Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge
2014 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

Massachusetts

JUNE **2015**

Race to the Top
Early Learning Challenge

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 cells in a table indicates that the Grantee did not provide data or did not select the option.*

APR Cover Sheet

General Information

1. PR/Award #: S412A120017

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

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

4. Project Director Name: Thomas L. Weber

     Title: Commissioner

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

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

Reporting Period Information

5. Reporting Period: 1/1/2014 **to** 12/31/2014

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 (Please specify):

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.

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

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

The following is a summary of key accomplishments achieved in 2014 to implement the Massachusetts Early Learning Plan.

Early Learning and Development Standards

Massachusetts, in partnership with the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Institute at the Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin, has continued its ground breaking work to adopt and implement new Early English Language Development standards. To bolster the infrastructure needed to implement these standards, Massachusetts used RTT-ELC funds in 2014 to host a statewide conference, *Young Dual Language Learner's School Readiness*, which reached maximum capacity at 160 participants. These participants represented a true cross section of early childhood programs and services including public preschool programs, Coordinated Families and Communities Engagement (CFCE) Grantees, Head Start, community based early education and care programs, home visiting programs, Educator and Provider Support (EPS) Grantees, Readiness Centers, institutes of higher education, state partner agencies, Child Care Resource and Referral (CCR&Rs) Agencies, Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation Grantees, advocacy groups, and others. Additional professional development was provided through three webinars housed at WIDA and a comprehensive Training of Trainers to support the sustained implementation of the E-ELD standards.

Based on an evaluation of the state's early learning and development standards completed in the second RTT-ELC year, Massachusetts began work with the University of Massachusetts-Boston in 2014 to develop comprehensive preschool and kindergarten standards in the domains of social emotional development and approaches to play and learning. Plans for 2015 include the development of comprehensive training to support the implementation of these standards.

Comprehensive Assessment Systems

For the 2014-2015 school year, the Massachusetts Kindergarten Entry Assessment (MKEA) initiative was expanded to reach 173 school districts across the state, assessing over 36,000 students using a valid and reliable formative assessment tool. In addition to expanding the number of school districts participating in MKEA, Massachusetts was also successful in enhancing the supports and training available to school districts, which resulted in approximately 2,000 educators being trained in the use of the formative assessment tool and in collecting and using observational data. This expanded support has also increased buy-in of the initiative at the state and local levels. Though progress was made in 2014 to continue building a comprehensive assessment system, there is still work to be done to garner stronger buy-in for MKEA and to improve data management and governance policies and practices. Several strategies will be put in place in year 4 to increase supports to the field to help teachers integrate use of MKEA within classroom practice and to increase the state's capacity to use MKEA data in a meaningful way.

Program Quality

In 2014, Massachusetts made several improvements to its Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) related to program standards and policies, including modifications to the use of measurement tools, Environmental Rating Scales, to ensure programs are rated accurately; the inclusion of the Early English Language Development standards; and the addition of degree requirements for lead teachers in center-based programs. In addition to the 6 Program Quality Specialists that were hired in year 3, several quality supports and resources were also developed in 2014 to assist programs in meeting QRIS standards, including a Continuous Quality Improvement Plan, a health and safety self-assessment tool, and monthly webinars that target specific audiences such as family based providers and program administrators.

By acquiring additional staffing resources to review programs' QRIS applications in year 3, Massachusetts was able to provide more accurate and reliable data on program quality. As a result, we are now able to replace programs' quality rating based on their self-assessment with a more thorough review and a "granting" of QRIS level status. For example, in year 3, we surpassed our target goal of 3 and granted 94 programs, including family child care programs, a rating of QRIS Level 3 that accurately reflects the program quality.

Family Engagement and Support

Massachusetts implemented several innovative strategies to increase community awareness of the importance of early childhood education and development. As part of the public awareness early childhood initiative, Brain Building In Progress, the state's transportation agency ran a ten week advertising campaign, "Build your child's brain on the train", to promote early learning. The Registrar of Motor Vehicles locations across the state became "Brain Building Zones", where they distributed a "License to Learn" poster to all caregivers with children that included tips for parents on how to spark interactive conversations with their children, and displayed a screen shot in waiting areas with additional activity ideas to engage in while waiting. In partnership with the Boston Children's Museum, Massachusetts expanded resources to parents and communities by engaging 56 museums and 119 libraries across the state to provide STEM, early literacy, and school readiness activities to children and families.

In 2014, Massachusetts also launched an innovative parent engagement and support initiative through the implementation of evidence-base parenting education in pediatric practices. Twenty-eight pediatric practices across the state were trained in the *Positive Parenting Program* (*Triple P)* to provide parents with skills for managing disruptive child behaviors.

Over the past year, Massachusetts has continued to develop professional development models that support a high quality early education workforce. Building off the success of the Post-Master's Certificate Program in Early Education Leadership Research, Policy and Leadership, which graduated two cohorts to date, the University of Massachusetts-Boston has created a doctoral degree program in early education, the first of its kind in the state. This provides a career path that will not only advance the education and skills of individual educators, but will also expand the field of early education and care.

Massachusetts also recently completed an evaluation of the Peer Advising and Coaching (PAC) model, which showed measurable improvements in adult-child interactions based on peer coaching practices. The results of this pre-post evaluation of the 2013-2014 cohort demonstrated improvements in all three areas measured with the CLASS assessment tool.

Early Learning Data Systems

Late in 2014, Massachusetts received federal approval to amend its RTT-ELC budget to allocate funding to support enhancements to the information technology (IT) systems that support the early education and care system. Currently the state's IT systems for licensing, childcare billing and provider information are outdated and do not easily integrate with EEC's Early Childhood Information System (ECIS). This work, to be completed in Year Four of the grant period, includes a redesign of the licensing program, complaint logs, and provider data systems and applications. The data collected through these redesigned systems will be integrated with ECIS and will be used for licensing, investigation, and provider reports. These upgrades to the IT infrastructure will allow the state to effectively use ECIS by gathering more high quality data to inform policy decisions and increase the efficiency of staff's time spent monitoring.

Lessons Learned

Massachusetts learned valuable lessons over the past year. First in reference to MKEA, investment in expanding and enhancing professional development and technical assistance to school districts not only improved the implementation of formative assessment in kindergarten classrooms, but also increased the buy-in from public schools on formative assessment. Second, the state learned the importance of having the indicators on the assessment tool used in MKEA fully align with Massachusetts' early learning and development standards. Finally, Massachusetts continues to learn the value of having an integrated IT system that can provide timely and accurate data to evaluate current programs and inform policy decisions.

Challenges

Although Massachusetts made much progress towards meeting its RTT-ELC goals during 2014, the state's budget spend-down rate remains a challenge. While several strategies were put in place to increase the efficiency of spending on projects, such as creating a tailored online purchasing portal to facilitate more efficient reimbursement of expenses for the QRIS Quality Improvement/Durable Goods grants, the state's overall spending rate is approximately at 60%.

Despite the state's efforts in implementing several strategies to improve supports and training for the teachers and administrators who are participating in MKEA, there remains resistance from school districts and other stakeholders about MKEA. More work needs to be done to increase buy-in from stakeholders about the value of formative assessment in supporting children's learning outcomes. Massachusetts will also need to develop a concrete and actionable sustainability plan for MKEA beyond the RTT-ELC grant period. Having this plan in place

will help facilitate more buy-in from school districts and other key partners as it shows that Massachusetts is committed to investing in formative assessment and MKEA for the long term.

Strategies to Address Challenges

Massachusetts is analyzing the budget to ensure that all grant funds will be expended in a timely manner that contributes to sustaining the state's efforts to enhance the system of early education and care. For example, the state is currently exploring potential investments in information technology infrastructure to better support QRIS. Additionally, contract and budget processes have been streamlined to ensure that vendors meet deliverables and file invoices in a more timely manner.

Massachusetts is also developing strategies to improve implementation of MKEA. To lessen the workload of kindergarten teachers in entering formative assessment data, the state will be evaluating the number of indicators in Teaching Strategies GOLD® formative assessment tool, and will identify those indicators that are most critical to assess children's progress. A researcher will be hired in 2015 to conduct this analysis and offer recommendations on the key indicators that most align with the state's kindergarten standards.   The state will also increase its communication efforts with school districts and share best practices in MKEA to ensure that districts are better equipped to overcome obstacles in implementing formative assessment in the classroom. Furthermore, the Department of Early Education and Care (EEC) and Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) will form an MKEA advisory committee, comprised of public school teachers and administrators and other stakeholders, to provide strategic guidance to the state on MKEA.

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).

The Department of Early Education and Care (EEC), led by Commissioner, Thomas L. Weber, continues to oversee the implementation and success of the Massachusetts Early Learning Plan. In June 2014, Governor Patrick appointed Jay Gonzalez as the new chairman of the Board of Early Education and Care replacing J.D Chesloff, who will remain on the Board. The Board oversees the development and administration of high-quality early education and care services in communities across the Commonwealth. There are eleven members on the Board, including the Secretaries of Education and Health and Human Services; together, they represent a variety of constituencies with diverse perspectives from business, education, parents, health and human service providers, evaluation and assessment practitioners, and psychology.

Under the Patrick Administration's leadership, there have been significant advances in the early education and care delivery system throughout the Commonwealth and considerable progress has been made in improving the quality of its services and resources and ensuring that they are accessible to families. From increased funding for programs, to expanded resources for workforce development, to a new system and additional supports for quality improvement, the system of early education and care in Massachusetts has both moved forward in progress, and upward in visibility. The state budget in fiscal year 2014 and 2015 included new investments in high-quality subsidized child care programs, including $30M for child care financial assistance for low-income families, and $18M for reimbursement rate increases for providers who serve these children.

In June 2014, the Board adopted an updated Strategic Plan for the Department for the next five years (2014-2019), setting a new vision and direction for the agency. Over the next five years, EEC aspires to:

- Be highly regarded, along with the whole field of early education and care, publicly recognized and supported, and clearly understood to be a value to the Commonwealth;

- Offer an array of high-quality comprehensive and affordable early childhood programs, out of school time programs and resources, materials and activities designed to meet the diverse and individual needs of children and families;

- Have an early education and care workforce that is respected, diverse, professional, qualified and fairly compensated;

- Be an effective, responsive, efficient and resilient department which provides licensing and monitoring to early childhood and out of school time programs;

- Have clear standards for accountability and evidence that those standards are being met;

- Engage families as partners, who are integral to the healthy development and learning of their children, with access to the necessary resources to do so;

- Have all children have access to high-quality early childhood, out of school and residential programs that meet the needs of families;

- Have children and families experience seamless transitions throughout their early learning and later developmental experiences; and

- Be aligned with, and support the goals and objectives of, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) and the Department of Higher Education (DHE), as one agency of the a larger system of education in the Commonwealth.

Several new RTT-ELC staff were hired in 2014: a Project Director, an Early Education Coordinator, and an Interagency Liaison. The Project Director is responsible for the management of the grant; the Early Educator Coordinator is responsible for the Massachusetts Kindergarten Entry Assessment (MKEA) and the Birth through Third Grade grant initiatives; and the Interagency Liaison is responsible the partnerships with the state's health and human service agencies.

The additions of both the Early Education Coordinator and the Interagency Liaison have expanded and strengthened the state's partnerships with its current state agency partners. Most notably, the Boards of EEC and ESE have convened a Joint Board Committee. Members of both Boards will sit on this Committee, which will focus on key issues related to Massachusetts' efforts to promote alignment throughout systems from birth through third grade. As noted later in this report, EEC was also instrumental in convening an interagency group to serve as the Massachusetts team for the National Governor's Association Policy Academy (NGA) Policy Academy on State Strategies to Improve Early Learning Outcomes.

Other advancements made through collaboration with other state agency partners health and human service agencies are detailed in the Engaging and Supporting Families (C(4) section of this report.

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. Stakeholder groups include leadership governing bodies, advisory committees, and working groups from the early education field. The following is a list of committees and advisory councils that continue to support and guide EEC's work:

- **The Board Early Education and Care**: as described above, the Board is the governing body of the Department of Early Education and Care (EEC) and consists of members that are a cross disciplinary group that represents education, health and human services, higher education, and families and community members.

- **EEC Advisory Council:** The Advisory Council is comprised of a wider representation of stakeholders involved in the systems of early education and care, as well as family support and human services. While the Advisory Council does not have a formal governing role with EEC, it provides guidance to the agency's work and initiatives and provides a comprehensive stakeholder audience to gather feedback to vet the work of the agency. The

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

  - Validation of Educator Competencies Advisory Committee
  - Post-Masters Certificate Program Advisory Committee
  - Peer Assistance and Coaching Advisory Panel
  - Brain Building in Progress Advisory Committee
  - Media Based Resources for Early Learning Advisory Committee
  - QRIS Working Group
  - QRIS Professional Development Review Team
  - QRIS Public School Task Force
  - QRIS Validation Study Advisory Board

Partner organizations and agencies that participate in the groups mentioned above are too numerous to list. A few of the key partners include:

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

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 2014 state executive orders, policies, and legislation that impact Massachusetts' RTT-ELC grant.

- Governor Patrick's proposed FY15 budget included a new item designed to create more Pre-Kindergarten classrooms through collaborations between districts and other entities such as private providers and community organizations.

- In November, Massachusetts elected a new governor, Charles Baker, to succeed Governor Deval Patrick. Governor Elect Baker will begin his term in January 2015. Since the new administration will be facing a significant state budget deficit, EEC anticipates changes to the budget that may negatively impact programs and services delivered by EEC and its vendors.

- In December, the state was awarded the federal Preschool Expansion Grant to increase the availability of high-quality preschool programs to 4-year-olds from low-income families in the communities of Boston, Holyoke, Lawrence, Lowell, and Springfield.

As previously mentioned, in December, the Boards EEC and ESE approved the creation of a birth through third grade subcommittee to better align early education with K-12 education in the state. This subcommittee is a

result of the successful work state did with the National Governor's Association (NGA) Policy Academy on State Strategies to Improve Early Learning Outcomes.

Participating State Agencies

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

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) have continued and expanded their collaborative efforts with EEC to execute the goals and objectives in the Massachusetts Early Learning Plan. While there have been no changes to the number of state agencies that are participating in Massachusetts' State Plan, with the hiring of a new and experienced Interagency Liaison at EEC, Massachusetts saw a marked increase in the activities and commitment of its state agency partners in 2014.

Information about progress made with participating state agencies can be found in the Engaging and Supporting Families 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.

Massachusetts is committed to ensuring that children have access to high quality early learning opportunities. Over the year, the state has made progress in removing barriers and obstacles for programs so that they can achieve better quality and move to higher tiers within QRIS. For example, EEC revised its Environment Rating Scales (ERS) policy from needing every program to meet every single requirement within each item, to now using the average of the sub-scales. This policy change has resulted in more programs advancing to higher QRIS levels. The following is a description of the 2014 progress made in revising QRIS standards and policies:

Revised Program Standards: Massachusetts launched a standards revision process based on data from the QRIS Pilot Validation Study, data from ERS Reliable Raters, feedback from the field and other stakeholders, and national best practice research. Standards and guidance revisions for all program types (i.e. family child care, out-of-school time and public schools) have been made and will be finalized in 2015. The center based program standards have already been revised to ensure high levels of quality, while also meeting the needs of educators. These revision include:

- the integration of the Early English Language Development Standards into the QRIS criteria for curriculum and learning;

- moving the QRIS Health Consultant site visit from QRIS Level 2 to Level 3 because programs were not ready for a Health Consultant visit at this level and programs at Level 3 were more deeply engaged with QRIS;

- requiring "in-classroom" sink requirements from Level 4 to Level 2 because it allows programs to better achieve higher scores on the ERS personal care routine scale;

- requiring that 100% of classrooms must have a qualified Lead Teacher at Level 2 and that 100% of classrooms must have at least one educator with a bachelors degree by January 1, 2020, as well as the development of an Alternative Pathway to Educator Qualifications for those individuals who are well-qualified but unable to attain the bachelor's level qualification;

- requiring compliance with state mandate to ensure that all families have services and materials that are translated into their home language; and

- requiring that programs participating in QRIS offer benefits to part-time staff, as well as clarify the requirements for written business plans.

Health and Safety: In response to issues raised during the 2013 QRIS evaluation process, Massachusetts worked to address its health and safety standard supports. QRIS Health Advisors completed a pilot health and safety self-assessment in late 2014, which will be used along with all other QRIS self-assessment measurement tools. The tool has been developed in conjunction with five online health and safety orientation modules for educators and providers.

Environment Rating Scales Scoring Policy and Practices: In order to address challenges that are keeping programs from advancing in QRIS, Massachusetts revised its ERS policy to capture the average subscale score. As a result of this policy change, individual items that were sometimes problematic will not keep quality programs from moving up in the tiered system. Use of the average subscale score has also allowed Massachusetts to provide targeted technical assistance to programs based on identified strengths and challenges. ERS policy changes also now require a technical assistance site visit by a highly trained Program Quality Specialists at Level 3, moving the ERS Reliable Rater assessment to Level 4 applicants only.

Continuous Quality Improvement Process: Massachusetts piloted a Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) Plan tool during the summer and fall of 2014 with recipients of the QRIS Quality Improvement Grant. Programs used data collected through self-assessments and Reliable Rater observations to identify strengths as well as areas for potential growth. Programs then developed concrete action steps and identify key individuals and resources to support implementation of the action steps. The CQI has allowed programs to reflect on any gains they made in improving program quality and record the outcomes. EEC is receiving positive feedback from the field about the CQI tool to affect quality practice.

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.

Since the launch of the Massachusetts QRIS in 2011, there has been steady growth of participation in QRIS. In 2014, the state has made progress in increasing the number of programs participating in QRIS. For Performance Measure (B)(2)(c), the following early learning and development programs participated in QRIS:

- 3,702 Childcare Development Fund (CCDF) funded programs (83%)
- 233 Head Start programs (98%)
- 224 Universal Pre-Kindergarten (UPK) programs (100%)
- 136 Inclusive Early Learning Environment programs (100%)
- 122 License-exempt programs (52%)
- 103 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) part B, section 619 funded programs (20%)
- 20 Title I funded programs (10%)

Massachusetts has instituted several activities that have increased participation in QRIS. One of such activities are the monthly technical assistance webinars for family child care system support staff (i.e. administrators, education specialists and home coordinators). These webinars, such as "Understanding the Environment Rating Scales and ERS Scoring Policy," "Navigating the Professional Qualifications Registry," and "The Continuous Quality Improvement Process", focus on critical topics that support improved program quality. Monthly webinars have averaged 350 participants per webinar. In 2014, a total of 922 educators participated in QRIS webinars to improve their knowledge on creating and sustaining high quality programs for young children.

Approximately 1,500 programs and providers across the mixed delivery system were given QRIS technical assistance in 2014. This included orientations, trainings, on-site classroom/program observations, and targeted technical assistance via phone and email support. The most common topics addressed during technical assistance were health and safety, continuous program improvement, and business management practices.

In August 2014, Massachusetts launched the QRIS Online Community (www.QRIScommunity.org) in collaboration with the United Way of Massachusetts Bay and Merrimack Valley. This resource, geared towards educators, administrators, and providers, includes specialized groups, discussion forums, and a section for sharing resources and best practices.

Public school preschool programs receive targeted technical assistance from EEC staff. In collaboration with ESE, EEC is in the process of developing separate QRIS criteria for public preschools so that greater numbers of children can have high quality services in the public school system.

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c)

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

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

Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	192	89.00%	216	100.00%	216	100.00%	216	100.00%	216	100.00%
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	112	51.00%	145	66.00%	221	100.00%	221	100.00%	221	100.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	-	0.00%	-	0.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	29	6.00%	102	20.00%	229	45.00%	356	70.00%	508	100.00%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	18	11.00%	34	20.00%	56	33.00%	112	66.00%	128	100.00%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	1,088	26.00%	8,406	100.00%	8,406	100.00%	8,406	100.00%	8,406	100.00%
Other 1	25	33.00%	26	35.00%	27	40.00%	33	45.00%	37	50.00%
Describe:	License-exempt									
Other 2	25	15.00%	50	30.00%	164	100.00%	164	100.00%	164	100.00%
Describe:	Inclusive Early Learning Environments/Inclusive Preschool Learning Environments (IPLE)									

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

[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	89.00%	166	166	100.00%	226	226	100.00%
Specify:	Universal Pre-Kindergarten (UPK)								
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	221	112	51.00%	214	214	100.00%	219	219	100.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	-	-	0.00%	-	-	0.00%	-	-	0.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	508	29	6.00%	504	70	14.00%	504	98	19.00%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	170	18	11.00%	172	28	16.00%	172	24	6.60%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	8,406	1,088	26.00%	8,469	3,287	75.00%	4,410	3,393	80.00%
Other 1	75	25	33.00%	75	136	79.00%	75	9	39.00%
Describe:	License-exempt								
Other 2	164	25	15.00%	164	69	48.00%	164	130	96.00%
Describe:	Inclusive Early Learning Environments/Inclusive Preschool Learning Environments (IPLE)								

[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	Year 3			Year 4		
	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%
State-funded preschool	224	224	100.00%			
Specify:	Universal Pre-Kindergarten (UPK)					
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	233	233	100.00%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	-	-	0.00%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	515	103	20.00%			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	194	20	10.00%			
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	4,410	3,702	83.00%			
Other 1	233	122	52.00%			
Describe:	License-exempt					
Other 2	136	136	100%			
Describe:	Inclusive Early Learning Environments/Inclusive Preschool Learning Environments (IPLE)					

[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.

UPK: The total number of Universal Pre-Kindergarten programs in FY2014 was 224. As of December 31, 2014, there was:

- **1** program at **Level 4** (center-based);
- **57** programs at **Level 3** (48 center-based, 4 family child care (FCC), 1 private school, and 4 public schools);
- **102** programs at **Level 2** (47 center-based, 54 FCC, and 1 public school);
- **49** programs at **Level 1** (27 center-based, 20 FCC, and 2 public schools);
- **15** programs with **No Rating** (6 center-based, 3 FCC, and 6 public schools).

Please note that the programs that are at Level 2, Level 1 or have No Rating have submitted online applications for Level 3 per the requirements of the UPK Grant; however, these applications have not been given a granted Level 3 status by EEC's Program Quality Specialists as of December 31, 2014.

Inclusive Early Learning Environments/Inclusive Preschool Learning Environments (IPLE):

As of December 31, 2014, there are 136 IPLE programs participating in QRIS:

- 11 program with a QRIS Rating Granted - Level 3 (6 public school preschool programs and 5 EEC-licensed center-based programs);

- 28 programs with a QRIS Rating Granted - Level 2 (25 public school preschool programs and 3 EEC-licensed center-based programs); and

- 58 programs with a QRIS Rating Granted - Level 1 (54 public school preschool programs and 4 EEC-licensed center-based programs).

- 39 programs have yet to receive a QRIS Ratings and have self- assessed their programs as follows:

    o 2 public schools have self-assessed at level 4;
    o 9 public schools and 2 EEC- licensed programs have self-assessed at level 3;
    o 15 public schools and 1 EEC- licensed program have self-assessed at level 2;
    o 11 public schools have self-assessed at level 1.

Please note that EEC's Program Quality Specialists continue to provide technical assistance and conduct QRIS verification visits with programs that have yet to receive a QRIS rating.

Head Start: This data is from the FY 2014-2015 Massachusetts Head Start Participation Survey. This includes Head Start Center Based programs and Family Center Based programs that are required to be in QRIS (it does not include Home-Based programs as they are not required to participate in QRIS). The number of grantees in FY2014 is lower due to the impact of the sequestration.

IDEA, Part C: The state does not report on IDEA part C for the RTT grant. The MA QRIS Standards were not designed to address program quality in Early Intervention programs (Part C), as the Commonwealth's Early Intervention service delivery model is very different than early education and care programs. As a result, the

state's QRIS does not include EI programs funded under Part C of IDEA. The state does not collect data on children receiving EI services in early education programs participating in QRIS.

IDEA, Part B: There are 515 schools receiving IDEA part B funding in school year 2014-2015. Of this total, there are 103 programs in QRIS. This data was provided by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE). The discrepancies between the target numbers and actual numbers is because at the time of submitting the RTT grant application, the state assumed that more public schools would voluntarily participate in QRIS. EEC is unable to mandate public school programs to participate in QRIS because IDEA part B funding is granted to ESE.

Title I: The total number of Title I schools receiving school wide funding (that have prekindergarten classrooms) in school year 2014-2015 is 194. Of this total, there are 20 programs in QRIS. This data was provided by ESE.

CCDF: There are 4,410 programs receiving CCDF funding and of this total 3,702 programs are in QRIS. The target number of 8,406 reflects the state's ambitious goal of engaging all programs in QRIS though not all programs have chosen to participate in QRIS. The CCDF data comes from the Early Childhood Information System (ECIS) which is extracted from financial billing data for CCDF in calendar year 2014. The CCDF funded programs in QRIS include those who have a granted QRIS rating and those who have started a QRIS application but have not received a granted QRIS rating yet. The numbers of CCDF programs in QRIS in the state vary from grant year because programs close and new programs open. Programs close voluntarily or because of financial constraints.

License Exempt: According to data provided by the QRIS Program Manager, EEC has identified 233 programs that are license exempt (public school, private schools, community based organizations, faith based organizations) participating in QRIS. Of this total, 122 have a granted QRIS level rating. EEC does not have data on the total number of license exempt programs throughout the state because these programs are overseen by other local entities. There is a discrepancy between numbers reported in year 2 and year 3 because in year 2, the state only reported on faith based programs (9 total). The state did not include the public schools in the license exempt total for year 2. Numbers reported in year 3 include all license exempt programs with a QRIS rating.

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.

In the first two years of the RTT-ELC grant, EEC lacked the capacity to verify all program documentation and complete classroom assessments for the large number of QRIS participants; as a result, EEC reported participation based on child care programs' *self-assessed* ratings. As the state's QRIS has matured and the EEC infrastructure has strengthened, EEC has made significant progress verifying and assessing the program quality of QRIS participants and we are now able to report the number of programs in each tier based on *granted* ratings. As a result of this change in reporting, EEC has seen a slight drop in some of the benchmarks because some programs had self-assessed their tier at a higher rating than accurately reflected their quality. EEC is using the same reporting criteria for public schools, which address the IDEA and Title I portions of Performance Measure (B)(2)(c). The number of programs reported reflect those programs that have been granted a QRIS tier level, while one-third more programs are in the process of completing their tier 1 QRIS application, and have not yet been granted. EEC expects to verify QRIS applications in process and grant more programs a QRIS rating in the upcoming year.

Massachusetts has instituted several activities that have increased participation in QRIS. One of such activities are the monthly technical assistance webinars for family child care system support staff (i.e. administrators,

education specialists and home coordinators). These webinars focus on critical topics that support improved program quality. EEC will continue to provide comprehensive technical assistance to program so that they can achieve higher quality and move up to a higher QRIS tier by the end of the RTT-ELC grant period. Comprehensive technical assistance includes QRIS orientations, trainings, on-site classroom/program observations, and targeted technical assistance via phone and email support. The most common topics addressed during technical assistance were health and safety, continuous program improvement, and business management practices. Additionally, the QRIS Online Community is a valuable resource for educators, administrators, and providers that will help more programs to achieve quality and increase participation in QRIS overall because information sharing on best practices.

In the upcoming year, EEC will continue to collaborate with ESE to increase QRIS participation from public school programs. EEC has established a QRIS Working Group for Public Schools and is developing specific QRIS criteria for public preschools so that greater numbers of children can have high quality services in the public school system.

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)	
Makes program quality rating data, information, and licensing history (including any health and safety violations) publicly available in formats that are easy to understand and use for decision making by families selecting Early Learning and Development Programs and families whose children are enrolled in such programs	

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

The following are activities the state engages in 2014 to ensure that early learning and development programs are accurately rated and monitored.

- The Program Quality Specialists and the Manager of Program Quality and Improvement met on a monthly basis to review QRIS inter-rater reliability protocols. The purpose of these meetings are to develop and/or review practices that ensure consistency of program quality monitoring and measures, enhance the verification process, and examine means to make the rating process more efficient. The group also develops tools and resources to support programs and providers with the QRIS application process.

- The Program Quality Specialists instituted a new procedure to manage each individual caseload. On a monthly basis, the number of open QRIS applications are calculated. The Program Quality Specialists use this data to identify and address trends in caseload management and to strategically prioritize their technical support. Through the new monthly caseload review process, the Program Quality Specialists have been able to process 10% more applications on a monthly basis.

- The full Program Quality Unit (Program Quality Specialists, Manager of Program Quality and Improvement, QRIS Health Advisors, UPK Project Manager and QRIS Workforce Specialist) meets monthly to ensure integration of QRIS-related efforts.

- The Program Quality Unit has also worked closely with contracted Environment Rating Scales (ERS) Reliable Raters from Wellesley College. As part of the relationship between Wellesley College and EEC, Reliable Raters provided extensive trainings to the Program Quality Specialists in the comprehensive set of ERS tools including Infant/Toddler (ITERS), Early Childhood (ECERS), Family Childcare (FCCERS), and

School Age Childcare (SACERS). The training process included classroom presentations, group and individual on-site practice, and reliability checks for each attendee. Wellesley College also provided ongoing ERS support, answers ERS-related questions from the Program Quality Unit, hosts ERS webinars for the field, and provides resources and tools for the field to address ERS challenges. As the vendor performing Reliable Rater visits, Wellesley College provides detailed site visit summary reports that serve as a guide for programs to develop their Continuous Quality Improvement plan with their Program Quality Specialists.

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

Has the State made progress in improving the quality of the Early Learning and Development Programs that are participating 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	

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	87	11	46	20	6	178	361
TQRIS Programs that Moved Down at Least One Level	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Optional Notes - State TQRIS Tiers/Levels
Explain missing data. If program movement up or down is not tracked by program type in the TQRIS you can provide the Total Programs that Moved Up and Total Programs that Moved Down in this optional notes box.

CCDF programs (center-based and family child care) movement up a QRIS level is based on a self-assessed QRIS level.

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.

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

Through a partnership with the Massachusetts Department of Public Health (DPH), EEC is also working to strengthen health related supports that are available to programs to aid in their efforts to improve program quality. The work being done through this partnership expands beyond health related supports for programs participating in QRIS, which is outlined in the Engaging and Supporting Families (C(4)) section of this report. Below are the accomplishments made by DPH and EEC to increase program supports related to health and physical activity:

- The DPH Health Specialist facilitated the development of a *new EEC Safe Cleaning Policy* through an inter- and intra-agency collaboration that included the EEC Deputy Commissioner for Field Operations; regional office staff and Directors; DPH's Early Childhood, Occupational Health, Infection Control, and Epidemiology bureaus; Head Start State Collaboration Office; and Health Resources in Action Healthy Homes.

- The Health Specialist also worked with EEC to development of *QRIS Category 2: Safe, Healthy Indoor and Outdoor Environments,* and is now finalizing the Level 2 Health and Safety Self-Assessment Tool and Health and Safety Orientation Modules.

- The four Health Advisor provide health and safety policy implementation, technical assistance, trainings, and community agency and program collaborations. Health Advisors have contributed best practice protocols and reviewed content for the QRIS Level 2 Health and Safety Self-Assessment Tool and the QRIS Level 2 Health and Safety Orientation Modules.

- Health Advisors continue to act as the EEC Regional Health and Safety Advisor researching, developing, and implementing requests from regional office staff, educator/providers and community agencies and programs.

- Trained registered nurses housed at Regional Consultation Programs provided a total of 228 individual Medication Administration in Child Care (MACC) module trainings to 116 child care programs, reaching 1691 educators. The MACC modules include asthma, allergies and anaphylaxis, seizure disorders, and diabetes.

- MA Children at Play (MCAP) Early Childhood Obesity Prevention Initiative*:* A cohort of ten child care health consultants and early education coaches were recruited and trained to serve as MCAP mentors to child care programs across five out of six regions of the state, representing the second cohort funded by the RTT-ELC grant.

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	Year 3	Year 4
Total number of programs covered by the TQRIS	1,345	8,187	8,647	8,647	6,015	4,489	4,410	5,891	
Number of Programs in Tier 1	1,111	222	722	922	5,000	2,099	1,820	4,589	
Number of Programs in Tier 2	86	4	9	17	1,700	1,075	1,344	1,497	
Number of Programs in Tier 3	84	1	2	3	175	156	324	94	
Number of Programs in Tier 4	9	1	2	3	20	23	24	2	

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1) Data Notes
Describe the methodology used to collect the data, including any error or data quality information; and please include any definitions you used that are not defined in the notice.

This data comes from the QRIS Program Manager, EEC's online system for programs to participate in QRIS. The data provided reflects the number of programs in each tier/level of QRIS that have a granted QRIS rating versus a self-assessed QRIS rating. At the beginning of this grant, the state reported on the program's assessment of their own QRIS level. By acquiring additional staffing resources to review programs' QRIS applications in year 3, the state is now able to provide more accurate and reliable data on program quality. The state is able to report on a program's granted QRIS level (which has been thoroughly verified by EEC staff) versus its self-assessment level.

The total number of programs participating in QRIS is 5,891. This total includes programs that have applied to receive a QRIS rating as well as programs that have already received a QRIS rating. The data in performance measure B4c1, reflects that some programs receive multiple QRIS ratings because their QRIS applications are verified at each level. Please note that year 1 and 2 reporting at all levels was based on a program's self-assessment of their QRIS rating; for year 3, the state is reporting on actual granted QRIS Levels.

Below is a summary of how the change in reporting for year 3 reflects the number of programs that have a granted rating at each QRIS Level.

The number of programs with a granted QRIS Level 1 rating is 4,589. The state surpassed its target goal of 922 by engaging 4,589 programs to participate in QRIS and granting them a Level 1 rating.

The number of programs with a granted QRIS Level 2 rating is 1,497. The state surpassed its target goal of 17 by engaging 1,497 programs to participate in QRIS and granting them a Level 2 rating.

The number of programs with a granted QRIS Level 3 rating is 94. The state surpassed its target goal of 3 by engaging 94 programs to participate in QRIS and granting them a Level 3 rating.

The number of programs with a granted QRIS Level 4 rating is 2. The state almost reached its target goal of 3 by engaging 2 programs to participate in QRIS and granting them a Level 4 rating.

The state is revising the year 4 targets for Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(1) since it has changed the methodology for determining the QRIS rating (from self-assessed rating to granted rating). The previous year 4 targets established at the time of the RTT-ELC grant application was based on a program's self-assessment of their quality. Now that the state has a more mature QRIS, it can better report on a program's true quality because more accurate and reliable date is available. The revised year 4 targets are as follows:

- Total number of programs covered by the TQRIS: 6,015
- Number of programs in Tier 1: 5,000
- Number of programs in Tier 2: 1,700
- Number of programs in Tier 3: 175
- Number of programs in Tier 4: 20

The revised year 4 targets were derived from the following rationale:

- Start with a baseline of 5,891 programs in QRIS (includes those who have opened QRIS applications and those with a granted level) by the end of grant year 3.

- From January 2015 to April 2015, there were 41 new programs that joined QRIS. The state is projecting that approximately 41 new programs will join QRIS every 4 months and thus we anticipate there will be a total of 6,015 programs in QRIS by December 31, 2015.

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

Performance Measure (B)(4)(c)(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.

In the first two years of the RTT-ELC grant, EEC lacked the capacity to verify all program documentation and complete classroom assessments for the large number of QRIS participants. As a result, EEC reported participation based on programs' *self-assessed* ratings. As Massachusetts' QRIS has matured and the EEC infrastructure has strengthened, EEC has made significant progress verifying and assessing the program quality

of QRIS participants and we are now able to report the number of programs in each tier based on *granted* ratings.

Massachusetts 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 during year 4.

- EEC now employs a full Program Quality Unit to provide QRIS technical assistance and other support to early education programs in each of the five regions across the Commonwealth.

- EEC's revised the Environment Rating Scales (ERS) policy to require a site visit at Level 3, which has led to 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 ERS policy and QRIS level 1 requirements for public school programs. The engagement of these working groups improved stakeholder buy-in with QRIS and increased understanding of QRIS and its value to children and families resulting in greater participation.

- EEC will make improvements to the QRIS online system to improve functionality and make it more user-friendly. EEC is contracting with a vendor to do a full assessment of QRIS vision and business needs to inform IT improvements.

- As part of the QRIS Program Improvement Grant, EEC developed the QRIS Online Community to best practice information among programs. In addition, coaches and mentors have been recruited and trained to assist grantees.

- EEC has begun to use an email subscription service to offer additional support to programs and providers and also to communicate QRIS developments.

- The state plans to revise its Universal Pre-Kindergarten (UPK) grant strategy in the next competitive grant cycle starting in 2015 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. One strategy the state plans to investigate is the feasibility of tiered funding to promote greater participation in QRIS.

EEC is exploring the option of a hybrid QRIS structure, in light of recent research suggesting that program quality is better captured through a hybrid structure, as opposed to a block or point structure. This will remove existing barriers for programs serving high needs children to demonstrate quality and advance to the upper levels of QRIS.

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.

Targets 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	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	4,308	70.00%	6,193	100.00%	6,193	100.00%	6,193	100.00%	6,193	100.00%
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	9,614	58.00%	10,751	65.00%	12,405	75.00%	14,059	85.00%	6,193	100.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	2,045	13.00%	3,721	25.00%	7,441	50.00%	11,162	75.00%	14,882	100.00%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	662	4.00%	2,963	25.00%	5,926	50.00%	8,889	75.00%	11,852	100.00%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	13,153	89.00%	14,846	100.00%	14,846	100.00%	14,846	100.00%	14,846	100.00%
Other 1	2,911	48.00%	3,301	55.00%	1,892	65.00%	4,501	75.00%	6,002	100.00%
Describe:	Inclusive Early Learning Environments/Inclusive Preschool Learning Environments (IPLE)									

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

Actuals Number and percentage of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS									
	Baseline			Year 1			Year 2		
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	70.00%	5,844	5,844	100.00%	3,456	3,456	96.00%
Specify:	UPK								
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	16,540	9,614	58.00%	16,469	10,770	65.00%	16,086	16,086	100.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	-	-	0.00%	-	-	0.00%	-	-	0.00%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	14,882	2,045	13.00%	14,915	3,594	24.00%	14,915	1,271	36.00%
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	11,852	662	4.00%	11,167	1,164	10.00%	11,167	914	37.00%
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	14,846	13,153	89.00%	61,655	7,966	15.00%	61,655	37,113	67.00%
Other 1	6,936	2,911	48.00%	6,002	1,915	27.00%	6,936	2,090	65.00%
Describe:	Inclusive Early Learning Environments/Inclusive Preschool Learning Environments (IPLE)								

[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	Year 3			Year 4		
	# 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	4,248	3,071	72.00%			
Specify:	UPK					
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	14,199	8,246	58.00%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	-	-	0.00%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	15,133	522	3.00%			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	17,019	324	1.00%			
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	67,637	20,261	30.00%			
Other 1	3,657	732	20.00%			
Describe:	Inclusive Early Learning Environments/Inclusive Preschool Learning Environments (IPLE)					

[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.

The Massachusetts QRIS top tier levels are levels 2, 3, and 4.

UPK: This data is from the FY14 UPK Program Report. There are 4,248 high needs children served by UPK programs in all levels of QRIS. Of this total, 3,701 are in programs are in the top tiers of QRIS (level of 2, 3 and 4). The percentage calculation was based on the following: 3,701 (total number high needs children in top tiers of QRIS) divided by 4,248 (total number high needs children in all QRIS levels 1, 2, 3 and 4) equals 72%.

Inclusive Early Learning Environments/Inclusive Preschool Learning Environments/IPLE -391: During Calendar Year 2014 there were 136 IPLE funded programs and 100% of these programs participated in QRIS as center-based and school-based programs. There were 3,657 high needs children served in these programs, however only 732 children participated in programs in the top tiers of QRIS (levels 2, 3, or 4). The percentage calculation was based on the following: 732 (total number high needs children in top tiers of QRIS) divided by 3,657 (total number high needs children in all QRIS levels 1, 2, 3 and 4) equals 20%.

Head Start: This data is from the FY 2014-2015 Massachusetts Head Start Participation Survey. This includes Head Start Center Based programs and Family Center Based programs that are required to be in QRIS (it does not include Home-Based programs as they are not required to participate in QRIS). There were 14,199 high needs children served in Head Start programs participating in QRIS at all levels. Of this total, only 8,246 high

needs children were in programs at the top tiers of QRIS (levels 2, 3 and 4). The percentage calculation was based on the following: 8,246 (total number high needs children in top tiers of QRIS) divided by 14,199 (total number high needs children in all QRIS levels 1, 2, 3 and 4) equals 58%.

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

IDEA, Part B: This data is from the Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Education. The total number of schools receiving IDEA part B funding in school year 2014-2015 is 515. Of this total, there are103 programs participating in QRIS with 15,133 high needs children. There are 522 high needs children in programs at the top tiers of QRIS (levels of 2, 3 and 4). The percentage calculation was based on the following: 522 (total number high needs children in top tiers of QRIS) divided by 15,133 (total number high needs children in all QRIS levels 1, 2, 3 and 4) equals 3.4%.

Title I: This data is from the Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Education. The total number of Title I schools receiving school wide funding (that have prekindergarten classrooms) in school year 2014-2015 is 194. Of this total, there are 20 programs in QRIS with 17,019 high needs children and 324 children are in programs with a QRIS level of 2, 3 and 4. The percentage calculation was based on the following: 324 (total number high needs children in top tiers of QRIS) divided by 17,019 (total number high needs children in all QRIS levels 1, 2, 3 and 4) equals 1.9%.

CCDF: The data source is the Early Childhood Information System (ECIS). In year 3, there were 67,637 high needs children in CCDF funded programs participating in QRIS. Of this total, 20,261 children are in QRIS programs at levels 2, 3 and 4. The percentage calculation was based on the following: 20,261 (total number high needs children in top tiers of QRIS) divided by 67,637 (total number high needs children in all QRIS levels 1, 2, 3 and 4) equals 30%.

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.

In the first two years of the RTT-ELC grant, EEC lacked the capacity to verify all program documentation and complete classroom assessments for the large number of QRIS participants. As a result, EEC reported participation based on programs' *self-assessed* ratings. As Massachusetts' QRIS has matured and the EEC infrastructure has strengthened, EEC has made significant progress verifying and assessing the program quality of QRIS participants and we are now able to report the number of programs in each tier based on *granted* ratings.

Massachusetts 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 during year 4.

- EEC now employs a full Program Quality Unit to provide QRIS technical assistance and other support to early education programs in each of the five regions across the Commonwealth.

- EEC's revised the Environment Rating Scales (ERS) policy to require a site visit at Level 3, which has led to 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 ERS policy and QRIS level 1 requirements for public school programs. The engagement of these working groups improved stakeholder buy-in with QRIS and increased understanding of QRIS and its value to children and families resulting in greater participation.

- EEC will make improvements to the QRIS online system to improve functionality and make it more user-friendly. EEC is contracting with a vendor to do a full assessment of QRIS vision and business needs to inform IT improvements.

- As part of the QRIS Program Improvement Grant, EEC developed the QRIS Online Community to best practice information among programs. In addition, coaches and mentors have been recruited and trained to assist grantees.

- EEC has begun to use an email subscription service to offer additional support to programs and providers and also to communicate QRIS developments.

- The state plans to revise its Universal Pre-Kindergarten (UPK) grant strategy in the next competitive grant cycle starting in 2015 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. One strategy the state plans to investigate is the feasibility of tiered funding to promote greater participation in QRIS.

- EEC is exploring the option of a hybrid QRIS structure, in light of recent research suggesting that program quality is better captured through a hybrid structure, as opposed to a block or point structure. This will remove existing barriers for programs serving high needs children to demonstrate quality and advance to the upper levels of 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.

QRIS Validation Study

EEC hired the University of Massachusetts Donahue Institute (UMDI) to conduct a study of its 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.

In January 2014, UMDI and Wellesley College Center for Women revised the research study plan. The study received approval by EEC and the New England Institutional Review Board (NEIRB) in June 2014. Programs were randomly selected for the participation in the QRIS Validation Study from a list of all programs currently participating in the QRIS. 128 eligible programs agreed to participate in the study.

The analyses including in this revised design include:

Approach 1: Examine the Validity of Key Underlying Concepts

Do experts in the field within Massachusetts support the key components of quality within QRIS? What are the perceptions of QRIS and QRIS engagement by programs and providers?

To answer these questions, UMDI held focus groups and implemented a state-wide provider survey. The survey report, finalized in January 2014, summarized the results, which demonstrated that programs acknowledge the inherent value in a quality improvement system and are grateful for the push forward. A majority of early educators from programs participating in QRIS believe the system helps programs improve, that it is an important priority for Massachusetts, and that it will help elevate the public perception of early education and care in the state. UMDI provided several recommendations based on survey results including: develop a robust infrastructure to help programs and providers improve and advance; simplify and align QRIS with other quality measures and requirements; remove or reduce common barriers to maximize success; and enhance communication and messaging to build on initial success of QRIS.

Approach 2: Examine the Measurement Strategies Used to Assess Quality

What are the characteristics of programs by level? Are these characteristics consistent with QRIS level requirements?

Observational and survey data for QRIS levels 2-4 will be compiled for each participating program to create a program QRIS profile. These profiles will be used to determine if the program meets the criteria for its current level. Rates of accuracy and false positives will be used to determine the reliability of the QRIS in classifying programs into distinct levels and the validity of QRIS assessment activities in determining the level achieved by programs.

Do measures relate to one another as expected? Do different ways of calculating or combining scores yield more meaningful distinctions among programs?

UMDI will examine the distribution and variance of scores for a given indicator or set of indicators as well as analyze the correlation among indicators. The strength of correlations will help determine whether a given indicator is contributing unique information to measure quality. An exploratory factor analysis will be conducted to further explore how the variables are grouped together and are related to form factors. The factors will be analyzed to identify significant related variables and potentially reducing the QRIS standards that are redundant.

Approach 3: Assess the Outputs of the Rating Process

Do programs in different QRIS levels differ significantly in observed and structural quality? Do level distributions vary by key program characteristics?

Analysis of variance will be used to compare the overall quality scores on the ERS, the subscale scores, and the subscale scores on the Arnett-Caregiver Interaction Scale by QRIS level to determine if significant differences are found in observational quality by programs' QRIS level. The analysis will also determine the differences in key quality indicators related to the five quality domains of QRIS.

Approach 4: Examine How Ratings are Associated with Children's Development

Do children who attend higher-rated programs have greater gains than children who attend lower level programs? What QRIS standards are significantly associated with increased child outcomes?

Although research studies that examine the relationship between child outcomes and program quality indicators have found only modest effect sizes, UMDI will analyze correlations between QRIS levels and various child development measures to examine this relationship. To measure children's development, UMDI identified two types of methods that would be used: a) direct one-on-one assessments of children's skills and abilities, b) 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. Pre-assessments of randomly selected preschool children in 127 programs were completed in 2014 to measure children's developmental gains and examine the connections between QRIS and child development outcomes. Post-assessments will take place in the spring of 2015. The second component of measuring child development outcomes involves the rating scales to be completed by classroom teachers. For each preschool-aged child selected for assessment, teachers will complete two forms at both pre- and post-assessment time periods.

Does QRIS level significantly predict children's outcomes beyond key demographics of children?

This analysis will explore relationships between key QRIS standards and child outcomes. This analysis will also look at whether specific aspects of the QRIS rating level are particularly salient in predicting children's outcomes.

The Program Quality Unit has been working to ensure that there are sufficient number of programs that have a granted QRIS Level 3 status so that the study will be complete by the end of the RTT-ELC grant period. Efforts to support program quality improvement, as mentioned above, have also increased the number of programs that are able to reach higher QRIS levels. EEC is also working with UMDI to share their work and successes nationally. In April 2014, the UMDI research team presented at the 2014 QRIS National Meeting: Building High Quality Systems through QRIS, which was held July 23 through 25 in Denver, CO. Two members of the UMDI research team attended the national meeting and presented with EEC. Their presentation was entitled "Using Field Data to Strengthen QRIS Systems: Example from Massachusetts."

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.

Focused Investment Areas

☑ (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 it's 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.

During 2014, Massachusetts worked to enhance both the comprehensiveness of its early learning and development standards and to support the field's understanding and commitment to its standards. Below are descriptions of Massachusetts work to enhance and increase the alignment of its preschool and kindergarten learning standards as well as efforts to increase supports to the field in using the Early English Language Standards.

Enhancing Preschool and Kindergarten Learning Standards.

In 2012, EEC partnered with Sharon Lynn Kagan, Ed.D., Catherine Scott-Little, Ph.D., Jeanne L. Reid, M.P.P. 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 Massachusetts early learning standards. The study concluded in October 2013 and four analytic reports were completed. The results presented in the four reports affirm that Massachusetts has a solid set of early learning standards for infants, toddlers, and preschool aged children, but could strengthen and improve its alignment by being attentive to the domains of Social-Emotional Development and Approaches to Play and Learning. It was recommended that the preschool and kindergarten standards be revised to reflect the integrated and multi-domain nature of early learning.

In August 2014, EEC contracted with the University of Massachusetts Boston (UMB) to develop learning standards in the domains of Social-Emotional Development and Approaches to Play and Learning for preschool and kindergarten. The standards will align and connect to the *Massachusetts Early Learning Guidelines for Infants and Toddlers, Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, the Head Start Child Development and Early Learning Framework (HSCDELF), Pre-K and Kindergarten Science, Technology and Engineering Standards (STE) and the World Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) English Language Development Standards (K-12)* and the *Early English Development Standards*.

Additionally, UMB will develop accompanying guidelines that demonstrate the inter-connection and integration between the new Social-Emotional Development and Approaches to Play and Learning standards with existing

state standards (such as the *Massachusetts Early Learning Guidelines for Infants and Toddlers, the Massachusetts Guidelines for Preschool Learning Experiences, the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks and the HSCDELF*). The integration will include English Language Arts standards, Mathematic standards, Pre-K and K Science and Technology/Engineering Standards. It will also connect to topics such as family engagement, children with disabilities and those who are dual language learners, curriculum and instructional practices, and assessment practices. Furthermore, the guidelines will indicate how the new standards connect with other EEC and ESE initiatives such as family engagement, bullying intervention and prevention, safe school climate, and Early English Language Development Guidelines (age 2.5-5.5). The guidelines will also address accommodations for diverse learners such as students with disabilities and dual language learners.

In September and October 2014, UMB conducted an extensive literature review, convened two regional focus groups and issued an online survey to gather feedback from early educators and administrators as well as public school teachers and administrators. Seventy-five people attended the focus groups and 27 people completed the online survey. In November 2014, UMB wrote the first draft of the preschool and kindergarten standards. The first draft of the standards were reviewed by the Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL), Dr. Sharon Lynn Kagan (Columbia University) and Dr. Stephanie Jones (Harvard University). On December 15, 2014 there was an additional focus group for the field to comment on the draft standards. In January 2015, EEC will conduct public hearing meetings to get feedback on the final draft of the standards before they are presented to the EEC Board for approval and adoption.

Once the new standards have been approved and adopted by EEC's Board (anticipated timeline is June 2015), the standards and accompanying guidelines will be translated into Spanish, Portuguese, Haitian Creole, and Simplified Chinese. The professional development plan for the new standards will include an introduction of the new standards to the field through regional information sessions and a train the trainer model. The train the trainer course, which will be online and face-to-face will be developed and delivered to approximately 100 trainers in the state's mixed-delivery system. Professional development will commence in fall 2015.

Early English Language Development Standards

In 2012, EEC engaged with the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment Institute (WIDA) from the University of Wisconsin-Madison to participate in their efforts to develop Early English Language Development Standards (E-ELDS). The Standards Framework defines language development and model performance indicators drawn from research and theory, including theories of second language acquisition in very young children, and identifies and defines levels of language development in three contiguous age groups: 2.5 -3.5 years old, 3.5 -4.5 years old, and 4.5 -5.5 years old. The E-ELDS help practitioners to identify a child's language abilities in English and their home language, set reasonable expectations given the child's abilities, and learn how to scaffold language support in English and the home language so that the child succeeds in school.

In 2014, there were numerous activities to promote the E-ELDS among educators and families. The state hosted a conference in February entitled, **Supporting Young Dual Language Learners' School Readiness and Beyond, where** an overview of WIDA's E-ELDS: Massachusetts Guidelines to support Dual Language Learners (DLLs) was presented. In March and April, EEC hosted three webinars on each component of the E-ELDS: *Language in Play: Introduction to the Early English Language Development (E-ELD) Standards***; Understanding Language Growth: The E-ELD Performance Definitions;** and **Playing with Language: Understanding and Using the Model Performance Indicator (MPI) Strands.**

The state provided regional train the trainer workshops to build a cadre of master-level trainers in E-ELDS and to ensure the sustainability of providing continuous professional development on these standards. The trainers

include individuals from diverse early education and care settings, higher education, Head Start programs, home visiting programs, public schools, family advocates, and preschool and kindergarten classrooms. From June to November, regional focus groups were held to inform parents and families of the newly adopted E-ELDS and promote the important role that home language plays in English acquisition and school readiness. Massachusetts has received national recognition for its work on supporting young dual language learners. The state was invited to present at four national conferences on E-ELDS.

In 2015, EEC will focus on three goals to strengthen the workforce so that early education and care programs can better serve Dual Language Learners and their families. To strengthen the workforce, the state plans to: 1) implement training for administrators, practitioners, and families with a focus on developing knowledge and instructional skills related to language development for DLLs utilizing a model of blended learning that will incorporate specific areas identified by a needs assessment; 2) develop program leadership coach training on effective program development, the implementation of content knowledge into everyday practices, and continual support for language development, and 3) develop and disseminate resources to be used by practitioners to engage families in language development and school readiness.

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) measures child growth and development from birth through third grade. Alignment among other aspects of Massachusetts' birth through third grade system is needed to support its efforts to build and sustain a comprehensive assessment system. In 2014, Massachusetts continued its work to increase alignment through several initiatives including local Birth to Grade Three grants to communities, as well as participation in the NGA Policy Academy on State Strategies to Improve Early Learning Outcomes.

Birth to Grade Three Alignment Grants

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

In 2012, EEC awarded the Birth to Grade Three Community Implementation/Planning grant to five communities: Lowell, Boston, Springfield, Somerville, and Pittsfield. In spring 2014, EEC awarded additional funding to these five communities, as well as an additional seven communities to support their alignment building through the conclusion of the RTT-ELC grant period. The seven new communities included: Cape Cod, Holyoke, Lawrence, New Bedford, North Adams/Northern Berkshires, and Worcester. The Birth to Grade Three Alignment Grants focus on strengthening the existing birth to third grade infrastructure within targeted high need communities

As part of the application process, all applicants used the "Framework for Planning, Implementing, and Evaluating PreK-3rd Grade Approaches" created by Kristie Kauerz and Julia Hoffman to evaluate alignment in their community in the areas of: Cross-Sector Work, Administrator Effectiveness, Teacher Effectiveness, Instructional Tools, Learning Environment, Data-Driven Improvement, Family Engagement, and Continuity and Pathways. While each grantee designed goals and projects to support the needs of their specific community, many of the communities chose to focus on common themes, including family engagement, improving alignment and transitions between/among early learning environments and public schools, improving 3rd grade

literacy scores, professional development for educators and administrators, and school readiness. At the core of these communities' work is developing strong partnerships and increasing collaboration among partners serving young children and their families.

For the communities who received initial funding, EEC partnered with a private non-profit organization to document and analyze 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. This non-profit has documented the work done in the communities who received the initial funding, and created a website called the Learning Hub. This website shares information about the alignment initiatives being conducted locally and nationally, shares promising practices, and highlights relevant research. This organization has also provided guiding support to new grantees as they began to implement their projects.

Below are highlights of the alignment work happening across these twelve total communities:

Shared Professional Development

- Bringing instructional materials, professional development and coaching to community-based classrooms, while replicating the same quality drivers that have produced positive results in public pre-k classrooms.

- Working collaboratively to identify and replicate best practices in family engagement, particularly around sharing child assessment information.

Building Local Leadership

- Strengthening existing collaborative networks while developing new networks including a local "Elementary Principals and Early Childhood Administrators Committee".

- Convening a strong cross-sector Leadership Alignment Partnership, which developed a solid plan for the alignment work.

- Increasing administrative and leadership quality, teacher effectiveness through a summer leadership institute, ongoing collaborative professional development, and professional learning communities.

Using Common Data-Driven Indicators

- Supporting families and educators to support literacy gains through a local Early Literacy Initiative. This includes development and promotion of "On Track for Literacy" indicators for children from birth through third grade.

- Evaluating the quality of learning environments, educator/child interactions, and teaching strategies by collecting data at the child and program level and collecting feedback from the workforce. Ensure that educators and administrators have the skills to interpret data and use it to inform quality improvements.

- Using formative assessment and sharing information about students in preschool and kindergarten classrooms.

- Developing comprehensive kindergarten readiness indicators and piloting formative assessment in preschool and kindergarten classrooms in public schools, out-of-school time and community based programs.

- Building transition strategies between pre-k and kindergarten through data sharing and neighborhood transition activities, including educator cross-classroom visitation between feeder programs and neighborhood public schools. Developing a community-wide definition of school readiness and accompanying readiness characteristics.

Promoting Family Engagement

- Engaging families in promoting language and literacy development, particularly focusing on building the language and literacy skills of preschool-aged children who are not currently enrolled in the mixed-delivery system, and strengthening the language and literacy development of dual language learner by providing high-quality literacy activities for preschool-aged children and families.

- Strengthening the connection between families and early learning environments by hosting events that draw families in and smoothing transitions among learning environments through collaboration with a local Family Resource Center.

- Developing of a single point of entry (www.somvervillehub.org) giving families access to information about early learning programs, playgroups, early intervention, and other resources in their community through a comprehensive website.

Aligning Standards, Curriculum and Assessments:

- Ensuring that learning standards are aligned across the developmental continuum and that there are professional communities of practice that support effective instruction and understanding of linkages among curriculum, assessment, and learning standards.

- Using formative assessment in public and community based settings and providing ongoing support for educators to help them use the observation and the information it provides to support student growth. For example, New Bedford is using Teaching Strategies GOLD® as their formative assessment tool.

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, the NGA selected Massachusetts and five other states to participate in this policy academy and develop strategies that would reflect the unique developmental trajectories of children from birth through 3rd grade. The state team developed strategies that would result in the creation of a robust birth through 3rd grade standards and assessment system for Massachusetts. This team created three goals: 1) identify the foundational experiences and essential competencies that will lead to college and career success; 2) enhance the state's early learning standards; and 3) explore developmentally appropriate assessment strategies for birth through kindergarten as well as the early elementary grades. The policy academy ended in October 2014 and the following outcomes were accomplished:

- Creation of the document entitled *Building the Foundation for Success for Children from Birth through Grade.* EEC has created the *Building the Foundation* document identifies essential competencies across five developmental domains, as well as the foundational experiences that will lead to the development of these competencies. This document is directly aligned with the 2013 Definition of College and Career Readiness that was approved by the ESE Board and the Board of DHE. For the first time in the Commonwealth's history, state education agencies have identified the competencies that all children from birth through grade 3 should demonstrate in order to be on the path to college and career success.

Currently, it is understood that Massachusetts is the only state in the nation that has developed this type of document.

- Successful statewide conference - Birth through Grade 3 Policy Forum: Developing Strategic Pathways to College and Career Success. Approximately 250 attendees (including early educators, K-12 educators, representatives from institutions of higher education, municipal officials, and business and community partners) participated in the discussions over the course of the day, and the feedback about the event was also overwhelmingly positive.

- Creation of new website - Building the Foundation for College and Career Success from Birth through Grade 3 (www.mass.gov/edu/birththroughgrade3). The website has been designed to achieve two goals: 1) it will serve as a resource for key stakeholders regarding the development and implementation of exciting strategies in Massachusetts; 2) it will serve as an important tool for sharing information about this work and highlighting upcoming activities and events.

- Creation of the Framework for a Comprehensive Birth through Grade 3 Policy Agenda. This agenda currently includes five components: enhancing MA's early learning standards; creating a robust assessment system; enhancing educator effectiveness; increasing family and community engagement; and providing comprehensive support services to children and families.

In addition to increasing systemic alignment between the systems of early education and care and the early elementary system, Massachusetts also engaged in targeted effort further the development of comprehensive assessment system in 2014. Below are brief descriptions outlining EEC's recent accomplishments to promote developmental screening and comprehensive formative assessment.

Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) Screenings and Trainings

Since January 2014, approximately 1,380 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 89 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 the five developmental domains. For example, if the child's ASQ scores are below the cutoff, CFCE staff provide the family with information and referrals to other supports, such as developmental assessment and evaluation, Early Intervention, public preschool special education. Additionally, the ASQ kit includes activities that parents and families can do to support their child's progress in any of the developmental domains.

Using combined funds from a Help Me Grow grant and those from RTT-ELC, Massachusetts developed a webinar for pediatricians on the importance of developmental screening. Working with Elaine Gabovitch, a CDC Act Early Ambassador to Massachusetts, and faculty member at the University of Massachusetts Medical School and the Eunice Kennedy Shriver Center, content for the webinar was developed with a focus on the importance of developmental screening, how the ASQ is used by EEC's CFCE grantees in community settings, and how CFCEs can be partners and resources for pediatricians. This webinar is available for Continuing Medical Education credit for pediatricians for a small fee and for non-medical professionals for free.

Massachusetts Kindergarten Entry Assessment (MKEA)

During 2014, Massachusetts made several advancements in its MKEA initiative, including a considerable expansion of the initiative as well as enhancing the professional development and support provided to school districts across the state. Below are a few highlights of the work done to further MKEA in the past year. Additional information can be found in the *Understanding Children's Learning and Development at Kindergarten Entry* section of this report.

- As of December 2014, there are 173 school districts participating in MKEA. This is more than double the number of districts that participated in cohorts 1 and 2 combined.

- More than 36,000 kindergarten children were assessed in the fall of 2014.

- In April 2014, over 400 teachers and administrators participated in a statewide MKEA conference on collecting high quality observational data designed to support districts in gaining skills and comfort with formative assessment. In October 2014 more than 300 teachers and administrators participated in a statewide MKEA conference on using formative assessment data at the student classroom and district level.

- Between April and October of 2014, nearly 2,000 kindergarten educators and administrators participated in a two day formative assessment training designed to increase competency in using the formative assessment tool. To support alignment among early learning classrooms, many districts chose to have their preschool teachers attend the training with the kindergarten teachers.

- 240 administrators have attended webinars to learn more about the administrative side of successfully implementing MKEA and using formative assessment data. The state plans to continue these webinars in 2015 to support administrators.

- On-site technical assistance is available to all districts throughout the 2014-15 academic year at no charge to the district. The technical assistance is district directed and designed to respond to the specific needs of each individual group of educators and administrators.

- EEC allocated approximately $1.2 million to districts to support educators as they learn to implement formative assessment. This funding provides substitutes or stipends to kindergarten teachers, allowing them time to attend professional development, learning communities, district level training, work with their colleagues, and become familiar and proficient with TS Gold.

- Six Readiness Centers across the state continued to provide regional support to districts ranging from on-site technical assistance to regional administrator meetings.

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.

Implementing Family Engagement and Support Program Standards

Massachusetts continues to support a comprehensive system of family engagement and support through its local CFCE grantees. Supported through state funds, each CFCE organization covers a region of the state, ensuring that their services reach every town and community.   The work of CFCE is grounded in the Strengthening Families Protective Factor Framework and includes:

- universal and targeted outreach strategies;

- linkages to comprehensive services;

- family education (e.g. child development education and screening, evidence-based early literacy, and family literacy opportunities) and;

- transition support with specific focus on kindergarten.

Since launching our QRIS program standards in 2011, Massachusetts has been fully committed to integrating culturally and linguistically appropriate family engagement practices in all of its program quality standards, building off of the strength of its network of CFCE grantees. This has been accomplished by including the Strengthening Families Self Assessment Tool as a requirement for programs to reach QRIS level 2. In 2014, Massachusetts took steps to strengthen and support programs in implementing the Strengthening Families Framework by providing comprehensive professional development to our Program Quality Specialists, leveraging EEC's partnership with the Massachusetts Children's Trust.

The integration of the E-ELDS into the QRIS program standards in 2014 furthered the state's commitment to ensuring that its program standards include components of family engagement that are culturally and linguistically appropriate. As mentioned above in the *Early Learning and Development Standards* section, RTT-ELC funds have supported a comprehensive approach to providing professional development to the field on strategies for embedding these standards into practice including webinars, conferences, and a training of trainers across the state.

Supporting Providers' Ability to Implement Family Engagement and Support Standards

Using RTT-ELC funds, Massachusetts has expanded and enhanced the work of the CFCE grantees to use evidence based practices to support families. RTT-ELC funds have also supported cross-sector professional development provided in collaboration with its interagency partners. These efforts aim to enhance the capacity of families to support their children's education and development as well as providing professional development to educators and other service providers to understand the needs of young children and their families. Below are the accomplishments made by Massachusetts over the past year.

Development of Media-Based Literacy Support for Families and Educators

EEC, in partnership with the WGBH Educational Foundation, created *Resources for Early Learning*, a comprehensive digital library featuring hundreds of free media-based tools for teaching and learning. With a strong focus on English Language Arts (ELA) and Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM), Resources for Early Learning features:

- *Educator Activities (for educators of children ages birth to 33 months):* Quick, easy, and fun activities provide exciting, focused, everyday learning experiences. Educators can use these activities to help children's developmental, physical, and social-emotional learning.

- *Massachusetts Early Learning Curriculum (for educators of children ages 3 to 5 years):* The nine-unit comprehensive curriculum provides a media-based approach to help children develop their academic and social-emotional skills. The curriculum was created by a team of experts and is based, in large part, on two award-winning educational series: *PEEP and the Big Wide World* (which focuses on STEM learning) and *Between the Lions* (which focuses on ELA learning). Family childcare, center-based, and school-based educators will find this innovative, standards-aligned curriculum useful in all settings.

- *Professional Development (for educators of children ages birth to 5 years)*: 17 video-based trainings explore various essential best practices for early childhood education and offer instruction for both individuals and facilitated group use.

- *Parent Activities:* Quick, easy, and fun activities for families provide exciting, everyday learning experiences. Activities are organized in two age groups: birth to 33 months and 3 to 5 years.

- *Parenting Education Videos:* Ten short videos, designed for parents of children from birth to 5 years, provide advice, tips, and suggestions on how to enhance a child's learning. These videos are appropriate for both individual use and for facilitated groups. Videos are organized in two age groups: birth to 33 months and 3 to 5 years.

- *Text Message Campaign*: Parents and grandparents are invited to visit Resourcesforearlylearning.org to sign up to receive weekly messages (in English or Spanish) featuring low- and no-cost family activities, parenting tips, and links to learning games and other resources.

- *Playlists for Children:* The site features a collection of playlists of videos and other media that correspond to curriculum units and themes. Included on each playlist are full-length videos from Between the Lions and PEEP, live action segments that show children exploring language and the world around them, and interactive games.

In 2014, WGBH completed the development of content housed on the *Resources for Early Learning* site, implemented a series of trainings on how to use the media based resources, and launched a marketing campaign to promote the use of the tools and materials.

Trainings included two half-day trainings for Massachusetts' EPS grantee network. As one was hosted at WGBH in Boston and another at WGBY in Springfield, EEC was therefore able to reach EPS grantees in the eastern and western portions of the state. At each training, WGBH presented *Resources for Early Learning* and introduced the text message campaign (launched in March 2014), provided background on the developmentally appropriate use of media with young children, and distributed hundreds of books and manipulatives. Books and manipulatives were provided by WGBH through other private foundation grants. Following these trainings, WGBH provided support via phone and e-mail to EPS grantees, answering questions about the site and its content.

WBGH also conducted three regional workshops for CFCE grantees in collaboration with the Boston Children's Museum. Each workshop featured a presentation of *Resources for Early Learning,* a discussion of the developmentally appropriate use of media with young children, and the distribution of books and other educational resources. In addition to the three regional workshops, the Boston Children's Museum presented *Resources for Early Learning* at two additional workshops. WGBH provided support via phone and e-mail to CFCE grantees, answering questions about the site and its content.

WGBH also presented *Resources for Early Learning* and the text message campaign at the State STEM Summit and the Massachusetts Association for the Education of Young Children conference, reaching approximately 100 early childhood educators and trainers.

Response to *Resources for Early Learning* has been universally positive. EPS and CFCE grantees were impressed with the quality of the content and ease of use of the site. They also expressed surprise that all of these resources were available to them free of charge. In terms of the professional development, EPS grantees, in particular, stated their intention to use the video-centered modules with early childhood educators in their regions.

In response to the lower than expected use of the *Resources for Early Learning* site, WGBH developed a marketing and promotional plan to increase engagement with these resources. The plan includes leveraging social media platforms, PBS Learning Media, and direct e-mail communication to engage a broader audience of educators and parents in *Resources for Early Learning* and the text message campaign. In addition, the proposal includes a plan to produce communication kits, which will be distributed to hundreds of outlets across the state, including health offices and libraries. WGBH is also working to identify key opinion leaders within the state's early childhood community to officially endorse these resources via various websites and in-state publications.

Enhancing Evidence Based Family Literacy Practices

As one of the core goals of the CFCE program, grantees are required to incorporate the use of an evidence-based, EEC approved, early literacy model into their practice. Use of evidence-based early literacy curriculum enhances the capacity of CFCE grantees to help parents promote early literacy skills development in their children. By focusing on a small number of effective literacy models, EEC has created more consistency in the strategies that CFCE grantees use to help families cultivate their children`s literacy skills before they enter elementary school.

RTT-ELC funds were used to enhance existing literacy programming with evidence-based early literacy models by CFCE grantees to help parents promote early literacy skill development in their children. EEC is funding

programs that can integrate the use of evidence-based early literacy models into their existing practice and provide ongoing/year round opportunities for parents and children to learn and practice early literacy skills together. CFCE grantees are implementing one or more 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)
- Dialogic and Interactive reading models- using PEER and CROWD sequences

In addition to online reporting that includes information about programming, families served, and any additional narrative information, site visits were conducted to a number of grantees in 2014. In one of these site visits, grandparents and parents participated in an evidence-based literacy playgroup. A parent shared her experience of the ongoing playgroup with EEC staff and noted how significant the playgroup has been for her and her child. Programming is being offered in a variety of settings: homeless shelters, houses of corrections, libraries and other community settings.

Financial Literacy Education through Community Based Providers

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, in efforts to provide stable and healthy learning environments for young children. Since the launch of this project in 2012, over 394 community agencies participated in the financial education initiative and have provided financial literacy education to over 1,200 families. Below are the accomplishments made during 2014.

- In 2014, *The Promising Practices in Financial Education for Parents of Young Children Symposium* was held on Friday, October 24. Over 196 participants across multiple national, state, and local agencies that work with parents of young children in supporting financial education attended this successful event. The advisory members included representatives from the Administration of Children and Families, the Office of Head Start, Cambridge Economic Opportunity Council (CEOC), Community Teamwork, Inc., the Department of Housing and Community Development, the Department of Early Education and Care, the Department of Elementary and Secondary, the Head Start Association, the EEC/Head Start State Collaboration Office, the MA State Treasury, and MASSCAP.

- Also in October 2014, Massachusetts was invited by the Office of Head Start and the Office of Community Services to present at a national convening of stakeholders at the "Building the Financial Security of Families with Young Children" to present on the MA Statewide Financial Education Literacy initiative.

Imbedding Evidence Based Family Support Practices: 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. The goal for this project in 2014 was to increase training opportunities to the partners of the CFCE grantees and EEC staff, deepen knowledge and reflective practices for participants of the year one training and build mentors in the field with knowledge and understanding of how to implement the Brazelton Touchpoints practices.

In January 2014, an additional Touchpoints training program for 28 additional participants (new CFCE staff, EPS grantees, public school staff, home visitors and QRIS staff) included three full days followed by six sessions of facilitated reflective practice by teleconference. Participants were granted CEUs.

In spring 2014, there were 16 EEC Licensors that attended two additional intensive workshops for further professional development adapted specifically to their roles. Two parent group facilitation training programs (an 8 hour intensive interactive workshop and 4 web based sessions) were held to strengthen program's parent participation and to meet the needs of the participants.

Interagency Partnerships

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 2014 with the Interagency Partnerships.

Department of Children and Families (DCF)

The partnership between DCF and EEC 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 EEC's work with children and families involved in the child welfare system. Through this partnership, DCF is helping 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 description of the work done through this partnership with DCF in 2014.

- DCF Education Policy was updated to reflect the importance of education from cradle to career. Prior to these revisions, educational policies for children in DCF care focused on ensuring children participated in the k-12 system, but did not include any language or direction on the developmental needs of young children. This policy was implemented statewide in September 2014.

- In an effort to systematically imbed early childhood in the child welfare system, DCF continues to provide a mandatory, full day training for all new case workers that includes information on early childhood development, the effects of trauma on early development, and the resources that are available for families with young children. DCF also continues to maintain an internal website that provides works with comprehensive resources related to early childhood education and care.

- DCF created and distributed 2,000 Welcome Baby Bags (which contained baby products and information) across 29 Area Offices for DCF families with newborns between January and June 2014. The Welcome Baby Bag was created for social workers to bring along on a regular visit to a family with an open case that has recently had a new baby (birth to 6 months of age), including kinship/child specific placements.

- To help streamline the referral of DCF children to supportive child care slots, DCF developed a Supportive Child Care (SCC) New Data Management tool and trained 29 DCF Area Offices on the tool.

- DCF also successfully developed a training on Supportive Child Care for the Child Care Coordinators starting September, 2014. This training focuses on the importance of early education and care, ECC's Supportive Child Care policy and the services of the Supportive Child Care contract.

<u>Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD)</u>

The partnership between EEC and the DHCD focuses on aligning and improving access to early education and care services for children experiencing homelessness. Project goals include: increasing collaboration between DHCD, EEC and community organizations that serve young children experiencing homelessness (ages birth to five); developing and implementing a system for screening all children, including a referral system for those children who need additional services; connecting families experiencing homelessness with local services; identifying service gaps for re-housed families and those experiencing homelessness and their children; data sharing; and providing professional development on child development to staff working with these families. Work done in 2014 through this partnership includes:

- Direct one-on-one contact with over 350 families to distribute resources related to healthy early childhood development including information on social emotional development of young children, nutrition, promoting literacy in infants and toddlers, brain building activities and tips, activities to do with babies, information on immunizations and the *Keep Me Safe While I Sleep* brochure - part of a state wide safe sleep campaign for parents of infant's birth to12months.

- Direct one-on-one contact with 51 families in our local Emergency Assistance office in Roxbury, providing referrals for school placement, childcare including Head Start, Summer Camps, Early Intervention, referrals to community organizations to assist families with food pantry's, and free eye and hearing screenings.

- Referred 45 families with children under three years of age to Early Intervention services. Referred approximately 75 families to specific local school for services, including screenings, evaluations, and literacy opportunities.

- Referred approximately over 400 children residing in shelters and or hotels for homeless child care slots.

- In collaboration with Head Start, DCF, WGBH and EEC developed and implemented a *"Let's Celebrate"* event for over 30 shelter families in the greater Lowell/Lawrence area. Children and families received transportation to and from the activity, children books, and parenting materials, face painting, lunch and met Curious George.

- In collaboration with The Nurturing Center, DHCD provided Fathers Groups to over 80 participants across the state in shelters to ensure the needs of children of single fathers are addressed.

- Disseminated information to over 60 shelters on trainings with content on trauma, substance abuse, mental illness, nutrition and impact of domestic violence on the young child. Over 50 shelter staff across the state took advantage of these trainings.

<u>Department of Mental Health (DMH)</u>

The partnership between DMH and EEC addresses the mental health needs of young children and their families and strengthens the comprehensive statewide system of mental health supports for children and families throughout the Commonwealth. Work done through this partnership during 2014 includes:

- Thirty trainings in Infant and Toddler Mental Health that were attended by 1,014 participants. Participant evaluations indicated that close to 100% achieved greater awareness and understanding of infant and toddler mental health. Participants also reported that when concerns about a child's mental

health issues arise, they will use new strategies through communication with families and coworkers, observation and documentation of children's behaviors, and engaging parents/families/caregivers.

- Significantly enhanced the capacity of pediatricians in 28 practices across the state to offer skill training resources to parents of children with disruptive behaviors. Three trainings in the evidenced based practice, *Triple P, Positive Parenting Program*, were completed by 60 clinicians who are now fully accredited to work with parents. DMH also implemented an evaluation plan identifying factors that promote or hinder efforts to implement Triple P as designed, and identifying how implementation plays out in various contexts, associating variations in practice, operations, and demographics. Data is continuing to be collected on encounters and services provided in 95% of pediatric practices statewide to the birth to six population in order to track the expanded capacities to serve the preschool population.

- In collaboration with partners, DMH Completed an *Early Childhood Mental Guide for Early Childhood Educators,* a 40-page resource handbook that will be available online in January 2015 through the EEC, the Child Behavioral Health Initiative (CBHI), and DMH websites. Hard copies of the Guide developed in English and Spanish will be distributed statewide.

- DMH has implemented the Top of the Pyramid Skills Training/CSEFEL (Center on the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning) Pyramid Model Training for early education professionals and early childhood mental health consultants; 49 staff attended these regional trainings. The evaluations demonstrated that all trainees showed new ways to understand classroom behaviors and use new strategies to: a) identify triggers of challenging behavior and to describe the use of prevention strategies to address these triggers; b) describe why it is important to be intentional about teaching social emotional skills and when to teach these skills; and c) identify strategies for how to teach friendship, problem-solving, impulse and anger control skills.

- DMH provided support and technical assistance to EEC's regional Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation (ECMHC) grantees. ECMHC grantees developed a working relationship with the Children's Behavioral Health Initiative (CBHI) - the mental health system for young children. This work resulted in two major developments: training of clinicians from each of the grantee agencies in the *Triple P, Positive Parenting Program* so that they can to provide evidenced based parenting skills practice to parents of children with disruptive behaviors; and training of supervisors in the principles and practices of early childhood mental that provide in-home treatment component of CBHI health to families.

- Completed professional development series in three EEC regions of the state for educators on challenging behaviors of young children in center and family based programs using an evidenced based curriculum, Top of the Pyramid Skills Training (TOPS), developed by CSEFEL, which uses the pyramid model for supporting social emotional competencies in infants and young children. Fifty education and consultation staff were trained in TOPS.

- Completion of logic model with identified measures to be used across all consultation sites to 1) evaluate the effectiveness and outcomes of the service in reducing expulsions and suspensions; 2) how education staff are helped in dealing with disruptive behaviors and implementing social/emotional strategies; and, 3) involving parents in services.

- Introduced social workers at DCF to ECMHC grantees in order to begin a more formal collaboration to identify DCF children most at risk in early education centers who could, with consultation services, better achieve stability and be prevented from being expelled or suspended.

Department of Public Health (DPH)

The partnership between DPH and EEC is focused on building a system of health and mental health supports for young children and their families across early education and care and other child and family serving systems. 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. 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. In addition to the work that DPH has done to strengthen health related supports to programs participating in QRIS, which is outlined above in the Promoting Participating in QRIS section, additional accomplishments to enhance programs' ability to provide comprehensive support to families are below.

- DPH offered trainings on *Family Substance Use, Parent Mental Health,* and *Exposure to Violence across* 3 regions of the state in 2014 reaching over 300 participants. There have been waitlists for every training offered in this series, indicating a need in the field for these topics. DPH is working with the EPS leads to bring more of these trainings to educators in the spring of 2015.

- DPH led the collaboration with DHCD and Horizons for Homeless Children to design and implement the *Pyramid Model Foundations training for staff working within homeless shelters.* DPH invited teams made up of a supervisor, direct care staff and an identified lead person interested in sustaining the use of the Pyramid model. DPH then linked the eight shelters with an early childhood mental health clinician with knowledge of the Pyramid Model and trauma. The mental health clinicians participated in the trainings with their teams, and provided nine hours of mentoring plus conducting pre and post observations. Mentors have received support through an orientation, monthly Communities of Practice calls and will participate in a face to face debrief at the end of the project. The total number of participants for this first training series is 38.

Office of Refugees and Immigrants (ORI)

EEC has partnered with the ORI to support early learning and school readiness for immigrant and refugee children and their families. Through this partnership, ORI engages immigrant and refugee communities to increase the awareness of early education benefits and services, strengthen licensed early education programs that serve these population, provide technical assistance in effective policies for dual language learners, and provide outreach and interpreter services. Accomplishments made in 2014 include:

- In collaboration with the Massachusetts Immigrant and Refugee Advocacy Coalition (MIRA) and the Multilingual Action Council (MAC) at Wheelock College and Tufts University, ORI sponsored four regional trainings on *"New Start: Supporting Multilingual Young Children and Immigrant and Refugee Families",* for the CFCE grantees, Child Care Resources and Referral Agencies, MASS 2-1-1, Family Child Care System Providers, Head Start and ORI's service providers. The trainings offered knowledge on immigration policy as it impacts children and families, cultural competency, child development, and educational principles in the context of multilingual homes and multicultural environments. Approximately 270 people participated in the regional trainings over the course of 2014.

- In order to meet the program goal of exploring ways to increase the safety and supply of quality licensed early education and care in refugee and immigrant communities, ORI and EEC were able to create a revised scope of activities which include a focus on the high population of refugee and immigrants in Central Massachusetts and the development of a new training component for immigrant women. The purpose of the revised scope is to empower refugee and immigrant women on the path to achieving economic self-sufficiency though targeted entrepreneurial supports

Promoting Family Engagement and Support State-wide

Brain Building In Progress Campaign

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

2014 accomplishments:

- Enhancements of the Brain Building in Progress website (www.brainbuildinginprogress.org) included: access to informational materials listed above, organized by stakeholder category (legislative, educator, family, etc.), a "Brain Building Zone Finder", a calendar of "Brain Building" events that is searchable by community, and Brain Building materials for parents and caregivers.

- Expansion of the Brain Building in Progress Facebook page.

- Media partnership with the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) to run the "Build your child's brain on the train" ten week ad campaign on the subway and buses, included donated placement space from the MBTA and an event with the Secretary of Education, Commissioner of EEC, and MBTA General Manager, as well as legislators and families, where brain building materials were provided to the public.

- #IAmABrainBuilder social media effort on Twitter and Facebook, built off of the success of the "Build your child's brain on the train" campaign, which engaged parents and early education providers in turning everyday moments with children into engaging interactions that support brain development, and help close the educational gap among children from low income families.

- Development of an "I Am A Brain Builder" parent workshop.

- Coverage of the Brain Building in Progress initiative on several major Boston area media outlets including WCVB-Channel 5 morning EyeOpener, and Fox25 "Zip Trip" to Jamaica Plain (Boston).

Museums and Libraries Partnership for Parent, Family and Community Engagement

In partnership with EEC, Boston Children's Museum (BCM) is engaged in a statewide strategy that is providing a shared framework and set of resources that is increasing 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 in supporting family and community engagement in four areas of child

development: early literacy, school readiness, including preparation for Kindergarten, STEM and public awareness of the importance of early education and care through the state's *Brain Building in Progress* communications initiative.

BCM has been working to build partnerships between museums, libraries, and CFCE grantees. In 2014, BCM designed and produced a Literacy StoryWalk training guide and provided training to the network of more than museums and libraries participating in the project. To date, 56 museums and 119 libraries have participated in at least one or more of the core trainings. StoryWalks were heartily embraced as a way to engage young families in physical activity, family engagement, and literacy. BCM, EEC, and a representative of the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners have been involved in ongoing planning and discussion about integration and sustainability of its activities across the network.

Working in partnership with Nikki Darling-Kuria, BCM introduced Brain Building to museums and libraries, using her book, *Brain-Based Early Learning Activities: Connecting Theory to Practice,* to create a practical theory to practice training for the project. The eight training sessions, held in Worcester, Pittsfield, Boston, Brockton, Salem, Mashpee, Holyoke, and Framingham, were focused on Brain Building and promoting literacy. Participants represented 24 museums and 58 libraries. 155 museum and library educators and CFCEs attended. 94% of participants rated this session either Extremely or Very valuable. 49% of them increased their knowledge of literacy and 75% of them increased their knowledge of brain development.

Six regional training sessions of the STEM Family Activities Kit training for the CFCE grantees were held in 2014. BCM trained 182 CFCE coordinators and playgroup or parent group facilitators. BCM distributed 182 STEM Family Activities Kits. 87% of the participants from across the six sessions rated the training as Extremely or Very Valuable. 68% of participants increased their knowledge of STEM. BCM developed a CFCE Family STEM Kit. CFCE grantees across the state were trained on the kit and received state funds to offer programming within their communities.

BCM VicePresident Jeri Robinson presented an overview of the Museums and Libraries Project for the Early Childhood Funders Conference in Washington, DC on April 9, 2014. The major funders of early childhood initiatives attend this conference across the country. In addition, she and other museum staff have presented on this project at BUILD and other national conferences, and were asked to present in Greece

.In 2014, BMC also developed a "Passport to Kindergarten" and trained museums and libraries on how to use the "Passport" to offer quarterly activities. For instance, Jan-March will be STEM, April-June will be Brain Building, July-September will be Countdown to Kindergarten, and Oct-December will be Literacy.

BCM continues to enhance their Race to the Top website, which provides all project materials available to be downloaded for use. The link to this website has been shared across EEC networks, including CFCE grantees, educators and providers, and home visiting programs. Additional funds were used to support translation of parent resources (which are also posted on the website). http://www.bostonchildrensmuseum.org/learning-resources/race-to-the-top

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.

Through the RTT-ELC, Massachusetts has made progress on several projects that aim to increase the competencies of its early education and care workforce. These projects listed below both inform the development workforce systems as well as directly increase workforce competencies. System building projects include research based projects that aim to develop a clear understanding of how well the state's workforce are able to gain competencies as defined by its Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, as well as develop models to increase access to higher education for English Language Learners and for a evidenced based model for peer coaching and advising.

In addition to the professional development projects that promote providers' competencies related to family engagement and support that were outlined in the *Engaging and Supporting Families* section above, RTT-ELC funds also supported the development of web-based professional development that directly links to the program standards of QRIS, as well as directly working to advance educators achieving advanced degrees in early education and care.

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.

Building and Enhancing Workforce Development Systems

Development of a Post Master's Certificate Program

EEC partnered with the University of Massachusetts, Boston 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 following describes progress made with the PMC program in 2014.

- The Leadership Forum commemorating the PMC Cohort 2 graduates took place on September 27, 2014 at the University of Massachusetts Boston campus. Valora Washington, President of the Council for Professional Recognition, was the keynote speaker for the event.

- Cohort 2 participants graduated in December 2014.

- Participants from Cohorts 1 and 2 continue to participate in EEC working groups.

- UMass Boston is working on a survey for Cohort 1 participants to identify the impact of the PMC program after one year.

- Cohort 3 participants began coursework in September 2014.

- UMass Boston has submitted an application to the Massachusetts DHE for a PhD in early childhood education and care. The new PhD program will accept all 12 credits from the post master's program, ensuring a pathway from the PMC program into the doctoral program. The doctoral program was approved in December 2014.

- The PMC program will be sustained beyond the RTT-ELC grant through the UMass system.

The following describes challenges with the PMC program.

- One challenge in sustaining the PMC program is find the best way to expand it to other campuses in Massachusetts, as well as finding more PhD or CAGs programs that will accept the 12 credits from the PMC program.

- Another challenge is that the program is very intensive for the students who work fulltime. It is hard for students to balance work and coursework. The RTT-ELC grant has enabled the program to provide both academic and non-academic supports to students so that they can successfully complete the program. Graduates report high levels of satisfaction with the program and its impact.

- It is a challenge to establish articulation and transfer agreements with other institutions of higher education. There are currently agreements with three MA institutes of higher learning. The main barrier to increasing partner agreements is that there are almost no doctoral or advanced graduate programs in early education and care in the state for which this coursework would be relevant. Given this reality, it speaks to the importance of developing more advanced graduate and doctoral study in the early education field to meet the increasing need for higher education faculty with doctoral degrees in early education and care.

Developing a Model for Effective Peer Assistance and Coaching

In July 2012, using RTT-ELC funding, EEC partnered with the Institute for Education and Professional Development (IEPD) and an advisory team of experts in coaching and mentoring to design a model for Peer Assistance and Coaching (PAC). The goal of PAC is to develop a coaching model in Massachusetts to help programs improve quality as evidenced by their ability to meet criteria on the QRIS. This initiative also aims to promote career advancement, professionalization, and accessible professional development opportunities in the field of early education.

An advisory panel was selected through a competitive process to advise EEC and IEPD on the development of the PAC model in Massachusetts. The Massachusetts PAC model focused on colleague coaches, which define and enhance the colleague-to-colleague relationship to support individual educator growth and change. This type of peer coaching combines the promise of coaching as an effective strategy to improve quality and builds on the foundation that existing early childhood teachers and directors are well-equipped to support one another's practices. The PAC model takes elements from the Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) coaching model used in many K-12 school districts, but focuses on coaching supports instead of coaching review.

2014 accomplishments include:

- 15 pairs of coach/mentees were matched to participate in the first cohort (2013-2014); 36 pairs of coach/mentees were matched for 2014-2015.

- Mentees utilize an online platform (TORSH) to capture video for reflective observation and feedback from their coach. The use of TORSH has increased the frequency of coaching experiences without increasing the amount of travel between programs.

- Coaches received extensive training on coaching within the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) tool as their framework and relationship-based training.

- Coaches are supported with monthly Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) run by a facilitator from the Educator and Provider Support (EPS) Grantee system.

- Coaches and Mentees are further supported with funding to cover out of program time, funding for durable goods to improve classrooms and stipends for coaches.

- Early Childhood Associates (ECA) conducted a Pre-Post CLASS Observation, in October 2013 and June 2014, which summarizes their observations of Mentees participating in the PAC Pilot Project using the CLASS Assessment, which is a rating scale of instructional practices focused specifically on measuring the educational and interactional strategies that teachers use. All three CLASS domains showed improvement:

  - Total Emotional Support increased from 5.5 to 6.0
  - Total Classroom Organization increased from 4.5 to 5.5
  - Total Instructional Support increased from 2.4 to 3.2

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

Higher Education for English Language Learners

In 2012, EEC awarded funds to Wheelock College to design and deliver 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 5, who are engaged in formal early education. The first phase of this project targeted family child care providers, whose primary language is not English, with the goal of facilitating and supporting their achievement of higher academic coursework and credentials, in order to better equip them to effectively assist students that are ELL.

Wheelock College launched the "Pathways" program in the spring semester of the 2012-2013 academic year. The program schedule included two early education courses (Language and Curriculum) during the Spring semester, a third course (Special Needs) in the Fall semester of the 2013- 2014 academic year and the fourth (Teaching Reading) and final course of the program cycle ran during the early part of the Spring semester of the 2013- 2014 year. Each of the courses had an accompanying English language support component. The English-language courses carried no credit throughout the program cycle. Per the design of the program, students were to receive four Wheelock credits for each of the courses they successfully completed.

In 2014, EEC modified this project to support the development of an expanded model for increasing access to institutions of higher learning for ELLs. In a continued effort to effectively support ELL providers in the system of early education, in 2014, EEC hired the CAYL institute to:

- Organize two Higher Education Leadership Institutes with leaders from multiple Institutes of Higher Education;

- Develop a Career Lattice for ELL students entering into or advancing a career in the field of early education;

- Hold focus working groups across the state to brainstorm and develop next steps for supporting ELL students on a career pathway;

- Conduct research and a literature review on what other state models have done to support ELL students entering into a college career pathway;

- Develop formal reports summarizing the research findings and focus group recommendations so that they can be presented to the EEC Board Committee. The Board Committee will analyze the information and discuss the feasibility for supporting ELL students in either 2 or 4 year colleges. The report would be used to provide guidance for the state on ways to support ELL students in the early childhood field.

In December and November 2014, CAYL hosted focus groups with early childhood and higher education faculty to gather information.

Validation of Educator Competencies

EEC contracted with the American Institutes for Research (AIR) to conduct a two-year research study examining the relationships among educator supports, instructional practices, and child outcomes in early childhood settings (e.g., toddler-age and preschool-age classrooms or family child care settings) in Massachusetts. The second year of the study has two areas of focus: numeracy and literacy. The study concluded in 2014. Below are key findings and provides areas of improvement to help EEC as well as practitioners improve their support of early childhood educators and children.

Overall Educator Competency

Most educators across preschool-age and toddler-age classrooms (including family child care) in Massachusetts demonstrated medium levels of quality as measured by the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Pre-K and CLASS Toddler.

Social-Emotional Support

On average, the quality of emotional support in preschool classrooms and emotional and behavioral support in toddler classrooms approached high quality as measured by CLASS. No preschool or toddler classrooms scored in the low range for the Emotional Support (Pre-K CLASS) or Emotional and Behavioral Support (Toddler CLASS) domains.

Instructional Support

Areas in need of improvement were found in the Instructional Support (Pre-K CLASS) and Engaged Support for Learning (Toddler CLASS) domains, with almost two thirds (64 percent) of the preschool classrooms and 44 percent of the toddler classrooms scoring in the low range. However, compared to classrooms from a previous study --the Multi-State Study of Pre-Kindergarten and Study of State-Wide Early Education Programs -- classrooms in Massachusetts scored higher on all measured dimensions of the CLASS Pre-K.

Areas for Improvement--According to study results, areas for improvement in Massachusetts preschool-age and toddler-age classrooms are as follows:

Preschool-Age Classrooms

Concept Development. This dimension assesses how teachers use instructional discussions and activities to promote children's higher-order thinking skills (e.g., asking why or how questions, interpreting previous knowledge) in contrast to a focus on rote instruction.

Quality of Feedback. This dimension captures how teachers extend children's learning through their responses to children's ideas, comments, and work (e.g., asking children to explain their thinking, providing information related to a child's comment).

Toddler-Age Classrooms

- Facilitation of Learning and Development. This dimension considers how well the teacher facilitates activities to support children's learning and developmental opportunities (e.g., teacher embeds information when interacting with children, children freely manipulate materials and toys). Also included in this dimension is how the teacher connects and integrates learning into activities and tasks.

- Quality of Feedback. This dimension assesses the degree to which the teacher provides feedback (in response to what children say and/or do) that promotes learning and understanding and expands children's participation.

Educator Competency in Numeracy Practices

Educator competency in numeracy practices, 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 (score of 2 out of 5) of competency in numeracy or early mathematics practices, as measured by COEMET. There was variation in

the frequency and type of mathematics activities across settings, as measured by the COEMET mathematics activities checklist. Sum scores for the COEMET mathematics activities checklist ranged from 0 to 48, with an average of 10.43.

<u>Educator Competency in Literacy Practices</u>

Overall, educators in preschool-age classrooms demonstrated a basic level (score of 3 out of 5) 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 child care compared with those in family-based child care. The ELLCO mean item score also was higher for classrooms with educators who had at least a bachelor's degree compared with educators who did not. There was wide variation in the quality of the early language and literacy environment across settings, as measured by the ELLCO literacy environment checklist (see Figure 5). Sum scores for the ELLCO literacy environment checklist ranged from 0 to 36, with an average of 19.16.

Expanding Access to Competency Based Professional Development

Online Business Planning Courses

EEC supported programs specifically to increase their business planning skills, as programs that are able to implement sound business practices are better positioned to retain talented staff that can provide high- quality early education for young children. EEC partnered with Inspirational Ones with the goal of developing a business planning course to assist early educators in both center-based and family child care.

The business planning course is focused specifically on 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. A team of local and national experts developed the business planning curriculum, including the United Way of Massachusetts Bay and Merrimack Valley, a lawyer specializing in ECE issues and experts in ECE business practices. The course awards 1.5 CEUs and participants of the course had a sound business plan in place once they complete the course.

In 2014, additional RTT-ELC funds allowed for EEC to partner with Little Sprouts to provide additional trainings to qualified trainers within the Educator and Provider Support system, Readiness Centers, Family Child Care systems, and independent consultants to build state capacity on business planning. The first training of trainers was in June 2014, and additional trainings have been held in September and October.

Early Educators Fellowship Initiative (EEFI)

The Early Educators Fellowship Initiative (EEFI) is a community-based leadership series for early education and care providers in public and private programs serving children from birth to grade three. The purpose of EEFI is to organize, equip and empower Massachusetts educators who will then build high-quality learning environments for the 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 educator's understanding of the needs of young learners
- Action in local communities

For the 2014 EEFI Cohort, there were 20 cross-sector teams of 89 individuals from communities across the state. The program consisted of four workshops, which included a keynote address by a national or state expert on the workshop topic, panelists, and opportunities for teams to work together on a set of shared goals. To enhance the learning opportunity for teams, four webinars were also conducted, one after each of the workshops. These webinars served as a review of the workshops so that team members could extend the information to other members of their organizations and their communities. A coaching component was also included to help the teams organize, understand how the materials presented could be translated to their own programs and schools, and give support to the teams/individuals for sustainability.

The topics for the workshops included Inter-Agency Collaboration, Child Assessment, Leadership, and Quality Rating and Improvement Systems. The presenters were chosen based upon their areas of expertise in these areas.

Teams worked together throughout the Fellowship to address specific needs and concerns that were pertinent and relevant to their individual communities and programs and to 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.

In fall 2014, EEC put the project out to bid and selected a new vendor to manage the EEFI series for 2015.

Regional Professional Development Coordination Through Readiness Centers Activities Grant

Massachusetts has six Regional Readiness Centers which are multipurpose and collaborative centers focused on improving the quality of teaching both across the education continuum and across Massachusetts. They are managed and operated by a regional consortium of partners that include public and private institutions of higher education, school districts, early education and out-of-school-time providers, educational collaboratives, non-profit organizations, businesses and community partners.

The core functions of the Readiness Centers include:

- Providing high-quality professional development and instructional services to educators in early education and out-of-school-time programs, K-12 institutions, and higher education institutions to address both local/regional needs and statewide priorities; and

- Convening stakeholders from early education, elementary and secondary education, higher education, and other sectors to collaboratively address key education priorities, leveraging resources, building statewide capacity, and increasing integration and coherence across the education continuum.

EEC specifically allocated RTT-ELC funding to the Readiness Centers to expand regional capacity to:

- ensure academic advising and career counseling for early educators is aligned and consistent across regions of the state; provide professional development related to the Massachusetts QRIS; engage in data sharing regarding early educator preparation; and assist implementation of the Massachusetts Kindergarten Entry Assessment (MKEA).

The following describes progress made with the Readiness Centers Activities grant in 2014:

- The Readiness Center Activities grantees were issued an amendment for RTT Years 3 and 4 in January 2014. This amendment was issued to extend the contract with Readiness Centers to provide services through the end of the Early Learning Challenge grant and to more clearly articulate grantee services

around MKEA. The Readiness Center grantees were provided with revised technical assistance roles and responsibilities as they relate to MKEA in September 2014. The Readiness Centers have been instrumental to districts and the state through the MKEA implementation process.

- As part of the MKEA initiative the Readiness Centers also work with EEC's Assessment Grantee to organize professional development and technical assistance to MA school districts participating in the MKEA initiative.

- The six regional Readiness Centers continued to work with higher education institutes and their EEC Educator and Provider Support (EPS) grantee to provide academic advising and career counseling to educators in the early education and out of school time field. The Central MA Readiness Center convened a group of educators who had previously taken college coursework through the EPS grant or the Early Childhood Educators Scholarship program but were not actively pursuing a degree at this time. Each Readiness Center also hosted a regional college fair. The Readiness Centers also continue to convene regional college partners to develop and implement a degree pathway for educators.

- In collaboration with EPS grantees the Readiness Centers have provided continuing education and college level coursework that aligns with EEC's Core Competencies and QRIS; over 400 educators were supported through this coursework.

- In efforts to further support data management and the MA workforce, the Readiness Centers have been working with local IHEs to update college profiles that were initially part of EEC's Institutes of Higher Education Mapping Project but had not been updated since 2010. The revised profiles provide a brief overview of campus supports and programs for individuals in the early education and out-of- school time field.

There have been a few challenges to the implementation of the Readiness Center Activities grant in 2014 including the loss of funding to the MA Regional Readiness Centers when the RTT-ELC grant through ESE ended on September 30, 2014. As a result in the funding loss there has been a decrease in the number of staff and a decrease in the number of staff hours at the Readiness Centers.

Another challenge to the Readiness Center grant is the deliverable of a regional college and career fair. Attendance at stand along regional college and career fairs has been poor. For RTT Year 4 the Readiness Centers will work to include regional institutions of higher education as venders at existing early childhood events and conferences across the state. This method has proven more successful for some of the grantees.

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.

	Baseline	Targets				Actuals			
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Total number of "aligned" institutions and providers	26	32	38	49	58	37	36	83	
Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider	1,017	1,098	1,179	1,260	1,341	1,670	815	543	

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

The breakdown of total number of "aligned" institutions and providers (83) is as follows: 36 Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) aligned with EEC Core Competencies and 47 IHEs aligned with the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's PreK-2 licensure.

EEC's Race To The Top Early Learning Challenge Grant application listed 58 institutions of higher education in Massachusetts with degrees in education. Further refinement of that list of colleges and universities has found that there are only 51 colleges and universities in Massachusetts that will issue credentials to the early education workforce in 2014. Although some of the Massachusetts early education bachelor's degree programs align with EEC's Core Competency Areas, the majority of bachelor degree granting programs in Massachusetts issue degrees to individuals looking to work in the Massachusetts' public school system and therefore align with the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) requirements for teacher licensure.

The following IHEs align their coursework and degree programs with both EEC and DESE: Anna Maria College, Bay Path College, Becker College, Berkshire Community College, Brandies University, Bridgewater State University, Bristol Community College, Bunker Hill Community College, Cape Cod Community College, College of Our Lady of Elms, Curry College, Fitchburg State University, Framingham University, Greenfield Community College, Holyoke Community College, Mass Bay Community College, Massasoit Community College, Middlesex Community College, Mount Ida College, Mount Wachusett Community College, North Shore Community College, Northern Essex Community College, Pine Manor College, Quincy College, Quinsigamond Community College, Salem State University, Springfield College, University of Massachusetts Amherst and Boston, Westfield State University, Wheelock College, and Worcester State University.

The following IHEs align their coursework and degree programs with EEC Core Competencies only: Dean College, Fisher College, Springfield Technical Community College, and Urban College of Boston.

The following IHEs align their coursework and degree programs with DESE licensing requirements only: Endicott College, Gordon College, Lasell College, Lesley University, Massachusetts College of Arts, Merrimack College, Mount Holyoke Community College, Roxbury Community College, Smith College, Stonehill College, Tufts University, and Wheaton College.

Since the Year 2 Annual Report, three IHEs are no longer offering a bachelor's degree in early education, including Boston College, Regis College, and Simmons College.

The Massachusetts Department of Higher Education has confirmed the number of graduates for the 2012 -2013 academic year through the USDOE, Integrated Postsecondary Education Database. The data included in table D2D1 has been revised from the Year 2 Annual Report. Data for the 2013 - 2014 academic year are not available at this time. EEC has sought graduation data from IHEs individually through the Readiness Centers and EEC's Educator and Provider Support grantees; 21 colleges have responded to this request for information. Minimal data was received. Not all IHEs have this information available at this time as they are not required to report this information until fall 2015. The following IHEs provided preliminary graduation data: Anna Maria College, Becker College, Bridgewater State University, Bristol Community College, Fisher College, Greenfield Community College, Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts, Massasoit Community College, Mount Wachusett Community College, University of Massachusetts Amherst, University of Massachusetts University Without Walls, Westfield State University, Wheaton College, and Worcester State University.

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.

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).

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	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Child Development Associate/ ECE Certificate	4,001	10.00%	4,076	10.00%	4,226	10.00%	4,451	11.00%	4,751	11.00%
Associate's Degree in ECE	1,020	2.00%	1,270	3.00%	1,570	4.00%	1,920	5.00%	2,320	6.00%
Bachelor's Degree in ECE	557	1.00%	657	2.00%	832	2.00%	1,057	3.00%	1,357	3.00%
Post Graduate Degree in ECE (MEd & PhD)	103	0.20%	153	0.40%	203	0.50%	253	1.00%	303	1.00%

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		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Child Development Associate/ ECE Certificate	4,001	10.00%	4,639	10.00%	4,748	13.00%	5,476	13.00%		
Associate's Degree in ECE	1,020	2.00%	1,224	0.50%	1,503	21.00%	1,628	40.00%		
Bachelor's Degree in ECE	557	1.00%	784	0.50%	1,023	30.00%	250	1.00%		
Post Graduate Degree in ECE (MEd & PhD)	103	0.20%	1,089	2.00%	1,340	23.00%	187	0.50%		

Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2) Data Notes
Please describe the methodology used to collect the data, including any error or data quality information.

The data table above includes 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.

For Credential Type 1 included in D2(d)(2), the Child Development Associate credential is in reference to the Child Development Associate (CDA), a national credential awarded by the Council for Professional Recognition. The Council has provided the number of Massachusetts educators that were awarded the CDA during calendar year 2014. ECE Certificate includes all college level certificate programs in early childhood education. The majority of these certificates are issued by Massachusetts community colleges and include infant and toddler certificate, early childhood certificate, and day care administration certificate programs.

Data presented for RTT Year 3 is preliminary data that is not inclusive of all IHEs in Massachusetts. EEC has issued a data request through the use on an online survey to gather graduation data for 2014. The survey was issued to local institutions of higher education that award credentials to early childhood educators. Percentages are based on baseline data provided in the ELC grant application.

The Early Childhood Educators (ECE) Scholarship is an annual state-funded initiative to support individuals working in the early education and out of school time field who are working towards an associate's or bachelor's degree in early childhood education or a related field. The ECE Scholarship has been supporting early childhood educators since 2005. For the 2014-14 academic year EEC approved 1041 early educators for the ECE Scholarship. Annually allocation of funds to support the ECE Scholarship is more than $3.2M, still in Massachusetts this is still not enough to meet the demand, nor does this funding ensure college's capacity for students. Even with the supports from the ECE Scholarship and EEC's Educator and Provider Support grants that also support college coursework for early educators the cost of attending college is great and the path to degree completion is long. In Massachusetts, the average cost per course at a public 2-year institution is $531.39 the cost per course nearly doubles at the 4-year public institution, $950.62 per course (2013-2014 academic year). It may take 6-7 years for an educator to complete their associate's degree if they are funding their degree solely through the ECE Scholarship.

Additionally, to earn a degree educators currently working in the field require a degree program that addresses the needs of adult learners and provides the appropriate resources and supports to help them succeed. Although a number of IHEs in Massachusetts award credentials to early educators this does not infer to higher education's ability to provide the necessary supports for the early childhood workforce. From EEC's statewide Educator and Provider Support Network we know that 34% (1040) of educators working with a grantee to complete an Individualized Professional Development Plan (IPDP) had a goal of degree attainment.

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.

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 state is using Teaching Strategies GOLD® (TS GOLD®) as the Massachusetts Kindergarten Entry Assessment (MKEA), which is a formative assessment tool that is researched based, reliable and valid. Observation and documentation of children begins early in the kindergarten year and continues throughout the academic year. Each district complete a minimum of 2 checkpoints each year. Checkpoints provide teachers with an opportunity to easily finalize a decision on levels for each item based on the student information that a teacher has been observing and collecting during that time period. Massachusetts has set the first mandatory checkpoint in early November to capture data about school readiness. The second occurs near the end of the school year. Districts have the option of adding an additional checkpoint mid-year.

Districts are required to assess student's social-emotional and cognitive areas during the 2014-15 academic year and assess in all areas beginning in 2015-16. In response to feedback from unions, teachers and administrators expressing concern about the amount of time the assessment was taking teachers, the state made adjustments to MKEA to give public schools more time to assess across all areas in the 2015-16 year after teachers have gained more experience with formative assessment and the TS GOLD® tool.

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

The 2014-15 academic year is the first year Massachusetts has moved beyond piloting MKEA to implementing it in classrooms supported by the state's full day kindergarten grant. Cohort 3, which began implementation in the fall of 2014, is the largest cohort thus far with participation in this cohort almost doubling the total number of districts participating in MKEA. The state learned a great deal in the first 2 years of implementation and has developed a comprehensive training and technical assistance system to support teachers and administrators in the 2014-15 academic year.

Progress on the administration of MKEA include:

- Nineteen school districts participated in Cohort 1 during the 2012-13 academic year and an additional 58 joined as part of Cohort 2. The number of districts participating in MKEA more than doubled in 2014, as Massachusetts began requiring implementation for all full day kindergarten grantees, with 96 districts joining in cohort 3. More than 36,000 kindergarten students were assessed in the fall of 2014.

- The majority of districts who had previously selected to use Work Sampling® switched to TS GOLD® in 2014. All but seven districts in cohorts 1 and 2 are using TS GOLD® as their formative assessment tool. The state's two largest districts, Boston and Worcester, continue to use Work Sampling.

- All districts joining in cohort 3 are required to use TS GOLD®. Districts in cohorts 1 & 2 who had selected to use Work Sampling® were given the option to switch to TS GOLD® in 2014. The state submitted an amendment in April 2014 reflecting this change to using one formative assessment tool.

The state is currently in the process of planning for Cohort 4 and the 2015-16 academic year. As the state's RTTT-ELC grant will end midyear, the state is currently reflecting on the status of MKEA, what needs to happen in the next year, and how MKEA will be sustained beyond the RTTT-ELC grant term. The state plans to complete the following three projects designed to inform next steps:

- Conduct a thorough analysis of MKEA data to determine what the current strengths and challenges of the data are and develop a plan to mitigate challenges.

- Look closely at how the objectives and indicators in TS GOLD® align with educational standards, WIDA, and early learning policy in Massachusetts. This information will be used to determine which objectives and indicators are the most critical and useful to educators and policy makers.

- Document the ways in which MKEA data is being used across the state and what districts who have been very successful with MKEA are doing with the data.

The state is supporting alignment in assessment among early learning environments both vertically and horizontally and the work done in implementing MKEA has substantially supported alignment building work. Formative assessment has been used in many early learning environments across the state and Massachusetts continues to support the use of formative assessment and Gold specifically. The Collaborative for Educational Services (CES), who provides training and technical assistance to public school kindergarten teachers for MKEA, has been awarded state funding to offer training and materials to mixed delivery system educators across the state in assessment and screening. Between May and October of 2014, CES trained a total of 682 educators, over half of which are employed by programs serving a population of young children in which 50% or more are

receiving state subsidies. Of these educators, 465 received formative assessment training and materials. The state offers training and purchases assessment tools for all educators new to using formative assessment.

Though EEC has increased support for MKEA through major improvements to the quality and quantity of training and technical assistance in the 2014-2015 school year, there is still a great deal of concern from both teachers and administrators regarding the burden of expanded MKEA requirements to assess across all domains in this coming school year. EEC is also learning that because many kindergarten teachers and school administrators have not received pre-service or intensive in-service training on observational assessment and early childhood development, particularly in the area of social emotional development and approaches to learning, there is a lack of appreciation among many school districts for the value of authentic formative assessment in supporting children's educational success.   As mentioned above, Massachusetts is working to tailor the formative assessment tools used in MKEA reduce the number of objectives/indicators that teachers are required to assess in, which will reduce the burden on teachers who are implementing MKEA. This work will also make the connection between Massachusetts early learning and development standards and the formative assessment tools, thereby increasing the perceived value of the initiative. Additionally, efforts to document and share best practices will provide districts struggling to implement MKEA with a peer learning resource to aid in their efforts to improve implementation.

Two recent leadership changes in Massachusetts also pose a challenge to EEC's ability to successfully implement expanded requirements for MKEA in the next school year. With these changes to the state's political landscape, it is imperative that EEC garners further support for MKEA from school districts. As in many states, the opinion that school districts and their powerful advocates express, either for or against an initiative, can greatly influence Massachusetts leaderships' commitment to an initiative. Therefore further increasing support for MKEA within school districts is key to the long-term sustainability of the initiative.

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 platform which reduces the time required to generate reports; and support outside agencies, such as ESE's Longitudinal Data System (LDS) in providing between data on child outcomes ensuring compliance with existing federal and state privacy laws. The following describes progress made with ECIS in 2014:

- The state developed reports and disseminated the reports to policy makers.

- The state rolled 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.

- The state integrated ECIS with EEC's Child Care Financial Assistance system (formerly named Unified System).

State strategies for the remainder of the grant period:

- The state will develop a method for integrating data on early childhood grant program data (such as UPK and Head Start) with ECIS.

- The ECIS team will conduct training for regional licensing offices, program quality and workforce staff on the ECIS reports and how to utilize the data to inform policy.

- In 2015, knowledge transfer from ECIS contractors to full time EEC staff will occur to foster sustainability and ongoing support for ECIS.

With regards to challenges, EEC has the following challenges with regards to ECIS adoption and support:

- IT staffing and skill set: The agency is experiencing a skill gap with several newer technologies, which can be addressed through training, attrition and staff augmentation.

- Slow adoption of ECIS across the enterprise by business leaders, both in terms of use and understanding of data warehousing capabilities

- The maturation of the data warehousing technology: The ECIS data warehousing is the precursor to the use of data cubes and drag-and-drop analytics. Subsequent tools will further enable the business to drive performance. Adoption and skills are necessary to justify need for faster, better, cheaper tools to access data.

The Executive Office of Education and the EEC IT Executive Management team has focused on increasing the ECIS adoption rate within the agency by marketing its use within the agency, and through statewide inter-agency integration. In an effort to invigorate the adoption rate, EEC has implemented the following initiatives:

- Cross training IT specialists for understanding and support management.

- In-person demonstrations with key users from the business.

- Socializing the concepts and technology through multiple communication channels such as coupling ECIS information with the release of new applications or services.

- Migration of existing strategic reporting from source systems to the ECIS platform.

- Creation of new reports using the ECIS platform will be completed.

- Documented performance improvements for time-to-production development of reporting between legacy process and ECIS.

- Strategic communication of ECIS work to EEC Board, EEC Commissioner and Executive Office of Education Chief Information Officer.

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	65,359	32.0%
Toddlers ages 1 through 2	65,359	32.0%
Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry	72,895	33.0%
Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families	138,254	32.0%
[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 2012 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 65,359 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]	51,225	11.6%
Are English learners[2]	5,999	1.4%
Reside on "Indian Lands"	0	0.0%
Are migrant[3]	121	0.0%
Are homeless[4]	11,818	2.7%
Are in foster care	2,745	0.1%

[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.

Developmental Delays: There are 36,092 high needs children in Early Intervention programs and 15,133 in IDEA Part B funded programs. The percentage is calculated from a base of 442,592 (2010 Census data of children in MA who are 0-5 years old).

English Language Learners: This data is from the FY 2014-2015 Massachusetts Head Start Participation Survey. Percentage is based on 2010 Census data of children in MA who are 0-5 years old (442,592).

Migrant: This data is from the FY 2014-2015 Massachusetts Head Start Participation Survey. Percentage is based on 2010 Census data of children in MA who are 0-5 years old (442,592).

Homeless: Info from Dept. of Housing and Community Development data system (ASIST and Daily Census reports). Percentage 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. Percentage based on total number of foster children under the age of 18 in the state (45,444).

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

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

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

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	-	-	7,905	7,905
Specify:	UPK and Inclusive Preschool Learning Environments			
Data Source and Year:	UPK data is collected from fall and spring 2014 data reports from UPK grantees. Inclusive Preschool Learning Environments data is from SFY15 reports from grantees			
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	599	2,227	11,200	14,199
Data Source and Year:	Massachusetts Head Start Participation Survey (FY2014-2015)			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C and Part B, section 619	2,920	14,622	15,133	32,675
Data Source and Year:	Infant and toddler data is from Dept. of Public Health (Early Intervention, 2014). Preschool data is from Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Education (school year 2014-2015)			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	-	-	26,246	26,246
Data Source and Year:	Preschool data is from Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Education (school year 2014-2015); schools receiving school wide (SW) Title I funding			
Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	5,510	24,526	41,934	71,975
Data Source and Year:	2014 data from ECIS. CCDF figures may include duplicate counts where children age up from one age group to another during the course of the year.			
[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: FY14 UPK Program Report from grantees.

IPLE: FY15 Mid Year report from grantees,

Head Start: This data is from the FY 2014-2015 Massachusetts Head Start Participation Survey.

IDEA, Part B: Data source is Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Education, school year 2014-2015.

IDEA Part C: Infant and toddler data is from Dept. of Public Health, Early Intervention, 2014.

Title I: Data source is Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Education, school year 2014-2015.

CCDF: Data source is the Early Childhood Information System (ECIS), 2014.

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	2,071	9	408	1,075	30	765	3,011
Specify:	UPK						
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	6,009	54	608	2,563	33	1,376	5,419
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C							
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	15,186	131	3,436	6,118	43	1,905	19,295
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	12,060	64	1,792	4,790	26	1,035	6,479
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	31,461	207	1,121	11,189	65	31,366	12,555
Other 1	1,008	26	450	756	16	330	4,964
Describe:	Inclusive Preschool Learning Environments (391 grant)						

[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: FY14 UPK Program Report from grantees.

IPLE: FY15 Mid Year report from grantees.

Head Start: This data is from the FY 2014-2015 Massachusetts Head Start Participation Survey.

IDEA, Part B: Data source is Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Education, school year 2014-2015.

Title I: Data source is Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Education, school year 2014-2015.

CCDF: Data source is the Early Childhood Information System (ECIS), 2014.

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**	**Year 4**
Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	$7,499,998	$7,500,000	$7,500,000	$8,100,000	$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	$27,597,937
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	$9,019,276
Total State contributions to CCDF[2]	$77,052,705	$76,863,988	$76,526,436	$76,179,788	$76,144,298
State match to CCDF Exceeded / Met / Not Met	Met	Exceeded	Exceeded	Exceeded	Exceeded
If exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded		$31,890,620	$31,553,068	$31,206,420	$31,170,930
TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs[3]	$290,409,712	$287,953,485	$283,202,984	$279,097,990	$315,701,656
Other State contributions 1	$47,500,000	$53,200,000	$53,400,000	$63,300,000	$70,900,000
Specify:	DPH part C- MassHealth				
Other State contributions 2	$40,200,000	$41,700,000	$45,000,000	$44,900,000	$52,900,000
Specify:	DPH part C- Private Insurance				
Total State contributions:	**$540,000,000**	**$546,820,988**	**$542,242,504**	**$546,545,011**	**$598,934,097**

[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, SFY14 for Year 3 and SFY14 for Year 4.

UPK Based on State Appropriation for UPK SFY 12 (for Year 1), SFY13 for Year 2, SFY14 for Year 3 and SFY14 for Year 4.

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. Year 4 is the FFY14 award amount, Year 3 is FFY14 award amount, Year 2 is FFY13 final award amount; and Year 1 is the 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**	**Year 3**
State-funded preschool *(annual census count; e.g., October 1 count)*	14,221	14,071	6,638	7,905
Specify:	UPK and Inclusive Preschool Learning Environments grants			
Early Head Start and Head Start[2] *(funded enrollment)*	16,540	15,963	15,888	14,199
Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619 *(annual December 1 count)*	30,044	30,693	32,345	36,092
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	26,246
Programs receiving CCDF funds *(average monthly served)*	62,742	60,583	61,655	67,637

[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 2014 data reports from UPK grantees

IPLE/391: FY15 Mid-Year Report from IPLE grantees

Head Start: 2013-2014 Head Start Program Information Report

IDEA Part B: Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Education, IDEA part B, school year 2014-2015

Title I: Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Education, Title I schools receiving school wide funding, school year 2014-2015

CCDF: ECIS, calendar year 2014

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.

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

Data Table (A)(1)-7 Data Notes
Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data, if necessary.

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 Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	$258,607.86	$641,539.02	$759,796.52	$0.00	**$1,659,943.40**
2. Fringe Benefits	$68,042.36	$168,033.81	$210,311.68	$0.00	**$446,387.85**
3. Travel	$5,175.60	$26,380.83	$19,963.24	$0.00	**$51,519.67**
4. Equipment	$625.00	$1,775.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$2,400.00**
5. Supplies	$4,474.97	$11,441.36	$213.84	$0.00	**$16,130.17**
6. Contractual	$3,066,722.25	$7,280,411.78	$8,771,521.67	$0.00	**$19,118,655.70**
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
8. Other	$0.00	$20,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$20,000.00**
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$3,403,648.04	$8,149,581.80	$9,761,806.95	$0.00	**$21,315,036.79**
10. Indirect Costs	$164,079.65	$318,156.17	$431,559.93	$0.00	**$913,795.75**
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$912,122.39	$2,748,629.53	$4,513,325.53	$0.00	**$8,174,077.45**
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$86.23	$0.00	$36,178.90	$0.00	**$36,265.13**
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$4,479,936.31	$11,216,367.50	$14,742,871.31	$0.00	**$30,439,175.12**
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$46,954,903.60	$892,007.02	$0.00	$0.00	**$47,846,910.62**
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	**$51,434,839.91**	**$12,108,374.52**	**$14,742,871.31**	**$0.00**	**$78,286,085.74**

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.

Budget Summary Table Narrative

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

There was approximately $3.2M in year 3 funds that were not expended. For several projects, expenses were not as high as anticipated and that resulted in savings. For other projects, variables such as scheduling issues and participation rates that are inherent to activities like trainings and professional development events, resulted in less spending than anticipated. Additionally, Massachusetts realized a large savings in our indirect costs.

Budget Summary Table Explanation of Changes

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

One substantial change to Massachusetts RTT-ELC budget for year 4 is the reallocation of $2.3M in unspent year 3 funds to Project 10: Early Childhood Information System (ECIS). Massachusetts will be submitting a request to extend projects into the no-cost extension period. The extension of these project will in part be supported by additional unspent funds from year 3.

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

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
Budget Table: Project 1					
1. Personnel	$238,107.86	$593,039.02	$759,796.52	$0.00	**$1,590,943.40**
2. Fringe Benefits	$66,402.36	$164,153.81	$210,311.68	$0.00	**$440,867.85**
3. Travel	$5,175.60	$20,680.83	$19,963.24	$0.00	**$45,819.67**
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
5. Supplies	$4,474.97	$4,674.36	$213.84	$0.00	**$9,363.17**
6. Contractual	$40,772.20	$73,000.00	$2,500.00	$0.00	**$116,272.20**
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$354,932.99	$855,548.02	$992,785.28	$0.00	**$2,203,266.29**
10. Indirect Costs	$161,844.65	$307,843.97	$431,559.93	$0.00	**$901,248.55**
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$86.23	$0.00	$36,178.90	$0.00	**$36,265.13**
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$516,863.87	$1,163,391.99	$1,460,524.11	$0.00	**$3,140,779.97**
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$179,374.02	$179,374.02	$0.00	$0.00	**$358,748.04**
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	**$696,237.89**	**$1,342,766.01**	**$1,460,524.11**	**$0.00**	**$3,499,528.01**

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 1 Budget Narrative

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

Spending in Project 1 for RTT-ELC grant year 3 was about $817K lower than what was budgeted. The majority of those unspent funds are due to activities funded through our TA set-aside funds being moved to year 4. There was also less spending of indirect funds than was anticipated in the beginning of year 3 when our budgets were submitted.

Project 1 Budget Explanation of Changes

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

As mentioned above, the majority of activities being supported by the $300,000 of TA set-aside funds originally budgeted for year 3 will be carried out in year 4, which will result in an increase in year 4 spending for Project 1. Other unspent funds from Project 1 will be reallocated to other projects including Project 10.

Budget Table: Project 2 – QRIS Program Quality Supports

Budget Categories	Budget Table: Project 2				
	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
6. Contractual	$928,882.73	$2,652,597.66	$4,584,576.49	$0.00	**$8,166,056.88**
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$928,882.73	$2,652,597.66	$4,584,576.49	$0.00	**$8,166,056.88**
10. Indirect Costs	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$928,882.73	$2,652,597.66	$4,584,576.49	$0.00	**$8,166,056.88**
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$5,062,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$5,062,000.00**
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	**$5,990,882.73**	**$2,652,597.66**	**$4,584,576.49**	**$0.00**	**$13,228,056.88**

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 Narrative

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

At the end of grant year 3, Project 2 overspent by $14K. This is primarily due to Project 2.5, which spent $210,144 more than what was originally budgeted.

Project 2 Budget Explanation of Changes

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

Massachusetts does not anticipate any significant changes to this budget in the upcoming year.

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

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
Budget Table: Project 3					
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
2. Fringe Benefits				$0.00	**$0.00**
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
6. Contractual	$500,288.00	$348,779.00	$553,936.00	$0.00	**$1,403,003.00**
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$500,288.00	$348,779.00	$553,936.00	$0.00	**$1,403,003.00**
10. Indirect Costs	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$456,166.00	$259,041.00	$656,080.00	$0.00	**$1,371,287.00**
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$956,454.00	$607,820.00	$1,210,016.00	$0.00	**$2,774,290.00**
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$13,849,530.29	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$13,849,530.29**
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	**$14,805,984.29**	**$607,820.00**	**$1,210,016.00**	**$0.00**	**$16,623,820.29**

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

There was considerably less funds expended in Project 3 than was budgeted at the end of year 3. Project 3 under spent by $1.7M. Activity 3.1 was under spent by $143K. Activity 3.2 was under spent by $820K. Activity 3.8 was under spent by $652K. The state overestimated costs needed for MKEA.

Project 3 Budget Explanation of Changes
Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

The year 4 budget for this project will be slightly reduced. There is no anticipated effect on our ability to meet any of our deliverable under Project 3.

Budget Table: Project 4 – Family Engagement Evidence Based Practice

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
2. Fringe Benefits				$0.00	**$0.00**
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
6. Contractual	$243,921.29	$842,479.03	$699,532.53	$0.00	**$1,785,932.85**
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$243,921.29	$842,479.03	$699,532.53	$0.00	**$1,785,932.85**
10. Indirect Costs	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$243,921.29	$842,479.03	$699,532.53	$0.00	**$1,785,932.85**
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$14,649,530.29	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$14,649,530.29**
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	**$14,893,451.58**	**$842,479.03**	**$699,532.53**	**$0.00**	**$16,435,463.14**

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

Overall Project 4's budget for year 3 was under spent by $267K. The under-spending in this project budget was due mostly to Activity 4.2 that funds Evidence Based Literacy grants. The nature of the work carried out though these grants is variable in nature since they include planning for events and workshops for families that often change due to scheduling or attendance issues. Since the contract with these grantees ended in December of 2014, grantees were not able to rollover unexpended funds as they have in the past. Unspent funds will be reallocated to Project 10 in year 4.

Project 4 Budget 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 the RTT-ELC budget for Project 4. However there will be a slight reduction in year 4 funding for this project because there were less applicants that applied for the Evidence Based Literacy grant funding (Activity 4.2) than expected.

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

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
Budget Table: Project 5					
1. Personnel	$20,500.00	$48,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$69,000.00**
2. Fringe Benefits				$1,640.00	**$3,880.00**
3. Travel	$0.00	$5,700.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$5,700.00**
4. Equipment	$625.00	$1,775.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$2,400.00**
5. Supplies	$0.00	$6,767.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$6,767.00**
6. Contractual	$0.00	$20,006.00	$118,457.21	$0.00	**$138,463.21**
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
8. Other	$0.00	$20,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$20,000.00**
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$22,765.00	$106,628.00	$118,457.21	$0.00	**$247,850.21**
10. Indirect Costs	$2,235.00	$10,312.20	$0.00	$0.00	**$12,547.20**
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$215,758.55	$1,129,413.01	$1,637,272.00	$0.00	**$2,982,443.56**
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
13**. Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$240,758.55	$1,246,353.21	$1,755,729.21	$0.00	**$3,242,840.97**
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$3,367,219.00	$94,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$3,461,719.00**
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	**$3,607,977.55**	**$1,340,853.21**	**$1,755,729.21**	**$0.00**	**$6,704,559.97**

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 5 Budget Narrative

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

At the end of year 3, Project 5 under spent by approximately $700K due to Activity 5.2 and Activity 5.3. Activity 5.2 under spent by $134K and Activity 5.3 under spent by $561K. Project 3 still has $13K remaining in year 3 funds that will be obligated.

Project 5 Budget Explanation of Changes

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

There are no substantive changes anticipated for the year 4 budget of Project 5.

Budget Table: Project 6 – Standards Validation and Alignment

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
Budget Table: Project 6					
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
2. Fringe Benefits				$0.00	**$0.00**
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
6. Contractual	$538,772.79	$677,545.73	$742,147.90	$0.00	**$1,958,466.42**
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$538,772.79	$677,545.73	$742,147.90	$0.00	**$1,958,466.42**
10. Indirect Costs	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$538,772.79	$677,545.73	$742,147.90	$0.00	**$1,958,466.42**
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$125,000.00	$125,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$250,000.00**
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	**$663,772.79**	**$802,545.73**	**$742,147.90**	**$0.00**	**$2,208,466.42**

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

The budget for Project 6 was under spent by $392K at the end of year 3. This under spending came from Activity 6.3 ($165K) and Activity 6.4 ($161K). Much of the funding for Activity 6.3 Early English Language Development Standards will be moved into year 4 to reflect changes to the work plan that will move costs into year 4. Other funds remaining from Activity 6.4 Translation will be reallocated to another project.

Project 6 Budget Explanation of Changes
Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

No substantive changes are anticipated for the year 4 budget of Project 6.

Budget Table: Project 7 – Interagency Partnerships

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Budget Table: Project 7</th></tr>
<tr>
<th>Budget Categories</th>
<th>Grant Year 1 (a)</th>
<th>Grant Year 2 (b)</th>
<th>Grant Year 3 (c)</th>
<th>Grant Year 4 (d)</th>
<th>Total (e)</th>
</tr>
<tr><td>1. Personnel</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td><td>**$0.00**</td></tr>
<tr><td>2. Fringe Benefits</td><td></td><td></td><td></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><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><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><td>$0.00</td><td>**$0.00**</td></tr>
<tr><td>6. Contractual</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td><td>**$0.00**</td></tr>
<tr><td>7. Training Stipends</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</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><td>$0.00</td><td>**$0.00**</td></tr>
<tr><td>9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td><td>**$0.00**</td></tr>
<tr><td>10. Indirect Costs</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</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>$148,105.68</td><td>$1,043,460.99</td><td>$1,695,727.18</td><td>$0.00</td><td>**$2,887,293.85**</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><td>$0.00</td><td>**$0.00**</td></tr>
<tr><td>13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)</td><td>$148,105.68</td><td>$1,043,460.99</td><td>$1,695,727.18</td><td>$0.00</td><td>**$2,887,293.85**</td></tr>
<tr><td>14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td><td>$0.00</td><td>**$0.00**</td></tr>
<tr><td>15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)</td><td>**$148,105.68**</td><td>**$1,043,460.99**</td><td>**$1,695,727.18**</td><td>**$0.00**</td><td>**$2,887,293.85**</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 7 Budget Narrative

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

Overall Project 7 under spent by $250K at the end of year 3. Activity 7.1 had unspent funds of $120K. Activity 7.4 had $170K in unspent funds, however this activity still has $73K in obligated funds remaining for year 3. Activity 7.3 spent over $100K over the year 3 budget and it has $27K of obligated funds to spend in year 3. Spending in Project 7 was varied because there were delays in deliverables in year 3.

Project 7 Budget Explanation of Changes

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

There are no substantive changes in Project 7 budget anticipated for year 4.

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

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
Budget Table: Project 8					
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
2. Fringe Benefits				$0.00	**$0.00**
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
6. Contractual	$322,895.83	$1,383,366.17	$1,456,557.40	$0.00	**$3,162,819.40**
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$322,895.83	$1,383,366.17	$1,456,557.40	$0.00	**$3,162,819.40**
10. Indirect Costs	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$322,895.83	$1,383,366.17	$1,456,557.40	$0.00	**$3,162,819.40**
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$9,503,997.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$9,503,997.00**
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	**$9,826,892.83**	**$1,383,366.17**	**$1,456,557.40**	**$0.00**	**$12,666,816.40**

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

Spending for Project 8 was under budget by $336K at the end of year 3. This is largely due to the contract under Activity 8.5 having a delayed start. Due to this late start, approximately $80K of year 3 funding for this project will be rolled into year 4. A reduction of year 3 costs were also caused by less participants than expected in Activity 8.7 Peer Advising and Coaching. Lastly, there was a delay in spending for Activity 8.6 Post Masters Certificate Program due to costs related to tuition for participants being delayed, which will be paid out in year 4. Funds that are not being moved into year 4 to continue supporting activities in Project 8 will be reallocated to other projects.

Project 8 Budget Explanation of Changes
Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

There are no substantial changes anticipated for this project in year 4.

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

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
Budget Table: Project 9					
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
2. Fringe Benefits				$0.00	**$0.00**
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
6. Contractual	$157,659.41	$74,867.49	$0.00	$0.00	**$232,526.90**
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$157,659.41	$74,867.49	$0.00	$0.00	**$232,526.90**
10. Indirect Costs	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$157,659.41	$74,867.49	$0.00	$0.00	**$232,526.90**
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	**$157,659.41**	**$74,867.49**	**$0.00**	**$0.00**	**$232,526.90**

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 9 Budget 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 only 2 Activities for this project and both were completed in Year 2.

Project 9 Budget Explanation of Changes
Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

Not applicable: there are not activities planned for this project in year 4.

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

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
Budget Table: Project 10					
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
2. Fringe Benefits				$0.00	**$0.00**
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
6. Contractual	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
10. Indirect Costs	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$92,092.16	$316,714.53	$524,246.35	$0.00	**$933,053.04**
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$92,092.16	$316,714.53	$524,246.35	$0.00	**$933,053.04**
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$218,253.00	$447,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$665,753.00**
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	**$310,345.16**	**$764,214.53**	**$524,246.35**	**$0.00**	**$1,598,806.04**

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

Massachusetts is reallocating overall unspent year 3 funds to Project 10. This includes an additional $110K of year 3 funds that were transferred into Project 10 and spent during year 3.

Project 10 Budget Explanation of Changes
Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

Massachusetts will be reallocating a total of $2.3M in unexpended year 3 funds to expand activities carried out through Project 10: ECIS. This reallocation will allow Massachusetts to invest in enhancements to our IT systems that will improve our reporting abilities and increase staff efficiencies and effectiveness.

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

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
2. Fringe Benefits				$0.00	**$0.00**
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
6. Contractual	$67,322.00	$166,726.70	$103,638.14	$0.00	**$337,686.84**
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$67,322.00	$166,726.70	$103,638.14	$0.00	**$337,686.84**
10. Indirect Costs	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$0.00**
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$67,322.00	$166,726.70	$103,638.14	$0.00	**$337,686.84**
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$45,633.00	$0.00	$0.00	**$45,633.00**
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	**$67,322.00**	**$212,359.70**	**$103,638.14**	**$0.00**	**$383,319.84**

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

There has been no change to the Project 11 budget.

Project 11 Budget Explanation of Changes
Please describe any substantive changes that you anticipate to the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year.

There are not substantive changes anticipated for this budget for year 4.

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)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
Budget Table: Project 12					
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits				$0.00	$0.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
6. Contractual	$266,208.00	$1,041,044.00	$510,176.00	$0.00	$1,817,428.00
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$266,208.00	$1,041,044.00	$510,176.00	$0.00	$1,817,428.00
10. Indirect Costs	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$266,208.00	$1,041,044.00	$510,176.00	$0.00	$1,817,428.00
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$266,208.00	$1,041,044.00	$510,176.00	$0.00	$1,817,428.00

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 12 Budget Narrative

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

Over the course of grant year 3, Massachusetts anticipated that the expenses for Project 12 would be higher than originally budgeted. To ensure adequate funding was available, approximately $189K was transferred from the year 4 budget to year 3 for this project. Due to costs being lower than expected and a slight shift in the activities being carried out through Project 12, the full increase was not full expended in year 3, leaving approximately $106K in unspent funding that will be reallocated to another project in year 4.

Project 12 Budget Explanation of Changes

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

There are not substantive changes anticipated for this budget for year 4.

			LEVEL 1 Health & Safety Practices	LEVEL 2 Commitment to Quality	LEVEL 3 Focused Development	LEVEL 4 Full Integration
QRIS Roundtable Participation						
Reliable Rater Program Assessment						√
QRIS Health Consultant Site Visit						√
Individualized Technical Assistance Site Visit					√	√
Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI)					√	√
Program Self-Assessment					√	√
Expanded Health and Safety Practices					√	√
Development of Best Practice and Policy					√	√
Formal Professional Development					√	√
Development of Best Practice and Policy					√	√
Measurement Tools					√	√
Documentation Review					√	√
QRIS Community					√	√
Technical Assistance					√	√
On-line Orientation for the Level						
A. EEC Licensed Program	B. EEC Approved License Exempt Program with Self-Assessment	C. Public School with Self-Assessment and Agreement				