables uniform data collection and easy entry of the Essential Data Elements by Participating State Agencies and Participating Programs	Yes
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	Yes
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	Yes
Meets the Data System Oversight Requirements and complies with the requirements of Federal, State, and local privacy laws	Yes

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.

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

The following describes progress made with ECIS in 2013:
- ECIS went into production as an enterprise data system in June 2013.
- ECIS data feed to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE)/Executive Office of Education (EOE) went live in July 2013, enabling a flow of early childhood education and program data into the state's longitudinal data system (SLDS) - also referred to as EDWin Analytics managed by EOE.
- Database loading was completed for the Massachusetts Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) for program quality data and Professional Qualifications Registry for workforce data

- The ECIS report development team added 37 new reports in 2013 on child, program and workforce data, including early warning indicators, workforce demographics, program quality trends, child waitlist and licensing, building further on the demographics and funding source reports created in 2012.
- The ECIS enabled the creation of a proof of concept dashboard to measure trends vs. goals with regards to the department's performance on program quality and waitlist trends.

State strategies for the remainder of the grant period:
- Building on the operational success of the Early Childhood Information System, the state will continue developing reports and disseminating the reports to policy makers.
- In 2014, the state will roll out a strategic performance measurement tool (or dashboard) on program quality and access to childcare waitlist data to facilitate better policy and decision-making both within EEC.
- By the end of 2014, the state will continue delivering on the original scope of work for ECIS by integrating ECIS with EEC's Child Care Financial Assistance system (formerly named Unified System).
- The state will also develop a method for integrating data on early childhood grant program data (such as UPK and Head Start) with ECIS.
- The ECIS team will also conduct training for regional licensing offices, program quality and workforce staff on the ECIS reports and how to utilize the data to inform policy.
- Also to be implemented in 2015 is knowledge transfer from ECIS contractors to full time EEC staff in order to foster sustainability and ongoing support for ECIS.

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-Income families, by age

Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income[1] 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	67,557*	32.0%*
Toddlers ages 1 through 2	67,557	32.0%
Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry	68,736	31.0%
Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families	136,293	31.0%
[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

Indicate the data source and clarify or explain any of these data if needed.

*This 2011 data comes from the National Center for Children in Poverty http://www.nccp.org/profiles/MA_profile_8.html. *NCCP indicates that there are a total of 67,557 low income children under the age of 3.

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

Table (A)(1)-2: Special Populations of Children with High 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]	48,928	11.00%
Are English learners[2]	11,056	40.84%
Reside on "Indian Lands"		
Are migrant[3]	109	.067%
Are homeless[4]	9,844	2.2%
Are in foster care	2,380	0.5%

[1]For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children with disabilities or developmental delays are defined as children birth through kindergarten entry that have an Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) or an Individual Education Plan (IEP).
[2]For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children who are English learners are children birth through kindergarten entry who have home languages other than English.
[3]For purposes of this Annual Performance Report, children who are migrant are children birth through kindergarten entry who meet the definition of "migratory child" in ESEA section 1309(2).
[4]The term "homeless children" has the meaning given the term "homeless children and youths" in section 725(2) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (425 U.S.C. 11434a(2)).

Data Table (A)(1)-2 Data Notes

Indicate the data source and clarify or explain any of these data if needed.

Have disabilities or developmental delays: DPH Early Intervention (EI) IDEA Part C Source: 32,345 (EI -IDEA Part C) Total number of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs in MA (FY12) 16,583. IDEA Part B Source: Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Special Education Planning & Policy Development *Special Education and Massachusetts Statewide Special Education Steering Committee Presentation December 10, 2013*. Percent of population who are children with disabilities (Age 3-5) is 7.4% (IDEA Part B 619), *Source: Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Special Education Planning & Policy Development State Profile SY 2011-2012.* Base number of MA Children 0-5 years old is 442,592.

English Language Learners: Data from 2012-2013 Head Start Program Information Report (PIR).

Migrant: Data from 2012-2013 Head Start Program Information Report (PIR).

Homeless: Info from Dept. of Housing and Community Development data system (ASIST and Daily Census reports). % of homeless children was calculated with a base of 442,592 children in MA who are 0-5 years old.

Foster care: Info from Dept. of Children and Families. % of foster care children was calculated with a base of 442,592 children in MA who are 0-5 years old.

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.

Table (A)(1)-3a: Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age				
Type of Early Learning & Development Program	Infants under age 1	Toddlers ages 1 through 2	Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry	Total
State-funded preschool	0	0	9,998	9,998
Specify:	UPK and Inclusive Preschool Learning Environments (IPLE)(391 grant)			
Data Source and Year:	UPK (fall and spring data reports FY13), IPLE (mid year report 6 months of FY13 and 6 months of FY14)			
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	598	2,505	12,785	15,888
Data Source and Year:	Head Start Program Information Report (PIR), 2012-2013			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C and Part B, section 619	12,156	20,189	15,386	47,731
Data Source and Year:	Infant and toddler data is from Dept. of Public Health, Early Intervention, FY12. Preschool data is from Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Education, school year 2013-2014			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	0	0	6,591	6,591
Data Source and Year:	Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Education, school year 2013-2014, schools receiving school wide Title I funding.			
Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	6,448	26,211	46,316	78,975
Data Source and Year:	ECIS, calendar year 2013			
[1] *Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.*				

Data Table (A)(1)-3a Data Notes

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

UPK: fall and spring 2013 data reports from UPK grantees.

IPLE (391 grant): FY14 Mid-Year report

Head Start: Head Start Program Information Report (2012-2013)

IDEA part B and C: Infant and toddler data is from Dept. of Public Health, Early Intervention (FY12). Preschooler data is from Dept. of Elementary & Secondary Education (school year 2013-2014).

Title I: Preschooler data is from Dept. of Elementary & Secondary Education (school year 2013-2014);school receiving school wide (SW) Title I funding.

CCDF: ECIS, calendar year 2013, figures may include duplicate counts where children age up from one age group to another during the course of a year.

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.

Table (A)(1)-3b: Number of Children							
Type of Early Learning & Development Program	Hispanic Children	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native Children	Non-Hispanic Asian Children	Non-Hispanic Black or African American Children	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Children	Non-Hispanic Children of Two or more races	Non-Hispanic White Children
State-funded preschool	1,004	26	419	606	18	549	5,366
Specify:	Inclusive Preschool Learning Environments (IPLE)(391 grant)						
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	6,675	43	718	3,180	8	1,626	6,033
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	8,268						
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	16,213	139	3,635	6,362	44	1,799	20,781
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	12,005	58	1,877	4,656	23	923	6,093
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	34,356	201	1,293	12,592	81	32,135	14,420

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

Data Table (A)(1)-3b Data Notes

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

UPK: Data on race/ethnicity of children in UPK programs is not currently available.

IPLE: Race/ethnicity for children enrolled Calendar year January 1, 2013 - December 31, 2013. Program reported information for 8 programs is pending. Source: 391 IPLE FY14 Mid-Year Report.

Head Start: Head Start Program Information Report (2012-2013).

IDEA part B: Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Education (school year 2013-2014).

IDEA part C: Dept. of Public Health (FY13, Early Intervention Summation Report).

Title I: Dept. of Elementary & Secondary Education (school year 2013-2014); schools receiving school wide (SW) Title I funding.

CCDF: ECIS, calendar year 2013.

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.

Table (A)(1)-4: Funding for each Fiscal Year				
Type of investment	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	$7,499,998	$7,500,000	$7,500,000	$8,100,000
State-funded preschool	$7,424,449	$7,500,000	$7,432,383	$7,500,000
Specify:	UPK			
State contributions to IDEA, Part C	$29,450,081	$31,144,420	$28,025,623	$27,241,537
State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry	$8,997,920	$9,019,276	$9,019,276	$9,019,276
Total State contributions to CCDF[2]	$77,052,705	$76,863,988	$76,526,436	$76,179,788
State match to CCDF Exceeded / Met / Not Met	Met	Met	Met	
If exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded				
TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs[3]	$290,409,712	$287,953,485	$283,202,984	$279,097,990
Other State contributions 1	$47,500,000	$53,200,000	$53,400,000	$54,400,000
Specify:	DPH part C- MassHealth			
Other State contributions 2	$40,200,000	$41,700,000	$45,000,000	$48,500,000
Specify:	DPH part C- Private Insurance			
Total State contributions:	$540,000,000	$546,820,988	$542,242,504	$541,385,026

[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.

Head Start: Based on State Appropriation for Head Start SFY 12 (for Year 1), SFY13 for Year 2, and SFY14 for Year 3.

UPK: Based on State Appropriation for UPK SFY 12 (for Year 1), SFY13 for Year 2, and SFY14 for Year 3.

IDEA Part C: State Appropriation for Early Intervention (line 4513-1020)

IPLE: EEC's allocation plan for Inclusive Preschool Learning Environments grant line item 3000-4060.

CCDF: Administration for Children and Families CCDF award amount. Y3 is FFY14 award amount, Y2 is FFY13 final award amount; and Y1 is final FFY12 award amount.

TANF: For each funding year, early education and care expenses (as allocated by EEC), including the annual TANF transfer to CCDF discretionary fund.

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.

Table (A)(1)-5: Total number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program[1]			
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	**Baseline**	**Year 1**	**Year 2**
State-funded preschool *(annual census count; e.g., October 1 count)*	14,221	14,071	6,638
Specify:	UPK and Inclusive Preschool Learning Environments (IPLE)		
Early Head Start and Head Start[2] *(funded enrollment)*	16,540	15,963	15,888
Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619 *(annual December 1 count)*	30,044	30,693	32,345
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA *(total number of children who receive Title I services annually, as reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report)*	10,710	11,167	6,591
Programs receiving CCDF funds *(average monthly served)*	62,742	60,583	61,655
[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.

UPK: fall and spring 2013 data reports from UPK grantees

IPLE (391 grant): FY14 Mid-Year report

Head Start: Head Start Program Information Report (2012-2013)

IDEA part C: Infant and toddler data is from Dept. of Public Health, Early Intervention (FY12).

Title I: Preschooler data is from Dept. of Elementary & Secondary Education (school year 2013-2014);school receiving school wide (SW) Title I funding.

CCDF: Baseline and Year One totals (calendar year) were revised based on data currently available in ECIS as of 12/31/13. Year Two total from ECIS as of 12/31/13.

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

Check marks indicate the State's Early Learning and Development Standards address the different age groups by Essential Domain of School Readiness.

Table (A)(1)-6: Current status of the State's Early Learning and Development Standards			
Essential Domains of School Readiness	**Age Groups**		
	Infants	**Toddlers**	**Preschoolers**
Language and literacy development	✓	✓	✓
Cognition and general knowledge (including early math and early scientific development)	✓	✓	✓
Approaches toward learning	✓	✓	✓
Physical well-being and motor development	✓	✓	✓
Social and emotional development	✓	✓	✓

Data Table (A)(1)-6 Data Notes

Enter text to explain or clarify information as needed.

None.

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

Check marks indicate where an element of a Comprehensive Assessment System is currently required.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Table (A)(1)-7: Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System currently required within the State</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Types of programs or systems</td><td colspan="5" align="center">Elements of a Comprehensive Assessment System</td></tr>
<tr><td>Screening Measures</td><td>Formative Assessments</td><td>Measures of Environmental Quality</td><td>Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions</td><td>Other</td></tr>
<tr><td>State-funded preschool</td><td>✓</td><td>✓</td><td>✓</td><td>✓</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td align="right">Specify:</td><td colspan="5">UPK</td></tr>
<tr><td>Early Head Start & Head Start[1]</td><td>✓</td><td>✓</td><td>✓</td><td>✓</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Programs funded by IDEA, Part C</td><td>✓</td><td>✓</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619</td><td>✓</td><td>✓</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Programs funded under Title I of ESEA</td><td>✓</td><td>✓</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Programs receiving CCDF funds</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Progress Reports</td></tr>
<tr><td>Current Quality Rating and Improvement System requirements (Specify by tier)
Tier 1</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Tier 2</td><td>✓</td><td>✓</td><td>✓</td><td>✓</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Tier 3</td><td>✓</td><td>✓</td><td>✓</td><td>✓</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Tier 4</td><td>✓</td><td>✓</td><td>✓</td><td>✓</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Tier 5</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>State licensing requirements</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Progress Reports</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">[1] Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.</td></tr>
</table>

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

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

None.

Budget and Expenditure Tables

Budget and Expenditure Table 1: Overall Budget and Expenditure Summary by Budget Category

Report your actual budget expenditures for the entire previous budget period and for the current reporting period.

Budget Summary Table

Budget Summary Table			
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$258,545.46	$641,541.23	$900,086.69
2. Fringe Benefits	$68,042.36	$165,656.52	$233,698.88
3. Travel	$5,175.60	$27,341.48	$32,517.08
4. Equipment	$625.00	$1,775.00	$2,400.00
5. Supplies	$4,474.97	$10,094.71	$14,569.68
6. Contractual	$3,062,239.73	$5,733,372.59	$8,795,612.32
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$20,000.00	$20,000.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$3,399,103.12	$6,599,781.53	$9,998,884.65
10. Indirect Costs	$164,079.65	$276,988.03	$441,067.68
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$975,050.28	$1,992,061.48	$2,967,111.76
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$86.23	$0.00	$86.23
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$4,538,319.28	$8,868,831.04	$13,407,150.32
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$46,954,903.60	$892,007.02	$47,846,910.62
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$51,493,222.88	$9,760,838.06	$61,254,060.94

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the 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.

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.

Total Race to the Top- Early Learning Challenge Grant expenditures for Massachusetts are currently $13,407,151. An additional $2,815,315 of obligated funds will be paid out for work performed in Year 2. Including these obligated funds, expenditures at the end of Year 2 will then amount to 72% of the approved budget for Years 1 and 2.

The state submitted two budget amendments in 2013 which were Federally approved. The first amendment was in June 2013 for the overall budget. The second amendment was in August 2013 for Project 3. These budget amendments impacted the Year 2 budget.

The state has analyzed each project activities' budget (including expenditures) at the end of Year 2 and will submit a budget amendment to shift unspent funding to project areas of the grant that have demonstrated success over the last two years as well as re-allocate funds to project areas that are in need of additional resources to ensure successful completion.

Budget Summary Table Explanation of Changes

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

The state plans to re-allocate unspent funds from grant Year 1 and Year 2 into grant Years 3 and Year 4 to ensure the goals of the RTT-ELC grant are met. The changes will primarily affect Projects 1, 2, 3, and 10. The state plans to submit a formal budget amendment in March 2014 to reflect these changes.

Budget Table: Project 1 – Systems Infrastructure Activity: EEC Budget

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
Budget Table: Project 1			
1. Personnel	$238,045.46	$593,041.23	$831,086.69
2. Fringe Benefits	$66,402.36	$161,776.52	$228,178.88
3. Travel	$5,175.60	$21,641.48	$26,817.08
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$4,474.97	$3,327.71	$7,802.68
6. Contractual	$40,772.20	$0.00	$40,772.20
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$354,870.59	$779,786.94	$1,134,657.53
10. Indirect Costs	$161,844.65	$266,675.83	$428,520.48
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$86.23	$0.00	$86.23
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$516,801.47	$1,046,462.77	$1,563,264.24
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$179,374.02	$179,374.02	$358,748.04
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$696,175.49	$1,225,836.79	$1,922,012.28

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the 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.

Project 1 Budget Table Narrative

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

Discrepancies were primarily due to unanticipated turnover and new hire start times causing payroll fringe and indirect cost to be lower than budgeted. An additional $341,632 of obligated funds will be paid out for work performed in Year 2. Project 1 expenditures at the end of Year 2 will then amount to 99% of the approved Year 1 & 2 total budget.

Project 1 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

The budget for Project 1 will change as unspent funds from year 2 will be moved to year 3 and year 4 to cover the cost of staffing and associated fringe and indirect costs.

Budget Table: Project 2 – QRIS Program Quality Supports

<table>
<tr><th colspan="4">Budget Table: Project 2</th></tr>
<tr><th>Budget Categories</th><th>Grant Year 1
(a)</th><th>Grant Year 2
(b)</th><th>Total
(e)</th></tr>
<tr><td>1. Personnel</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td></tr>
<tr><td>2. Fringe Benefits</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td></tr>
<tr><td>3. Travel</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td></tr>
<tr><td>4. Equipment</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td></tr>
<tr><td>5. Supplies</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td></tr>
<tr><td>6. Contractual</td><td>$928,882.73</td><td>$2,305,895.15</td><td>$3,234,777.88</td></tr>
<tr><td>7. Training Stipends</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td></tr>
<tr><td>8. Other</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td></tr>
<tr><td>9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)</td><td>$928,882.73</td><td>$2,305,895.15</td><td>$3,234,777.88</td></tr>
<tr><td>10. Indirect Costs</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td></tr>
<tr><td>11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td></tr>
<tr><td>12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td></tr>
<tr><td>13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)</td><td>$928,882.73</td><td>$2,305,895.15</td><td>$3,234,777.88</td></tr>
<tr><td>14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan</td><td>$5,062,000.00</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$5,062,000.00</td></tr>
<tr><td>15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)</td><td>$5,990,882.73</td><td>$2,305,895.15</td><td>$8,296,777.88</td></tr>
</table>

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.

Project 2 Budget Table Narrative

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

An additional $768,725 of obligated funds will be paid out for work performed in Year 2. Project 2 expenditures at the end of Year 2 would then cover 79% of the approved Year 1 & 2 total budget. Discrepancies were primarily due to Project 2.5 spending less than anticipated in Year 2. As a result we have re-evaluated funding levels for this project and will submit revised budgets based on work performed.

Project 2 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

The state will re-evaluate the Project 2 budget in 2014. It is possible that the budget for activity 2.3 and activity 2.5 will increase to better support the early education field.

Budget Table: Project 3 – Measuring Growth Through the Massachusetts Early Learning and Development Assessment System (MELD)

Budget Categories	Budget Table: Project 3		
	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
6. Contractual	$495,805.72	$235,199.57	$731,005.29
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$495,805.72	$235,199.57	$731,005.29
10. Indirect Costs	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$478,998.35	$68,096.57	$547,094.92
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$974,804.07	$303,296.14	$1,278,100.21
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$13,849,530.29	$0.00	$13,849,530.29
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$14,824,334.36	$303,296.14	$15,127,630.50

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the 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.

Project 3 Budget Table Narrative

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

An additional $38,176 of obligated funds will be paid out for work performed in Year 2. MKEA related Activities in Project 3, 3.2 - 3.6 and 3.8, submitted revised budgets in an amendment that was approved in October, 2013. Expenditures at the end of Year 2 are in line with what was approved at that time.

Project 3 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

The state intends to re-allocate additional funding to support MKEA. A formal budget amendment will be submitted in March 2014.

Budget Table: Project 4 – Family Engagement Evidence Based Practice

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
Budget Table: Project 4			
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
6. Contractual	$243,921.29	$690,712.28	$934,633.57
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$243,921.29	$690,712.28	$934,633.57
10. Indirect Costs	$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
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$243,921.29	$690,712.28	$934,633.57
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$14,649,530.29	$0.00	$14,649,530.29
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$14,893,451.58	$690,712.28	$15,584,163.86

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the 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.

Project 4 Budget Table Narrative

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

An additional $309,027 of obligated funds will be paid out for work performed in Year 2. Project 4 expenditures at the end of Year 2 will then cover 91% of the approved Year 1 & 2 total budget. Literacy programs did not expand as anticipated in Project 4.3 and as a result Year 2 costs were less than anticipated. As a result we have re-evaluated funding levels for this project and will submit revised budgets based on work performed.

Project 4 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

The state does not anticipate any substantive changes to Project 4's budget.

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

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
Budget Table: Project 5			
1. Personnel	$20,500.00	$48,500.00	$69,000.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$1,640.00	$3,880.00	$5,520.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$5,700.00	$5,700.00
4. Equipment	$625.00	$1,775.00	$2,400.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$6,767.00	$6,767.00
6. Contractual	$0.00	$16,500.00	$16,500.00
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$20,000.00	$20,000.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$22,765.00	$103,122.00	$125,887.00
10. Indirect Costs	$2,235.00	$10,312.20	$12,547.20
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$222,174.35	$787,333.85	$1,009,508.20
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$247,174.35	$900,768.05	$1,147,942.40
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$3,367,219.00	$94,500.00	$3,461,719.00
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$3,614,393.35	$995,268.05	$4,609,661.40

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the 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.

Project 5 Budget Table Narrative

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

An additional $309,027 of obligated funds will be paid out for work performed in Year 2. Project 5 expenditures at the end of Year 2 will then cover 59% of the approved Year 1 & 2 total budget. Discrepancies were primarily due to Project 5.3 spending less than anticipated in Year 2. As a result we have re-evaluated funding levels for this project and will submit revised budgets based on work performed in Year 2.

Project 5 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

The state anticipates changes to Project 5's budget in 2014. Unspent funds from grant year 2 will be re-allocated to other projects in years 3 and 4. The state will submit a formal budget amendment in March 2014 to reflect any changes to this project's budget.

Budget Table: Project 6 – Standards Validation and Alignment

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
Budget Table: Project 6			
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
6. Contractual	$538,772.79	$503,384.43	$1,042,157.22
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$538,772.79	$503,384.43	$1,042,157.22
10. Indirect Costs	$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
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$538,772.79	$503,384.43	$1,042,157.22
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$125,000.00	$125,000.00	$250,000.00
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$663,772.79	$628,384.43	$1,292,157.22

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the 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.

Project 6 Budget Table Narrative

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

An additional $187,793 of obligated funds will be paid out for work performed in Year 2. Project 6 expenditures at the end of Year 2 will then cover 74% of the approved Year 1 & 2 total budget. Discrepancies were primarily due to Project 6.3 and 6.4 spending less than anticipated in Year 2. As a result we have re-evaluated funding levels and will submit revised budgets based on work performed.

Project 6 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

The state does not anticipate any substantive changes to Project 6's budget.

Budget Table: Project 7 – Interagency Partnerships

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
Budget Table: Project 7			
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
6. Contractual	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
10. Indirect Costs	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$181,785.42	$930,459.14	$1,112,244.56
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$181,785.42	$930,459.14	$1,112,244.56
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$181,785.42	$930,459.14	$1,112,244.56

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the 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.

Project 7 Budget Table Narrative

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

An additional $58,836 of obligated funds will be paid out for work performed in Year 2. Project 7 expenditures at the end of Year 2 would then cover 54% of the approved Year 1 & 2 total budget. Discrepancies were primarily due to Project 7.3 spending less than anticipated in Year 2. As a result we have re-evaluated future funding levels and will submit revised budgets based on work performed.

Project 7 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

The state anticipates changes to Project 7's budget in 2014. Unspent funds from grant year 2 will be re-allocated to other projects in years 3 and 4. The state will submit a formal budget amendment in March 2014 to reflect any changes to this project's budget.

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

Budget Table: Project 8			
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
6. Contractual	$322,896.00	$823,279.03	$1,146,175.03
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$322,896.00	$823,279.03	$1,146,175.03
10. Indirect Costs	$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
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$322,896.00	$823,279.03	$1,146,175.03
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$9,503,997.00	$0.00	$9,503,997.00
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$9,826,893.00	$823,279.03	$10,650,172.03

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the 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.

Project 8 Budget Table Narrative

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

An additional $660,600 of obligated funds will be paid out for work performed in Year 2. Project 8 expenditures at the end of Year 2 would then cover 65% of the approved Year 1 & 2 total budget. Discrepancies were primarily due to Project 8.5 and 8.7 spending less than anticipated in Year 2. As a result we have made adjustments to funding levels and will submit revised budgets.

Project 8 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

The state anticipates changes to Project 8's budget in 2014. Unspent funds from grant year 2 will be re-allocated to other projects in years 3 and 4. The state will submit a formal budget amendment in March 2014 to reflect any changes to this project's budget.

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

Budget Table: Project 9			
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
6. Contractual	$157,659.00	$74,867.00	$232,526.00
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$157,659.00	$74,867.00	$232,526.00
10. Indirect Costs	$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
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$157,659.00	$74,867.00	$232,526.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$157,659.00	$74,867.00	$232,526.00

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the 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.

Project 9 Budget Table Narrative

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

Project 9 expenditures at the end of Year 2 cover 37% of the approved budget. There are only 2 Activities for this project and both were completed in Year 2 with a surplus of unspent funds. As a result we propose using the surplus of unspent funding for other Projects. We will provide plan for reallocating unspent funds from this project in an upcoming budget amendment.

Project 9 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

There will be changes to Project 9's budget as activity 9.1 and 9.2 have ended. The state will be submitting a formal amendment to describe the scope of work changes to these activities as well as reflect these changes in the budget amendment to be submitted in March 2014.

Budget Table: Project 10 – Implementing the Early Childhood Information System (ECIS)

Budget Table: Project 10			
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
6. Contractual	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
10. Indirect Costs	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$92,092.16	$206,171.92	$298,264.08
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$92,092.16	$206,171.92	$298,264.08
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$218,253.00	$447,500.00	$665,753.00
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$310,345.16	$653,671.92	$964,017.08

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the 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.

Project 10 Budget Table Narrative

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

The discrepancy between budget and expenditures is due to larger than anticipated access to outside funding streams for this Project in Year 2. As a result less Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge funding was needed in Years 1 & 2. We will include these changes and revised budgets based on project performance in an upcoming budget amendment.

Project 10 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

In 2014, there will be less state funds available for Project 10. Unspent Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge funds from grant year 2 will be rolled over to grant years 3 and 4.

Budget Table: Project 11 – Pre-K to Three Alignment for Educational Success: Communications

Budget Table: Project 11			
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
6. Contractual	$67,322.00	$151,900.13	$219,222.13
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$67,322.00	$151,900.13	$219,222.13
10. Indirect Costs	$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
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$67,322.00	$151,900.13	$219,222.13
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$45,633.00	$45,633.00
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$67,322.00	$197,533.13	$264,855.13

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the 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.

Project 11 Budget 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 are no significant discrepancies between the State approved budget and expenditures for Project 11. An additional $17,000 of obligated Year 2 funds will be expended.

Project 11 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

There will be no substantive changes to Project 11's budget in the coming year.

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

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
Budget Table: Project 12			
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
6. Contractual	$266,208.00	$931,635.00	$1,197,843.00
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$266,208.00	$931,635.00	$1,197,843.00
10. Indirect Costs	$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
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$266,208.00	$931,635.00	$1,197,843.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$266,208.00	$931,635.00	$1,197,843.00

Columns (a) and (b): 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 the 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.

Project 12 Budget 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 $153,726 of obligated funds that has not been paid out for work performed in Year 2. When these funds are liquidated, 100% of Year 1 and Year 2 budgeted funds will be expended.

Project 12 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

None.