

# Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge

## 2015 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT



JUNE 2016





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

**New Mexico**

2015

Due: February 29, 2016

U.S. Department of Education  
Washington, DC 20202  
OMB Number: 1810-0713  
Expiration Date: December 31, 2016

**Paperwork Burden Statement**

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0713. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 120 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email [ICDocketMgr@ed.gov](mailto:ICDocketMgr@ed.gov) and reference the OMB Control Number 1810-0713. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., S.W., Room 3E320, Washington, DC 20202-6200.



## Annual Performance Report Section List

General Information

Executive Summary

A(3) Successful State System

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

B(2) Promoting Participation in the TQRIS

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

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

B(5) Validating the Effectiveness of the State TQRIS

C(1) Early Learning and Development Standards

C(2) Comprehensive Assessment Systems

C(3) Health Promotion

C(4) Engaging and Supporting Families

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

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

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

E(2) Early Learning Data Systems

A(1) Background Data Tables



## Performance Report: Cover Sheet

### General Information

1. PR/Award#: S412A130025

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

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

4. Project Director Name: Leighann Lenti  
Title: New Mexico Public Education Department  
Phone #: (505) 412-2285 Ext.: \_\_\_\_\_ Fax #: \_\_\_\_\_  
Email: leighann.lenti@state.nm.us

### Reporting Period Information

5. Reporting Period: From: 01/01/2015 To: 12/31/2015

### Indirect Cost Information

#### 6. Indirect Costs

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

Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s): From: 07/01/2012 To: 06/30/2015

Approving Federal agency:  ED  HHS  Other Specify other: \_\_\_\_\_

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

## Executive Summary

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

New Mexico is pleased to report that at the end of Year Three of the Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge Grant (RTT-ELC), the State continues to make significant progress in grant implementation across all six of its RTT-ELC Projects: Grants Management; Focus-TQRIS; Early Childhood Investment Zones; Workforce Development; Early Childhood Data Systems; Kindergarten Entry Assessment.

New Mexico's ongoing, comprehensive commitment to building an early learning system of the highest quality for its most at-risk young children and their families is the result of collaboration among State agencies, community partners, and stakeholders and is reflected in the following 2015 accomplishments.

### ACCOMPLISHMENTS

New Mexico has made significant progress on the Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) grant since it began in January 2013, with much of Years One and Two spent on gearing up to implement the grant, including hiring key staff; establishing contracts; and establishing governance and communications processes.

The 2015 Annual Performance Report provides an overview of New Mexico's RTT-ELC activities for Year Three of the grant, highlighting continued strides towards building a robust, high quality learning system for our youngest children. During Year Three, several areas of progress and enhancements were realized within the six projects, including:

#### 1. Grants Management

##### Governance

Within the governance model, New Mexico has refined, coordinated and formalized collaborations and communications. As a part of the inter-agency collaboration used to implement the RTT-ELC grant, the Leadership Team continues to meet twice per month to discuss policy questions and implementation plans, review the status of each project, discuss any major challenges, maintain alignment among project policies and activities, and discuss and confirm any necessary adjustments to the budget, scope of work, and implementation plans. The Executive Team meets monthly to gain updates and resolve inter-agency concerns and is made up of top level executive-management staff from each of the participating State agencies.

In April 2015, New Mexico added a key staff member to our already existing staff by hiring a Project Grant Manager to oversee the overall management and implementation progress for the RTT-ELC grant. A transition plan was created and implemented by the interim project manager for the new project manager. Authority and accountability is still managed across the three departments, management and reporting responsibilities are aligned within PED.

##### Communication

Also within Grants Management, New Mexico recognized the need to improve communication and marketing regarding the RTT-ELC work. Needed improvements included communications to both internal State staff and external stakeholders.

In November 2014, New Mexico contracted with the North Carolina Early Childhood Foundation to create a communications and marketing plan. Plan development involved the participation of Executive and Leadership Teams in strategic planning sessions. This work resulted in:

- The release of an internal communications plan to increase awareness of New Mexico's Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge grant work. The plan focuses on ensuring that internal stakeholders, agency leaders and elected officials understand the RTT-ELC vision and how it contributes to advancing outcomes for New Mexico's children and provides a *call to action* for these audiences to actively champion the work.
- A statewide stakeholder engagement process that assessed why the work is important, identify how stakeholders fit into the system transformation, and provide input on how best to message across the early

childhood system and implement a cohesive communications plan.

To enhance communications further, New Mexico secured a contract with a web design company to develop the Early Learning NM website — [www.earlylearningnm.org](http://www.earlylearningnm.org). The website launched in February 2015 with information on each of the RTT-ELC projects. Also included on the site is information regarding the work of the New Mexico Early Learning Advisory Council (ELAC) and information regarding New Mexico early learning programs in order for parents to know how to access these programs and services.

In recognition of the need to have a dedicated communication position as part of the grants management team, New Mexico secured a contract in September 2015 with a professional communication specialist to serve in the role as the RTT-ELC Communications Manager. The Communications Manager has assumed responsibility for timely E-news communications; website updates; production management of informational fact sheets, presentations and supporting collateral materials; strategies to achieve continued stakeholder engagement; and the development/implementation of coordinated external communications plan. Additionally, a work plan that is based on the internal communications plan has been developed to maintain production schedules, costs and outcome measurements.

## **2. Raising the Quality of Early Learning Programs**

### Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System

New Mexico continued to build a Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS), called FOCUS, across all of the early learning sectors, including: Home Visiting, Early Intervention (Family Infant Toddler Program), Early Head Start and Head Start, Child Care, PreK, Title I, and Early Childhood Special Education. The Cross Sector Leadership Team was established in 2014 with representation of all the early learning system (Home Visiting, Early Intervention, Family Infant Toddler Program, Early Head Start and Head Start, Child Care, PreK, Title I, and Early Childhood Special Education) and their consultation support. The purpose, vision and goals of this group were refined during 2015 to develop a common quality framework that was articulated and measured, monitored, and supported consistently across sectors to benefit children, families, program leaders, early childhood educators, practitioners, and early childhood service providers. The group meets regularly to ensure that FOCUS is aligned across all agencies, sections and programs for such items as the terminology, Essential Elements of Quality, Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) approach, and program outcomes. Along with this, the Cross Sector team created and utilized a "Decision Template" which was a communication tool for presenting recommendations to the Leadership and Executive teams.

New Mexico's progress towards an aligned FOCUS-TQRIS includes agreed upon essential elements that support: family engagement, inclusive practices for children with developmental delays or disabilities, culture and language, dual language learners, and promoting social relationships, Professional Qualifications, Intentional Teaching and Early Intervention Practices and Intentional Leadership: Continuous Quality Improvement System.

Additional accomplishments include:

- FOCUS and Special Education Bureau hosted a two-day educational event titled, *Full Participation Institute*, where nearly 500 school administrators, teachers and consultants from FOCUS, NM PreK, FOCUS, and the Training and Technical Assistance Programs (TTAPs) participated. The success of the institute has generated additional dialogue with the PED Special Education Department regarding continued support for the PED FOCUS initiative and sustainability planning beyond the grant. In addition, several districts have initiated changes in their preschool programs to foster the full participation of each child. PED early childhood special education staff and FOCUS consultants are providing technical assistance and training.
- Home Visiting is implementing a CQI system called "*Onda*" to achieve a systemic change in the program and practices to benefit New Mexico children and their families. Home Visiting programs are currently participating in CQI *Onda*, which is a main component of the Home Visiting FOCUS criteria. Participation in FOCUS has also been added to the Home Visiting contracts, whereby programs will have one year to enroll in FOCUS after signing the contract.
- Established the New Mexico Pyramid Partnership to develop, evaluate and sustain a statewide collaborative process that utilizes the Pyramid Framework to support practitioners to promote social emotional

competence in young children, as well as prevent and address challenging behaviors. During 2015, the New Mexico Pyramid Partnership conducted a training of trainers throughout the state.

- There were four FOCUS Stakeholder Meetings for the Family Infant Toddler (FIT) Program in 2015 with the goal to receive input into Essential Elements and criteria based on early intervention research and evidenced based practices, as well as a process for scoring and validation design. Twenty-five participants, consisting of parents, early intervention personnel, provider administrators, early child practitioners, Higher Education representatives, and training and technical assistance consultants, attended the meetings.
- Implemented the NM Video Demonstration Project to: 1) Help FIT, FOCUS and PreK providers and consultants learn how to use video in their work with families to support infant and toddler development; 2) Produce educational videos that can be used to help other FIT early intervention personnel learn new skills; and 3) Help FIT early intervention personnel learn how to use videos, as one option, to support their program's Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) process.

### **Testimonial**

As one of the first New Mexico early learning centers to pilot FOCUS back in 2012, *Little Forest Playschool* Executive Director April Wade is excited by the drastic growth realized in the children, staff and center as a whole. "Through FOCUS, our center has adopted an environment of continuous learning, reflection and improvement," April noted. She explained that the FOCUS approach has enhanced the quality of the Los Alamos center's program as well as taught staff how to recognize and zero in on meeting the individual developmental needs of each child in their classroom. Read more online at <http://www.earlylearningnm.org/stories/detail/focus-on-young-childs-quos-learning>

## **3. Investing in Communities**

### Early Childhood Investment

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

Additional ECIZ accomplishments include:

- Work began in four Early Childhood Investment Zones to create change that results in better outcomes for young children while strengthening the community system that supports Home Visiting.
- The Family Development Program joined the project as a partner to provide training in collaborative leadership and in social emotional learning research and practices.
- Through a multi-year contract, the Family Development Program simultaneously began working in four additional targeted communities to increase knowledge and investment in the State's FOCUS initiative. The four investment zone communities include: Guadalupe (Santa Rosa), Socorro (Magdalena), Colfax (Raton), Sandoval (Cuba).
- An Early Childhood Coalition Self-Assessment and Planning Tool was created by the Coop/Family Development Program Team for coalition members to continuously revisit how progress is being made in these strategies, including tracking "getting started" with the strategy to "sustaining" it as part of the coalition's leadership practice. The tool also identifies the key areas of capacity building focus that are addressed by the Coop and Family Development Program partnership and is now being used to guide their aligned work as the initial Early Childhood Investment Zone Model is refined.

### **Testimonials**

*"While facilitating NM Pyramid Infant/Toddler Modules in Roswell in January I met 2 people from Clovis who work for MECA Therapies. Both had attended 7 Essential Skills and the Leadership Institute in Tucumcari. They found the life skills very helpful in terms of their work with children and families. They are using the Leadership Toolkit within their organization with staff.*

Paula Steele  
Family Development Program

*"I appreciate learning about young children's development [through essential skills], because it's not something I ever studied. It would be helpful to anyone."*

General Practice Physician  
Cuba Early Childhood Investment Zone

*"You can really see the alignment among the statewide outreach efforts: Full Participation, the Pyramid training, and Mind in the Making – each one supports the other."*

Coalition Member  
Magdalena Early Childhood Investment Zone

*"I just attended the NM Pyramid Training, and it fits so well with the Mind in the Making sessions we did last spring. Now I'm trying to figure out how to share this information in a way that is integrated with the families we serve in our program."*

Coalition Member  
Gallup Early Childhood Investment Zone

*[Through the Leadership Institute, I've learned]... "to value the voice of my employees, family, clients, and my community."*

Coalition Member  
Deming Early Childhood Investment Zone

*"Mind in the Making opened my eyes regarding the importance of teaching kids others perspectives by discussing feelings of characters in stories we read to them."*

Mind in the Making Training Participant  
Tucumcari Early Childhood Investment Zone

*"I value our early childhood coalition because I know who to call now for information I don't have."*

Coalition Member  
Gallup Early Childhood Investment Zone

#### **4. Professional Development**

##### Early Childhood Higher Education Task Force

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

### T.E.A.C.H.® Scholarships

New Mexico contracted with the New Mexico Association for the Education of Young Children (NMAEYC) for T.E.A.C.H.® scholarships to support the professional development of early childhood practitioners; and in 2015, expanded the scholarships, for Bachelor's, Master's and Doctorate level coursework to include Home Visiting staff, early intervention personnel, parent educators, FOCUS Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System consultants, consultants in NM PreK, child care licensing staff, early childhood special education preschool teachers in public schools, and community college faculty in early childhood.

As a result, New Mexico has greatly boosted the involvement of the early childhood workforce in seeking degrees in early childhood education. The number of T.E.A.C.H. scholars – who all are already working with young children, their parents or their teachers – has grown from 652 scholars in Fiscal Year 2014 to 1,000 scholars in Fiscal Year 2015, a 53 percent increase. The number of credit hours of coursework completed in 2015 grew from 5,229 to 6,649 hours, an increase of 27 percent.

### Reflective Supervision

Monthly Reflective Supervision groups are occurring throughout the state with national presenters brought in to support professional development. We are in the process of developing reflective supervision criteria and a training module for use with pilot sites.

### Training and Consultation Competencies

New Mexico entered a contract with Global Learning Partners, Inc. to implement a training and consultation model based upon assessment and feedback obtained. An advisory group, consisting of six experienced New Mexico Early Childhood Services trainers and consultants, has been formed to guide Global Learning Partners' work.

### **Testimonial**

With the Race to the Top support, the number of T.E.A.C.H. scholars who all are already working with young children, their parents or their teachers has grown 53% in just the past year — from 652 scholars in 2014 to 1,000 in FY 2015. “Race To the Top has made it possible for T.E.A.C.H. to offer scholarships to about 102 people who would not have been eligible before for the grant,” said Dan Ritchey, director of the T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood® scholarship program. Read more online at <http://www.earlylearningnm.org/stories/detail/teach-scholarships-grow-in-enrollment-and-eligibility>

## **5. Promoting Accountability**

### Early Childhood Integrated Data System (ECIDS)

Through the grant, New Mexico is well underway with promoting accountability by developing a data system that integrates data from across early learning programs serving young children to measure child outcomes over time and to enable planning for early learning investments.

In anticipation of the development of the ECIDS, the Student Teacher Accountability and Reporting System (STARS) was mapped to the data elements of the Common Education Data Standard (CEDS). STARS, along with the Kindergarten Observation Tool (KOT) application, are two Public Education Department applications that were mapped in 2015.

Additionally, database diagrams and data dictionaries of the agency's applications were developed in 2015 to further assist in the creation of the ECIDS. These developments were used to generate scripts that create the tables that map to the templates provided by the participating agencies.

A Request For Proposal for the creation of a unique identifier and the architecture that allows the information systems within PED, CYFD and DOH to match data and communicate with one another was released on September 18, 2015. New Mexico's ECIDS development vendor was selected with contract negotiations underway in December 2015.

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

New Mexico's NM-IBIS version 2.3 was released into production in March 2015 (<https://ibis.health.state.nm.us>). Included in IBIS are measures that identify high quality, accountable early learning programs; information to support improved child development outcomes through health, family engagement and vigorous use of early learning state standards and assessments; indicators on strengthening the early childhood workforce; and data to measure outcomes and progress.

The site currently includes 23 RTT-ELC indicator reports under the following six headings:

- Population Characteristics
- Child Care in New Mexico
- Family Infant Toddler (FIT) Program Early Intervention Measures
- Home Visiting Measures
- PreK Measures
- Public Education Department (PED) Public Education Measures

### **Testimonial**

Making informed decisions about programs, policies and decisions that promote positive outcomes for New Mexico children requires reliable information. Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge (RTT -ELC) grant is making that possible through the creation of an Early Childhood Integrated Data System (ECIDS).

ECIDS Project Manager explains, "Through a single identifier assigned to each child, the integrated system will pull data across all early learning programs to identify short and long term outcomes of early learning interventions for continuous improvement in programs and to ultimately achieve positive outcomes for each child from preschool through high school and beyond. Also, ECIDS will provide population-level outcomes on how children are faring throughout New Mexico." Read more online at <http://www.earlylearningnm.org/stories/detail/achieving-positive-outcomes-for-our-children-with-reliable-data>

## **6. Supporting Schools in Meeting Each Child's Needs**

### Kindergarten Observation Tool (KOT)

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

In 2015, New Mexico implemented the KOT and completed a rigorous validation study of the PreK Observational Assessment Tool. The Public Education Department (PED), in coordination with WestEd, completed the KOT Pilot in January 2015, with 40 teachers participating. During the pilot implementation phase of the KOT, PED staff and WestEd continued to provide support and guidance.

Following the completion of the observational period and data submission of the Pilot, WestEd developed, deployed, and analyzed two surveys for the participants to gather feedback on the rubrics, processes, and policies regarding the KOT. To obtain additional information, WestEd and the PED hosted an in-person Focus Group.

Another key accomplishment in the KOT development process in 2015 was the creation of the web-based application to input the data, the Kindergarten Observation Tool Application (KOTA), and corresponding technology components. Based on feedback, additional materials to support teachers in using the KOT were developed, such as:

- *Quick Look Recording Sheets* allowed teachers to record observations for their whole roster on an individual indicator and store the information on one page;
- *Field Test Essential Indicators Booklet*, a spiral-bound booklet containing all rubrics included in the KOT Field Test for use by teachers as they deemed necessary; and

– *KOT Field Test Assessment Guide* served as an extensive guide for teachers participating in the KOT Field Test.

Within the first 30 days of the 2015-2016 school year, 39 districts and seven charter schools in New Mexico participated in the KOT Field Test, with 5,597 children observed by 351 teachers. Results show that through the tool, New Mexico is supporting schools in meeting each child's needs by assessing school readiness to understand individual child needs at the beginning of kindergarten and identifying/providing early interventions to achieve positive learning outcomes.

### **Testimonial**

Coral Charter Community School's Head Administrator and Co-founder Donna Eldredge embraced the opportunity to implement the Kindergarten Observation Tool (KOT) at her school. "The more you know is always a plus for both teachers and children." Eldredge added, "KOT provides teachers with instant results so adjustments in teaching to a child's individual learning style and needs can be made right away." Read more online at <http://www.earlylearningnm.org/stories/detail/kot-is-making-a-difference>

### **LESSONS LEARNED**

- Enhanced collaboration, communications and progression of the RTT-ELC transformation work is being realized as a result of the newly established Governance Model and quarterly meetings with the three Department Secretaries — a strategy outlined in the communications plan. Additionally, the quarterly Department Secretaries meetings are resulting in a deeper level of understanding which, in turn, further engages leaders to champion New Mexico's early learning transformation.
- Internal audiences are necessary advocates and their understanding is crucial in implementing an effective external communications plan.
- While the two Stakeholder Meetings during 2015 engaged key target audiences, the end result focused on producing a broad early childhood marketing campaign that was beyond the scope of the grant. While concerns regarding the broad early childhood marketing campaign not being implemented were raised, stakeholder engagement continues with a new focus to: 1) Connect RTT-ELC initiatives and goals to stakeholders' work; 2) identify stories that reinforce core message points; and 3) gain feedback to inform RTT-ELC work and further their outreach commitment.
- The aggressive time line of the Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge Grant requires government systems related to hiring and contracting are addressed to ensure that progress is made.
- Existing materials needed to be revamped and new materials are being produced to reflect messaging that encompasses outcomes through personal stories, rather than project definitions and updates only. The end-result is the production of materials that are more meaningful to end-user audiences and demonstrate the impact of the RTT-ELC work for young children, families and early learning providers.
- The importance of building respectful relationships within each Early Childhood Investment Zone community was recognized. Regular monthly visits to each ECIZ community is a priority, recognizing that respectful relationship building is foundational for the initiative's success. While the initiative is refining its model for how to work effectively with each community, it is clear that the approach has to be adapted to meet each community's unique character and needs. Continuous listening and learning guides the planning and evolution of the initiative.
- The levels of interest in the ECIZ initiative expressed in every community thus far indicates that this project is meeting a high level need that community members are anxious and willing to address.
- The Kindergarten Observational Tool (KOT) post-pilot focus group discussions led to the following key recommendations for refining the emerging KOT:

- Teachers need to be guided on the difference between measuring entry-level status and measuring growth.
- The continuum of KOT rubrics needs to be extended to minimize the likelihood of a ceiling effect.
- The KOT rubrics should maintain alignment with the rubrics for the PreK Tools.
- Consider strategies for ensuring that a technical report is developed and updated on an ongoing basis for the emerging KOT.
- Continue to collect feedback from kindergarten teachers about the ease of administration and usefulness of results.
- Collect information about the impact of the KOT on students, teachers, and other stakeholders.

Monitoring the intended and unintended effects of testing is an important responsibility for all state education agencies.

- Reporting of the KOT data was integral to completing the KOT process. The report generating capacities were developed in two ways: 1) all authorized school, district, and state level administrators and personnel were given appropriate level of access to KOT reports via the KOT SharePoint site; and 2) authorized teachers accessed their classroom level reports via the Reports page of the KOTA.

- Reasons for districts or charter schools opting out of participation in the KOT Field Test included: 1) no superintendent at the time of approval; 2) kindergarten staff positions not filled in time for KOT training and implementation; and 3) other staff turnover that affected the ability to manage the Field Test appropriately.

- A priority in implementing KOT was to ensure communications provided transparency, addressed concerns, minimized confusion, and increased *buy-in*. There are several projects that emerged from the communications work to help meet these objectives:

- A communications plan was developed to coordinate communication goals, timelines, and projects and serves as a guide for the way in which the PED communicates with various stakeholders regarding the KOT;

- A logo was created to brand the KOT assessment and to align the production of materials developed for the KOT;

- An introduction video was created to provide various stakeholders an overview of the KOT and to increase *buy-in*. The video uses classroom and interview footage of New Mexico's students, teachers, education staff, and administrators.

## CHALLENGES/STRATEGIES

- **The Cross Sector work is challenging and takes time. It requires more than agreeing to a set of standards or definitions.**

*Strategy to address challenge:* Reflection on current practices and being open to potentially changing some aspects of a sectors' ways of working to ensure continuity across the early learning system.

- **Maintaining communication between Stakeholder meetings in the development of the Essential Elements and criteria was a slow process.**

*Strategy to address challenge:* Developed a newsletter and provided updates to various groups between meetings.

- **Determining the evidence-based practices for Reflective Supervision.**

*Strategy to address challenge:* An expanded set of criteria will be developed for Reflective Supervision. The second set of practices will apply to general reflective supervision around working with at risk families, families experiencing trauma, loss and other factors that families and children with disabilities may experience.

- **Major issues identified as priorities by the ECIZ include: Teen pregnancy prevention; Support for parenting and pregnant teens to graduate high school; Parenting skills training, especially to parents in at-risk families; Substance abuse treatment; Community-wide prevention initiatives to support social emotional learning; Intervention and treatment resources for infant mental health needs; Access to primary/prenatal and well-baby care; and Kindergarten readiness, early literacy.**

*Strategy to address challenges:*

- Look for possibility to fund coordinators for local ECIZ Early Childhood Coalitions; provide a specific planning process, expectations of role and deliverables.
- Align and coordinate roles of CYFD, DOH, Human Services Department (HSD), and PED to maximize impact in ECIZ. Create a policy priority in each agency to support ECIZ.
- Conduct an infrastructure and gap analysis to drive decision making for potential realignment of state-funded resources to better serve New Mexico ECIZ communities that is based on data that documents early childhood need.
- Implement a full continuum of Infant and Early Childhood Mental Health programming in ECIZ, using the social-emotional New Mexico Pyramid of prevention, intervention, and treatment to address social-emotional development.
- Increase access to services and realign resources to address unmet needs in ECIZ high-risk communities with available funding. Prioritize new funding and state agency staffing for ECIZ.
- Require (or strongly encourage) participation by all CYFD-funded local early childhood/early learning programs in the local Early Childhood Coalition.
- Develop rigorous, cross-agency approaches and supports for community identified issues and priorities. Identify and develop funding strategies for evidence-based programs or approaches.

• **With implementation of the FOCUS Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System and expansion of T.E.A.C.H. scholarship eligibility, there has been significant growth in interest in early childhood scholarships, thus creating a waiting list.**

*Strategy to address challenge:* Developed a priority and selection criteria. Additionally, classes paid for by T.E.A.C.H. will be limited to one class or one class plus a practicum for scholarship recipients attending college in the Spring of 2016, with exceptions granted to those recipients who registered early or are close to graduation.

• **Based on feedback from the Piolt KOT, teachers requested an easier way to record and submit their observations.**

*Strategy to address challenge:* The development of a web-based application is a crucial step to supporting teachers in using the KOT in their classrooms. This fact led to the development of the Kindergarten Observation Tool Application (KOTA). To further enhance ease of use, two manuals comprised of screenshots and technical language were developed: the KOTA Manual and Accessing Reports. The KOTA Manual provided a step-by-step tutorial on how to correctly use the various pages of the KOTA. The Accessing Reports manual provides a step-by-step tutorial on how to pull the various reports for the KOT.

## 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).

Under the governance model adopted in Year Three, the Executive Leadership Team meets monthly and the Leadership Team meets two times per month; and more often, as needed. The meetings consist of updates, discussions and approvals to achieve continuous progression of New Mexico's RTT-ELC work.

Additionally, RTT-ELC is included on the New Mexico Early Learning Advisory Council (ELAC) quarterly meeting agenda. ELAC receives continuous updates regarding the RTT-ELC project to keep the council informed and up-to-date on the progress of the grant; provide recommendations; and enable collaboration among New Mexico's early learning community.

#### 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 PED began pilot implementation of the FOCUS Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS) draft criteria effective January 1, 2015. Participants included school districts and classrooms funded by New Mexico PreK, Title I, and Special Education IDEA 619. In the Fall 2015, an additional cohort was selected to join the pilot group. Participants included school districts from all parts of the state, including representatives of both large and small districts. Selection was based on several factors: school districts that volunteered to participate; number of preschool classrooms in each school district; and location and case load capacity of FOCUS consultants. Based on feedback received from participating programs, ongoing input from stakeholders, and PED leadership (PreK, Special Education, and Title I), the PED FOCUS criteria was revised effective August 1, 2015. Clarifications regarding participation requirements, educator qualifications, and classroom ratios were among some of the changes made through stakeholder engagement.

The FOCUS Institute was held in May 2015 with over 250 participants. There were several workshops conducted by FOCUS consultants and managers, as well as a presentation by guest speakers, Mike and Chelsea Ashcraft of Children's Choice Child Care Services.

In November, there were two separate workgroups - one for the FOCUS Family Child Care (FCC) criteria and another for the FOCUS Out-of-School Time Criteria. During these workgroups, the criteria was reviewed and revised. The finalized drafts of each were submitted to the Office of Child Development for approval.

A statewide stakeholder engagement process was implemented that assessed why the RTT-ELC work is

important, identified how stakeholders fit into the system transformation, and provided input on how best to message across the early childhood system and implement a cohesive communications plan.

Additionally, in December a workgroup for the FOCUS Graduation Support was held. The plan developed and proposed will help FOCUS programs maintain their Star Level with support from the Training and Technical Assistance Programs (TTAPs).

### **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.

As a recommendation from the 2015 Legislative Session, three workgroups were formed to make recommendations to the Children, Youth and Families Department. The three workgroups included: Accreditation, Data and Inclusion of the Montessori system as part of the TQRIS.

The purpose of these meetings was to consider potential policy changes that could strengthen child care programs in ways that would help more programs provide high-quality early childhood education to children and better serve their parents and caregivers who are working or going to school.

### **Participating State Agencies**

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

The RTT-ELC Governance Team meets quarterly with the Cabinet Secretary's to review and discuss decisions about programs, policies and decisions that promote positive outcomes (i.e., sustainability, ongoing projects, communications). These quarterly meetings have renewed the commitment and participation from the three agencies.

THIS PAGE IS BLANK DUE TO FORMATTING ISSUES

## High-Quality, Accountable Programs

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Developing and Adopting a Statewide TQRIS – Progress Made**

The New Mexico Early Learning Guidelines and the goals they outline for children's growth and development provide a common outcome that programs are striving to achieve. Yet, it is clear that the services and strategies to support children and their families differ in important ways across the sectors. Identifying the essential elements of quality services provided across the early childhood system can provide a unifying framework for an integrated system. Early childhood public policy reforms in New Mexico are built upon the belief that families and communities must be the platform from which all efforts are launched. We believe that all work must be informed by and driven by a deep respect for the diverse values and cultures of New Mexico's families. Although New Mexico has been at the forefront of the movement to create standards within the early childhood system, it has taken great care to ensure that these standards do not impose the standardization of practice upon individual children, their families, or the communities where they live. Rather, it is the State's experience that these standards provide a framework in which programs are able to flourish and implement unique and appropriate programs that are based on the strengths of each community. This way, community-specific programs are able to reflect and preserve the history, culture, language, and traditions to support and strengthened each and every child's success.

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

The following were identified as the New Mexico Early Learning Essential Elements:

- Family Engagement and Practices
- Inclusive Practices
- Culture and Language
- Promoting Positive Social Relationships
- Professional Qualifications
- Intentional Teaching and Early Intervention Practices
- Intentional Leadership: Continuous Quality Improvement System

There are additional elements specific to each sector that will be measured as well.

The PED began pilot implementation of the FOCUS Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System draft criteria effective January 1, 2015. Participants included school districts and classrooms funded by New Mexico PreK, Title I, and Special Education IDEA 619. In the Fall 2015, an additional cohort was selected to join the pilot group. Participants included school districts from all parts of the state, representative of both large and small districts. Selection was based on several factors, including: school districts that have volunteered to participate; number of preschool classrooms in each school district; and location and case load capacity of FOCUS consultants. Based on feedback received from participating programs, ongoing input from stakeholders, and PED leadership (PreK, Special Education, and Title I), the PED FOCUS criteria was revised effective August 1, 2015. Clarifications regarding participation requirements, educator qualifications, and classroom ratios were among some of the changes made.

During the last quarter of the reporting year, the RTT-ELC Leadership team requested that the FOCUS criteria be aligned for PreK at the highest childcare level (5 STAR). In addition, the nomenclature of the levels of quality in the FOCUS criteria would need to be common. Meetings have begun to align the criteria in each of the elements of quality and to determine the criteria. New Mexico is working with Child Trends to ensure that the proposed criteria are valid and measurable. The aligned criteria will be implemented in the first quarter of 2016.

## **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.

Two FOCUS Cohorts were in held in 2015, one in August and the other in November. Over 60 programs were invited to each cohort. During these cohorts, programs were introduced to the WELS TQRIS system, FOCUS criteria and Continuous Quality Improvement process. In 2016, there will be monthly FOCUS orientations for new programs. In September, New Mexico's Head Start grantees were invited to a FOCUS event in Albuquerque. This event focused on lessons learned and a future partnership between Head Start and FOCUS. As a result, 10 Head Start programs applied to FOCUS.

An electronic quarterly FOCUS newsletter is disseminated to all preschool administrators and educators. Each issue highlights the purpose of the TQRIS, participation, and a section of the Essential Elements of Quality. Interviews and comments from current participants are featured. Supports for participation such as the T.E.A.C.H. scholarship program have also been featured. A regular section of the newsletter focuses on the benefits of high quality inclusion and takes the reader to a live online resource.

The "Why is FOCUS Good for My Child" brochure was developed and distributed to each of the participating FOCUS administrators and educators. This document will be translated into Spanish in the first quarter of 2016. There were four FOCUS Stakeholder Meetings for the Family Infant Toddler (FIT) Program in 2015 with the goal to receive input into Essential Elements, process for scoring, and validation design. Twenty-five participants attended the meetings, including parents, early intervention provider administrators, early intervention practitioners, Higher Education, and training and technical assistance (T&TA) consultants and representing the various program demographics in New Mexico. The stakeholders reviewed and reflected on Essential Elements work to date and provided a forum for all perspectives.

The FIT FOCUS steering committee (consisting of State staff, T&TA staff and State and National consultants) analyzed input after each meeting, shared with consultants and incorporated the input into the next phase of development. Results were shared at each meeting as the input from the stakeholders and other information was used to further the development of the Essential Elements and criteria. Following are the outcomes realized through participation:

- Stakeholders are informed and engaged in the process; have identified and given input on areas of concern; and have voiced the benefits for a FOCUS process. They have made specific recommendations as part of the FIT Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) and the Quality Subcommittee of the ICC.
- The Steering committee expanded membership to include two national consultants. This has enabled us to develop the criteria under the Essential Elements of Quality for: Assessment; Early Intervention Practices; Family Centered Practices; and Reflective Practices.
- All Essential Elements have sets of practices defined for programs and individual practitioners and all have practices that support programs to reach the next level, such as, initial practices that ask programs to review data that will identify needed technical assistance needs and then, at higher levels, lead to a data driven system that will be used for continuous quality improvement.
- To support the identification of evidence-based practices, we cross-checked the indicators/practices identified by FIT FOCUS stakeholders with the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center - (NECTAC) performance checklists. We also reviewed the Division of Early Childhood (DEC) recommended practices for early childhood special education and contracted DEC to learn about the evidence related to these practices. Based on the input from the stakeholders, the review of practices recommended by NECTA and DEC, were refined for the criteria and indicators to ensure clarity, specificity and consistency with evidence-based practices.
- A design for scoring individual practices verses program practices is in a final draft format and is being

piloted.

The UNM Center for Development and Disability has also established a FOCUS website that shares information about the FOCUS TQRIS, criteria, resources, contact information, and a FOCUS feedback form (<http://ped.state.nm.us/ped/PEDAtoZDirectory.html>). A link to this website is available on the PED PreK, Special Education, and Title I home pages.

Numerous FOCUS informational presentations for PreK and Title I Program Administrators have been provided, as well as presentations at the quarterly Special Education Administrator's Institute. The presentation highlights New Mexico's participation in the federal Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge grant, the history of New Mexico's FOCUS Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System, the current draft criteria, on site consultative support, and benefits of participation.

**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.

<b>Performance Measure (B)(2)(c): Increasing the number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the statewide TQRIS.</b>										
<b>Targets: Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS</b>										
Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline		Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	39	100%	39	100%	39	100%	57	100%		
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	35	90%	32	94%	33	96%	32	91%		
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	35	0%	0	0%	3	8%	8	24%		
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	667	0%	166	25%	333	50%	500	75%		
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	67	0%	0	0%	33	50%	67	100%		
Programs receiving CCDF funds	2,215	32%	813	37%	962	61%	947	64%		
Other 1	20	0%	26	10%	4	25%	10	50%		
<i>Describe:</i>	Home Visiting									
Other 2	28	0%	6	15%	22	22%	32	49%		
<i>Describe:</i>	State-funded preschool - PreK CYFD; PreK Providers in FACTS									
Other 3										
<i>Describe:</i>										

<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

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

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

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

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

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

Type of Early Learning and Development Program in the State	Baseline			Year One			Year Two			Year Three			Year Four		
	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%	# of programs in the State	#	%
State-funded preschool	39	39	100%	39	0	0%	39	39	100%	196	196	100%			
<i>Specify:</i>	PreK PED														
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	35	35	90%	35	32	91%	35	32	91%	35	32	91%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	35	35	0%	34	0	0%	34	0	0%	34	8	24%			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	667	667	0%	667	0	0%	667	0	0%	499	147	29%			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	67	67	0%	67	0	0%	67	0	0%	17	17	100%			
Programs receiving CCDF funds	2,215	2,215	32%	2,215	813	37%	1,567	962	61%	1,482	947	64%			
Other 1	20	20	0%	26	0	0%	24	0	0%	27	10	38%			
<i>Describe:</i>	Home Visiting														
Other 2	28	28	0%	28	6	15%	101	22	22%	65	32	49%			
<i>Describe:</i>	State-funded preschool - PreK CYFD; PreK Providers in FACTS														
Other 3															
<i>Describe:</i>															

<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

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

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

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

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

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

\*196 classrooms in 53 school districts and 4 state charter schools: Previous year's data reported the number of school districts for state-funded preschool and the number of classrooms for IDEA-funded and Title 1-funded preschool programs.

**\*\* Classrooms - Part B**

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c) Target Notes: In the Phase Two application, the targets for IDEA-funded children was 75% by the end of Year Three. PED began phasing in the IDEA-funded programs in the Fall 2015. Challenges included lack of sufficient numbers of qualified consultants, particularly in rural areas of the state. The geographic size of the state limited caseloads for consultants due to extensive travel. In addition, the "Full Participation Institute" held in December 2015 targeted IDEA-funded preschool programs to increase participation. If sufficient numbers of consultants were available to meet the needs of all IDEA, Part B, Section 619 programs, the budget would not cover the cost.

Home Visiting is piloting a CQI system called "Onda." Currently, (10) Home Visiting programs are part of the pilot that will be integrated into the main FOCUS criteria. Participation in FOCUS has been added to the Home Visiting contracts. Programs will have one year to enroll in FOCUS after full implementation and after signing the contract; whichever comes first.

Participation in FOCUS has been added to the CYFD PreK Contracts. Programs will have one year to enroll in FOCUS after the date the contracts are signed.

**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 Phase Two application, the targets for IDEA-funded children was 75% by the end of Year Three. PED began phasing in the IDEA-funded programs in the Fall 2015. Challenges included lack of sufficient numbers of qualified consultants, particularly in rural areas of the state. The geographic size of the state limited caseloads for consultants due to extensive travel. In addition, the Full Participation Institute held in December 2015 targeted IDEA-funded preschool programs to increase participation. If sufficient numbers of consultants were available to meet the needs of all IDEA, Part B, Section 619 programs, the budget would not cover the cost.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The FOCUS Cross Sector Leadership Team has been working together to:

- Develop a clear understanding of *why* a cross-sector FOCUS is important and meaningful for each sector and *what* it will look like when the vision is achieved.
- Identify the quality *elements* that are essential for a cross-sector FOCUS and develop clear and consistent language to describe these elements.
- Develop a *definition* of each essential element that can be used consistently across sectors.
- Develop a *research rationale* for including each element that can be used consistently across sectors.
- Develop a *vision for quality practices* that can help inform how quality can be measured and monitored across sectors.
- Identify possible strategies/tools for *measuring quality*. What common strategies could be used across sectors?

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

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

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

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

*FOCUS On Young Children's Learning*, New Mexico's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS), provides early childhood program personnel with the criteria, tools and resources they need to improve the quality of their programs. These quality improvements focus on children's growth, development and learning so that each child has an equitable opportunity to be successful when entering school. The *FOCUS: Essential Elements of Quality* provides a framework for programs as they strive to make quality improvement efforts. The Essential Elements of Quality also serve as criteria used to determine a program's STAR Level, the level of quality that is indicated on a child care license. Successfully completing the criteria at FOCUS Levels 3, 4, and 5 correspond to the 3, 4, or 5 STARS on a program's license. Together, the *New Mexico Early Learning Guidelines: Birth through Kindergarten* and the *FOCUS: Essential Elements of Quality* provide:

- Common Early Learning Standards, standardized criteria for a common Authentic Observation Documentation Curriculum Planning Process; and
- Common Early Learning Program Standards, a standardized process for Continuous Quality Improvement and standardized criteria for a common quality rating and improvement system.

The FOCUS framework is also closely aligned with the New Mexico Professional Development System, a standardized early childhood workforce knowledge and competency framework with a corresponding progression of credentials and licensure. Just as the NM Early Learning Guidelines provide a framework of criteria for children's growth, development and learning that educators rely on to plan curriculum, the *FOCUS: Essential Elements of Quality* provide a framework of criteria that program personnel can use to plan quality improvements for their programs. Through FOCUS, the state's Early Learning Standards, Early Learning Program Standards, and Early Childhood Professional Development Standards merge. Altogether, they are designed to ensure that many more children from birth through age five have access to dramatically improved early learning programs so that they enter school with the skills, knowledge and dispositions they need to be successful. Through the use of a program improvement and quality rating system, early learning programs will increase their ability to focus on children's learning, improve their practice and, as a result of that improvement in practice, improve each child's kindergarten readiness.

**Quality Grants**

A contract has been developed to assist programs in improving quality and safety through the provision of Health, Safety and Quality Grants for qualifying licensed early childhood programs. The goals are to:

1. Develop strategies and guidelines for participation using the following eligibility criteria:
  - a. CYFD Licensed Programs with or without Conditions of Operations Status
  - b. Programs participating in FOCUS
  - c. CYFD PreK Programs
  - d. Accredited Programs
  - e. Additional Points for programs operating within the identified New Mexico Early Childhood Investment Zones

2. The Quality grants are designed to be used for the following priorities:
  - a. Addressing health and safety issues
  - b. Program/classroom/Family Child Care Home Improvements (under \$5,000) and adaptations to meet quality standards
  - c. Purchase of educational materials, books, toys, etc.
  - d. Professional development not covered by any other funding sources
  - e. Accreditation-related costs (New Mexico approved Accrediting entity)
  - f. Implementation of local initiatives (such as full participation of each child, fatherhood programs, etc.) at a community level

A procedure, application and priority criteria has been developed and will be made available for the programs to apply in early 2016.

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

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

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

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

**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.

Data includes programs participating in the AIM High TQRIS. There were no programs verified using FOCUS TQRIS during Year Two of the project. Verification of programs at the 3 STAR began in March 2014. The data above includes all providers from Basic Licensure and STAR level 2 and 2+ thru STAR level 5. Programs must transition to FOCUS or to an approved accrediting entity by December 31, 2017. Beginning January 1, 2018, AimHigh will no longer be considered as part of New Mexico's TQRIS. Data includes centers and licensed homes.

Child Care FOCUS has accomplished the following in 2015:

Star 2+ = 166

Star 3 = 61

Star 4 = 18

Star 4 moving to Star 5 = 7

Star 5 = 1

**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.

Targets have been met and in some cases exceeded.

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

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

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

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

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

4-STAR - Additional Quality Standards

5-STAR - Higher Standards, Accreditation by an approved entity

Zero PED Preschool programs have moved up one tier in the TQRIS. All PED programs start at Tier 3 (Quality), and have two years to meet all criteria with the support of on-site consultation.

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

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

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

<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

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

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

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

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

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

All preschool children in Title 1 preschool programs and IDEA, Part B, Section 619 classrooms are children with High Needs.

Home Visiting is implementing a CQI system call "Onda." Onda (from Latin *unda*=Wave/ripple) uses the principle that everything we do and think affects the people in our lives and their reactions in turn affect others. Through the New Mexico Home Visiting Onda-CQI Process, we hope to achieve a systemic change in the program and practices that will "ripple" to benefit overall our children and their families. Currently, 10 programs are participating in CQI, which is a main component of the Home Visiting FOCUS criteria. Participation in FOCUS has been added to the Home Visiting contracts and programs will have one year to enroll in FOCUS after signing the contract.

All children in PED NM PreK programs are considered as children with High Needs as they are enrolled in Title 1 schools. All preschool children in Title 1 preschool programs and IDEA, Part B, Section 619 classrooms are children with High Needs.

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

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

In the Phase Two application, the targets for IDEA-funded children was 75% by the end of Year Three. PED began phasing in the IDEA-funded programs in the Fall 2015. Challenges included lack of sufficient numbers of qualified consultants, particularly in rural areas of the State. The geographic size of New Mexico limited caseloads for consultants due to extensive travel. In addition, the *Full Participation Institute* held in December 2015 targeted IDEA-funded preschool programs to increase participation. If sufficient numbers of consultants were available to meet the needs of all IDEA, Part B, Section 619 programs, the budget would not cover the cost.

CYFD has developed several strategies to recruit, support and coordinate participation of Head Start and Early Head Start programs in the FOCUS Pilot process. Some of the strategies include ongoing conversations with the Office of Head Start to ensure that there are no conflicts within the criteria or processes that may contradict program's requirements. In addition, the role of the CYFD Head Start Collaboration Office has been enhanced to support programs in their participation in State's initiatives including FOCUS.

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

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

Child Trends has been conducting a rigorous validation process of New Mexico FOCUS TQRIS, including:

- Continue testing and revising as necessary the use of the program self-assessment tool with programs who participate in the FOCUS pilot phase.
- Test whether the FOCUS TQRIS criteria at each level reflects differentiated child outcomes and ensures a reasonable level of confidence with the rating elements and process.
- Using data collected from participating programs, determine causal effects of higher ratings on child

outcomes.

- Develop a statewide inter-rater reliability plan and process for determining an accurate rating of programs at each level.
- Establish inter-rater reliability and make revisions as necessary.
- Establish a methodology for the evaluation of FOCUS to determine if it is actually working.
- Develop a professional development plan along with a cost estimate to ensure that New Mexico develops the staff capacity to continue the various elements detailed above.
- Finalize and validate the program self-assessment tool and process.
- Complete and validate a final revision of the FOCUS criteria in preparation for statewide implementation of FOCUS TQRIS.
- Establish a data collection protocol and dataset for the ongoing assessment and validation of the FOCUS TQRIS for ongoing validation, evaluation and continuous quality improvement.

PED is part of the current contract with Child Trends to conduct the TQRIS validation study. PED has worked collaboratively with Child Trends to review the current draft criteria.

Recommendations from Child Trends are now being implemented in the revision and alignment with the “5 STAR” level. Child Trends has shared examples of other state's TQRIS to support revision to the differential levels of program quality in FOCUS. With Child Trend's guidance, we have engaged in the development of a TQRIS Logic Model to determine child and family outcomes in each of the FOCUS areas of quality. During this process, New Mexico is examining the elements of quality at each level and determining whether the specific criteria at each level supports progress in children's learning, development and school readiness and whether the criteria is tiered appropriately. It is anticipated that the results of the validation study of New Mexico's Authentic Observation Documentation and Curriculum-Planning Process conducted by Child Trends will impact the final revision of the FOCUS TQRIS Intentional Teaching section.

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

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

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

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

## Promoting Early Learning Outcomes

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

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

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

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

Early Learning Guidelines (ELG) training: Training sessions were offered for individuals working in early childhood programs interested in a more advanced, in-depth learning experience about the New Mexico Early Learning Guidelines and their use in the Authentic Observation Documentation and Curriculum Planning Process. As a precursor of this training series, educators were offered the NM FOCUS *Orientation and Introduction to Intentional Teaching* series (FOCUS 2+). The series consisted of:

- Initial two-day face-to-face session
- Two two-hour webinars
- Final one-day face-to-face session

Session topics included:

- Principles for the appropriate use of the NM Early Learning Guidelines
- Authentic observational assessment
- Criteria-based curriculum planning
- Intentional use of play and everyday/routine activities for learning
- Portfolio documentation
- Family engagement

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

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

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

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

Child Trends recruited 85 programs for the Authentic Observation Documentation and Curriculum Planning (AODCP) validation study. The study includes parent interviews, classroom observations and child assessment. An application was submitted for an Institutional Review Board (IRB) modification for the format of the FOCUS director survey and teacher incentives structure. The FOCUS director survey protocol has been finalized. Child Trends developed a plan for appropriately gathering preliminary portfolio and other data from teachers to help inform the development of the fidelity of implementation measurement tools for the AODCP validation study. Child Trends is in communication with West Ed to discuss the KEA study and any potential intersection with components of the AODCP validation study. Child Trends and CYFD have been in communication with the Office of Head Start (OHS). OHS was provided with an update on the AODCP validation study and checked-in on the proposed reporting outline to ensure the validation study is on track with the Head Start requirements.

One important TQRIS validation activity is to conduct a review of the empirical evidence and expert consensus supporting the quality standards. Child Trends shared the findings and recommendations for New Mexico based on an initial review of the FOCUS standards for center based early care and education programs, family child care homes and out of school time programs. Included in the reviews were multiple strategies to conduct this analysis, such as reviews of the research base, best practices in early care and education as outlined by national early childhood associations and experts, and current practices in other state TQRIS. As a result, FOCUS Criteria and Process is undergoing its initial revision to reflect recommendations from Child Trends and input provider by early childhood programs participating in the FOCUS Pilot Phase.

The Contract with Child Trends has been expanded to work on the validation process for the FOCUS-TQRIS Criteria for the following programs in the order listed below:

1. PED PreK
2. PED Title I
3. PED 619
4. DOH FIT
5. CYFD Home Visiting

Part of the validation process is to ensure that criteria listed in each program comprising the FOCUS-TQRIS process is aligned and reflective of the New Mexico Early Learning System.

### Health Promotion (Section C(3) of Application)

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

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

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

A collaborative effort has taken place with the Department of Health, Maternal Child Health, Family Health Bureau, for training of educators and administrators, as well as conducting developmental screenings in early childhood programs.

Training for consultants and trainers has taken place, related to the background, implementation and follow up of age and cultural appropriate screening tools for developmental and social-emotional development. This includes the referral follow up and inclusion process. In addition, a New Mexico early childhood Inclusion Guide for early childhood programs has been developed with plan for distribution in 2016.

With State funding, program enhancements have been identified including strategies to support programs in the implementation of the curriculum planning and providing funds for qualified floaters in the classroom.

**Performance Measure (C)(3)(d)**

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

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

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

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

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

Population screening for genetic, metabolic, and congenital hearing loss for all newborns with a target set at annual birth population, Children with special health needs who have been identified and are eligible for services through the State's Children's Medical Services. Children's Medical Services does not screen for children with special needs but receives referrals into the program through various sources and this number includes children from birth to age 21 years.

The New Mexico Newborn Screening is in the process of testing newborn babies for some serious, but treatable, conditions. NBS can include a heel stick, hearing screen, and pulse oximetry. The conditions that newborn babies are screened for varies by state. Program (NMNBSP) requires that all babies born in New Mexico receive screening for certain genetic, metabolic, hemoglobin and endocrine conditions. The New Mexico Newborn Screening Program offers screening for 27 conditions. The NMNBSP provides services to over 28,000 babies and their families annually. Currently the State of New Mexico mandates two newborn screens be collected on every newborn born in New Mexico. New Mexico Newborn Screening Program continues to partner with Mountain States Genetic Network and has also contracted with Oregon State Public Health.

Information for Year One is actual, Year Two is estimated as final numbers are still being collected. The number or percentage of children who are up-to-date in a schedule of well child care is not currently tracked.

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

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

[Empty box for target notes]

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

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

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

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

In FOCUS, full participation is addressed in four areas: 1) how families are engaged in the development and learning of their children (family engagement); 2) how inclusive practices are implemented for young children with developmental delays and disabilities; 3) how the cultures and languages of each child, including young dual language learners (DLLs), are reflected and supported (culture and language including Dual Language Learners (DLLs)); and 4) how focused attention is paid to promoting social relationships.

**FOCUS Vision for Quality Practices in Family Engagement:** Programs and practitioners have a family-centered philosophy that welcomes and actively seeks the participation and input of families on a regular basis to benefit children's learning and development. The family-centered philosophy is responsive to the cultural and linguistic characteristics of the family and is used to inform the program and practitioner about areas of continuous quality improvement.

## Early Childhood Education Workforce

### Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and progression of credentials.

(Section D(1) of Application)

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

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

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

#### **Higher Education**

The New Mexico Early Childhood Higher Education Task Force has historically served to develop an aligned system of professional development and education for those providing early care and education services. Based on a Practicum Work Group's recommendations adopted by the Task Force in November 2015, the Task Force is creating a work group focused on improving the quality of the early childhood teacher preparation field experiences.

Specifically, this subcommittee will research and make recommendations to the Task Force addressing three components of the field experience:

##### *1. A process for preparing and certifying "professional mentor teachers;"*

- What is the current state of practice in New Mexico for placing practicum students with cooperating teachers?
- What are best practices for student teacher placement and preparation of cooperating/ mentoring teachers?
- How do others offer this preparation and what are the options for New Mexico (i.e. traditional or online college coursework, etc.)?
- How might the state develop a tiered system to allow for placement at sites/ classrooms without a certified mentor teacher?

##### *2. Economic incentives to support the field experience components for cooperating/ mentor teachers as well as for practicum students; and*

- What is the current state of practice in New Mexico for providing economic incentives (stipends) to practicum students and/or cooperating teachers?
- What are best practices for providing economic incentives (stipends) to practicum students and/or cooperating teachers?
- Who should receive stipends, in what amount and for doing what?
- What are options for sources of funds and mechanics for dissemination?

##### *3. Clinical supervision*

- What is the current state of practice in New Mexico for clinical supervision of practicum students, including training for faculty supervisors?
- What are best practices for clinical supervision of practicum students, including training for faculty supervisors?
- What documentation do New Mexico's four-year institutions require and prefer from the two-year institutions regarding field experiences?

Beginning March 2016, the work group will include educators from two- and four-year higher education institutions and will regularly brief the Task Force and receive feedback. The work group will meet in person, by phone and online during the late spring and early summer to create a report with recommendations to the Task Force by September 2016.

### **NM Pyramid Partnership for Social-Emotional Competences**

The New Mexico Pyramid Partnership designed and has been offering a unique training opportunity for early childhood practitioner regarding promoting children's social emotional competence and preventing and addressing challenging behaviors. The materials that have been used for this training are based on the CSEFEL (Center on the Social & Emotional Foundations for Early Learning) and in direct response to suggestions from program administrators, T/TA providers, early educators, and family members about the types and content of training that would be most useful in addressing the social emotional needs of young children.

The content of the training reflects a commitment to promoting social emotional development in all young children but recognizes the need for more intensive interventions when children have significant social emotional needs and challenging behavior.

The NM Pyramid Partnership roll out of Train the Trainers first began the Spring/Fall 2015 throughout New Mexico. To date, over 350 participants statewide have been trained. In our efforts to expand and sustain NM Pyramid Partnership, the leadership team is exploring the Coaching/Mentoring aspects to support the continuation of the social/emotional development of children in the State, while providing a cross-sector approach for success (PreK, Home Visiting, Child Care, early intervention, preschool special education, Head Start).

The NM Pyramid Leadership team completed the scoring process of the State Benchmarks of Quality from CSEFEL and we will continue to work on the State Action Plan to identify specific tasks for workgroups and focus areas for the upcoming year.

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

(Section D(2) of Application)

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

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

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

### **Scholarships T.E.A.C.H.**

The Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge grant has greatly boosted the involvement of early childhood educators of children ages birth to 5 in seeking degrees in early childhood education at the Associates, Bachelors, Masters and Ph.D. levels. The diversity of the early childhood educators eligible for T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood® Scholarships has been expanded due to the grant and now includes home visitors, early interventionists, parent educators, FOCUS Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System consultants, consultants in NM PreK, child care licensing staff, early childhood special education preschool teachers, and community college faculty in early childhood.

With the RTT-ELC support, the number of T.E.A.C.H. scholars, all of whom are all already working with young children, their parents or their teachers, has grown in just the past year from 652 scholars in Fiscal Year 2014 to 1,000 scholars in Fiscal Year 2015, a 53% increase. The number of credit hours of coursework completed grew from 5,229 to 6,649, a 27% increase. (Grades are still coming in for Spring and Summer terms, with some students starting partway through the year, so credit hours will increase.)

T.E.A.C.H. is fulfilling the main objectives of the Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge Grant via the

following:

- **PHD COHORT:** A cohort of 13 PhD students has completed four semesters of work in early childhood and is on track to complete coursework by the Summer 2018 through New Mexico State University, using a specially designed curriculum.
- **MASTER'S COHORT:** A cohort of seven people has completed five semesters of work toward a Master's in Early Childhood Education from Erikson Institute in Chicago, IL.
- **WIDER ELIGIBILITY:** About 80 students, who would not have been eligible for T.E.A.C.H. scholarships before Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge, are enrolled in early childhood classes. They include early interventionists, home visitors, public school special education and Title 1 assistant teachers, NM PreK, TTAP and FOCUS consultants, community college faculty in early childhood, and others.
- **SCHOLARSHIP AVAILABILITY:** T.E.A.C.H. used Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge funding to continue to add early educators to its rolls – 280 in all. The educators, in most cases, work in early care and education programs involved with FOCUS or getting ready to be involved with FOCUS. T.E.A.C.H. was able to continue to offer scholarships until August 1, 2015, when a waiting list was started due to the high number of scholarship requests. As of August 18, when the report was written, the wait list consisted of 42 early educators. T.E.A.C.H. is requesting more funding from the NM Children, Youth & Families Department (CYFD).
- **SPECIAL OUTREACH:** T.E.A.C.H. has reached out to early educators who are not typical college students. The scholarship program has helped set up and support Spanish language early childhood classes at Central NM Community College in Albuquerque and Doña Ana Community College in Las Cruces. The programs have been very successful in attracting and keeping students in college. The 1,000 T.E.A.C.H. scholars are 61% Hispanic, 24% White, 11% Native American, 2% Black, 1% Asian and 1% Multi-Racial.
- **INVESTMENT ZONE EFFORTS:** The scholarship program has also expanded participation rates in areas that CYFD has identified as Investment Zones, where children are especially in need of extra support.
- **COHORTS FOR ADVANCED DEGREES:** The cohort of 13 people working on a special PhD in early childhood education developed for Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge by New Mexico State University is progressing toward its degrees. The cohort has completed four semesters of PhD work and is on track to complete coursework by Summer 2016. Participants say that the course work is having a major and positive effect on their work. All cohort members are early childhood program directors, teachers, college instructors, home visiting coordinators or consultants. A Master's cohort, taking classes on-line through Erikson Institute in Chicago, IL, has been supported with RTT-ELC funds. Seven educators have completed five semesters of work toward the Master's and will complete the program in Spring 2016.

### **Training and Consultation Competencies**

A contract with Global Learning Partners, Inc. (GLP) has been developed for the implementation of a training and consultation model based on the assessment and dialogue received. An Advisory Group has been formed. This group of six (6) experienced New Mexico Early Childhood Services trainers and consultants will work with and advise Global Learning Partners throughout the length of the project. The group will:

Identify Key Trainers and Consultants to participate in the Initial Pilot of the customized courses. The Advisory Team, in collaboration with GLP consultants, will be strategic in inviting course participants who possess high quality competency in training others and are in a position help to assess the Trainer and Consultant Model(s) and related competencies.

GLP and the advisory group will establish High Level Training for Trainers and for Consultants based upon the agreed upon competencies in the early childhood field as identified in Phase I. GLP will lead this training system development project in consultation with the Advisory Group and, early on, will determine if there needs to be two different foundational courses – one for Trainers and one for Consultants – or, whether the courses designed and offered can be customized to meet the needs of both Trainers and Consultants in the same course or if two separate courses will be needed. Customization of course(s) would draw upon a developed, flexible and widely tested GLP approach to adult learning called Dialogue Education as well as the results of Phase 1 discoveries.

### **Other State Initiatives to support workforce development and retention**

With State General Funds, a contract was developed with the New Mexico Association for Education of Young Children (NMAEYC) for the implementation of New Mexico INCENTIVES Program per the following guidelines:

Provide INCENTIVES Early Childhood pay supplements to early childhood educators who:

- Are employed by a licensed or registered child care program or Head Start or Early Head Start in New Mexico

or are assistant teachers in NM PreK-funded classrooms in public schools.

- Meet minimum educational requirements – 5 credit hours of early childhood education classes or 70 semester hours of well-rounded coursework.

- Earn less than a certain hourly wage to be decided by INCENTIVES and the Children, Youth and Families Department (CYFD). Currently, the participants must earn less than \$16 an hour.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Actuals**

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

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

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

The data is actual as reported by the Office of Child Development database that includes the 45-hour Entry Level Course, the New Mexico Child Development Certificate, the Associate Certificates tracking system, and by institutions of Higher Education (The number of degrees awarded).

**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.

For the Bachelor's target, this was not met in terms of quantity. Educators were moving through the system to obtain their Child Development Certificate, moving towards the Associate certification. The goal is that educators continue progress so they can reach their goal to achieve their Bachelor's in early childhood education. New Mexico has entered a contract with New Mexico Association for the Education of Young Children (NMAEYC) to provide T.E.A.C.H.® Scholarships to enhance current state efforts on supporting the early childhood professional development. RTT-ELC funds are being used to increase scholarships to those whom T.E.A.C.H. scholarships were previously unavailable, including early interventionists, college faculty, mentor/trainers, parent educators and home visitors. As traditionally done, T.E.A.C.H. scholarships are offered to early care and education teachers and directors of early learning programs. Scholarships are also used to provide for a cohort of New Mexico students to obtain a Masters degree in early childhood education from Erikson Institute in Chicago, IL.

## Measuring Outcomes and Progress

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

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

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

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

#### **Validity and Reliability**

The KOT was developed following a validation study by WestEd on the current PreK Observational Assessment. With guidance from the PED, WestEd published a Validation Report titled "Report on the Development of the New Mexico Kindergarten Observation Tool" on March 1, 2015. This report presents findings from a set of research activities focused on validating New Mexico's Pre-Kindergarten Observational Assessment Tools (PreK Tools) for use as a kindergarten entry assessment (KEA). At the request of the New Mexico Public Education Department (PED), WestEd researchers engaged in these activities to collect evidence about the validity, reliability, fairness, and feasibility of the PreK Tools for use at the kindergarten level and the degree to which these tools meet the guidelines for responsible early childhood assessment established by the National Research Council (NRC), the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), and the National Association of Early Childhood Specialists in State Departments of Education (NAECS/SDE).

The research activities described in this report include the following: (1) a preliminary survey of a small sample of New Mexico teachers; (2) review of existing documentation about the PreK Tools; (3) pre-pilot modifications to the PreK Tools based on expert judgment; (4) pilot testing of the KOT; and (5) post-pilot focus group discussions. Additional feedback methods, including surveys and focus groups, have been implemented following the Field Test to further inform improvements made to the KOT.

The various research projects and data analyses the KOT is currently undergoing by WestEd and SEDL will further inform the steps taken and plan to be taken to ensure the KOT is valid, reliable and fair. Additional projects, like standard setting and defining readiness, have been discussed and are planned to be implemented following a contract amendment.

#### **Domain Coverage**

WestEd began by completing a set of 30 rubric revisions/extensions of the PreK Observational Assessment essential indicators to more fully align with Common Core State Standards for use in the pilot KOT. WestEd also

incorporated design elements to align with authentic observational assessment protocol that was informed by their research and aligned to the National Research Council's recommendations for assessment in early childhood education. Final pilot KOT rubric language was approved by the Public Education Department in October 2014. The approved pilot KOT rubrics fully encompassed all the Essential Domains of School Readiness.

A proportion breakdown of the KOT domains includes:

- 3 Physical Development, Health and Well-Being Indicators (9%)
- 10 Literacy Indicators (31%)
- 4 Numeracy Indicators (13%)
- 1 Aesthetic Creativity Indicator (3%)
- 3 Scientific Conceptual Understanding Indicators (9%)
- 7 Self, Family and Community Indicators (22%)
- 4 Approaches to Learning Indicators (13%)

Following the pilot test, revisions to the rubric language were made with additional rubrics created and some dropped from inclusion in the KOT. The number of indicators included were reduced from 30 to 24 to both better align to children's skills and knowledge that should be measured upon kindergarten entry and to increase the feasibility for teachers in administering the KOT in the first 30 instructional days. A proportion breakdown of the KOT domains includes:

- 2 Physical Development, Health and Well-Being Indicators (8%)
- 10 Literacy Indicators (38%)
- 5 Numeracy Indicators (19%)
- 0 Aesthetic Creativity Indicators (0%)
- 2 Scientific Conceptual Understanding Indicators (8%)
- 5 Self, Family and Community Indicators (19%)
- 2 Approaches to Learning Indicators (8%)

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.

#### **Timing for the Administration of the KOT**

The Pilot phase was conducted from November 23, 2014 to January 23, 2015. Forty teachers participated in the Pilot. Teachers were asked to complete 10 observational rubrics on at least five students representative of the diversity in their classroom. Teachers then completed two surveys to provide information about the professional development, rubric language and structure, and the administration process. This information was analyzed to identify key findings and suggestions for revisions to the KOT.

The Field Test phase was completed on October 15, 2015. Participation included 331 teachers representing 39 districts and 7 charters submitting final ratings. Teachers administered the KOT with their entire classroom roster and used the KOTA to submit their observations. Final statistics for the Field Test include:

- Children with observations: 5,597
- Children with Final Ratings: 5,254
- Teachers with Observations: 351
- Teachers with Final Ratings: 338
- School sites with Observations: 115
- Total Observations: 155,133
- Number of Final Ratings: 132,944

Fewer final ratings than observations conducted were noted due to the following factors:

- Teachers beginning and not continuing participation in the pilot
- Teachers thought they submitted final ratings, but did not complete final step in the process to "submit"
- Technology issues

Teachers completed surveys to offer their feedback regarding the professional development, rubric language and structure, technology, and the KOT administration process. This information has been reviewed and

informed additional changes to the KOT for the full implementation in the Fall 2016.

The Full Implementation phase will be completed from June-October 15, 2016 with all districts and public charters with kindergarten classrooms participating. Timelines have been set for training, including a new round of KOT Train the Trainer and KOT teacher training sessions. Teachers will administer the KOT to all kindergarten students within the first 30 instructional days and submit their data via the KOTA v2.0 by October 15, 2016.

Forty-seven school districts offer the K-3 Plus program in 235 schools. The K-3 Plus program provides a 25-day early start of the school year for students in kindergarten through grade three in eligible schools. Based upon feedback from the K-3 Plus Advisory Committee and several districts implementing the K-3 Plus program, the KOT will be administered at the beginning of the K-3 Plus program in order to accurately measure students' knowledge and abilities upon kindergarten entry.

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

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

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

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

In early 2015, the NM Public Education Department (PED) staff funded by the Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge grant made a decision to implement a key project, the Kindergarten Entry Assessment, in house. The decision was based on the commitment to deliver a Kindergarten Observation Tool (KOT) for field testing in the fall of 2015. The field test was successful. An enhanced version of the KOT will be used by K3 Plus kindergarten classes in the Summer 2016 and by all regular kindergarten classes in the Fall 2016. The KOT data can be matched with the PED's Student Teacher Accountability Reporting System (STARS) kindergarten students and will be an integral part of the Early Childhood Integrated Data System (ECIDS).

The decision to implement the KOT in house led to a second decision to work with a vendor to deliver the ECIDS project. A Request for Proposal to build the ECIDS was released in September 2015. Contract negotiations with the selected vendor began in December 2015, and the vendor is expected to begin work in February 2016. In November 2015, a contracted Project Manager for the Data System was brought on board to coordinate the collaboration of the vendor with the three key agencies tasked with building the ECIDS: CYFD, DOH and PED.

Work on the ECIDS continued throughout 2015. The first round of mapping CYFD EPIC's, DOH FITKids and PED's STARS data system elements to CEDS v4 had been completed. CEDS v5 was released in January 2015. The consensus was to incorporate the changes from CEDS v4 to v5 into our system, necessitating a revision of all database diagrams and spreadsheets with new tables and fields, renamed elements and degraded elements. The PED RTTT staff created an ECIDS SQL Server database based on the CEDS v5 structure that includes only the relevant tables and fields for our purpose. New physical and logical database diagrams and an ECIDS data dictionary were uploaded to the RTTT Sharepoint Teamsite.

Business requirements for the ECIDS continued to be collected. In May 2015, the agencies responded to a questionnaire regarding their data systems' timing of uploads, data transfer methods and security models. In July 2015, the agencies provided information on their data systems' platforms, connection methods, reporting methods and user computers. The compiled documents are available on the RTTT Sharepoint Teamsite.

Finally, in October 2015, key members of NM's RTTT group attended a two day Strategic Planning Session with

Corey Chatis of Chatis Consulting. A list of the Next Steps from the two-day session included:

#### Day 1

- Establish Data Policy Committee
  - Confirm members
  - Detail responsibilities
  - Review and update data governance manual to reflect reality
- Revise and refine value proposition, policy priorities, and highest priority user roles for ECIDS
- Continue crafting key questions the ECIDS should address, by user role
- Begin stakeholder engagement plan for 1st and 2nd priority user roles
- Begin engaging Head Start and Tribal providers to discuss their potential participation in ECIDS

#### Day 2

- Establish the ECIDS project manager as the data governance coordinator
- Executive leadership needs to convene, review, and approve the data governance committee roster proposed by the implementation team and communicate to designated members their role
- Revisit the data governance manual and revise to reflect the current plan
- Establish the initial meeting frequency of the data management committee and begin meeting
- Determine the exact scope of data elements that will be contributed to the ECIDS from each agency
- Determine the definition, format, option/code sets, business rules for each data element that will be contributed to the ECIDS, including the master source of record for common elements contributed by more than one agency/program
- In collaboration with executive leadership, establish a communications plan and materials for the high priority user roles of ECIDS and the agency source systems to define the distinct purpose/value of each
- Determine who and how user training on ECIDS will be provide – especially for high priority external users such as program providers
- Determine how change management will be implemented, e.g., Change Control Board
- Establish sustainability plan, including ongoing funding, staffing, knowledge transfer from vendor, user support, etc.

## 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).

<b>Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income<sup>1</sup> families, by age</b>		
	<b>Number of children from Low-Income families in the State</b>	<b>Children from Low-Income families as a percentage of all children in the State</b>
<b>Infants under age 1</b>	17,465	56.93%
<b>Toddlers ages 1 through 2</b>	34,937	56.93%
<b>Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry</b>	52,162	56.93%
<b>Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families</b>	104,564	56.93%

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

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

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

The percentage of children age 0 through 6 that were under 200% of the poverty level (59.63%) was calculated from Table B17024 from the U.S. Census Bureau, 5-Year, 2014 American Community Survey. That percentage was then applied to the University of New Mexico, Geospatial and Population Studies Program estimated 2014 number of children in each age group.

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

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

Special populations: Children who	Number of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who...	Percentage of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who...
Have disabilities or developmental delays <sup>1</sup>	9,634	5%
Are English learners <sup>2</sup>	54,483	31.3%
Reside on "Indian Lands"	13,489	7.69%
Are migrant <sup>3</sup>	241	0.03%
Are homeless <sup>4</sup>	6,400	3.9%
Are in foster care	844	0.45%
Other 1 as identified by the State	2,274	8.8%
<i>Describe:</i>	Infants Who Were Low and Very Low Weight at Birth	
Other 2 as identified by the State		
<i>Describe:</i>		

<sup>1</sup>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).

<sup>2</sup>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.

<sup>3</sup>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).

<sup>4</sup>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**

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

English Learners source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, American Community Survey, 2013 1-year estimates, Table B16007, Age by Language Spoken at Home for the Population 5 years and over, downloaded from <http://factfinder.census.gov> on 1-29-2015.

In 2013, there were an estimated 31.3% of children age 5-17 who spoke languages other than English at home, 68.7% spoke only English. Data for children under age 5 were not available. 31.3% of all children birth to kindergarten equals  $.313 \times 174,846 = 54,643$ .

Indian Lands: The total estimated 2010 New Mexico population living in U.S. Census "Tribal Areas" was 13,384. The rate of growth in this age group statewide was very small from 2010 to 2013 (0.16% annual growth rate), so the 2010 census estimate was used without adjusting for population growth.

Low Birth Weight: From 2009-2013, 8.7% of live births were low or very low weight at birth. (Source: New Mexico Department of Health, Bureau of Vital Records and Statistics)

**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.

<b>Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age</b>				
<b>Type of Early Learning and Development Program</b>	<b>Infants under age 1</b>	<b>Toddlers ages 1 through 2</b>	<b>Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>State-funded preschool</b>	0	0	0	4,847
<i>Specify:</i>	CYFD/PED State funded PreK child counts for the identified investment zones.			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	UNM Continuing Education PreK database December 2014			
<b>Early Head Start and Head Start<sup>1</sup></b>	612	1,217	7,448	9,155
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	Program Information Report 2013			
<b>Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619</b>	2,377	10,833	4,494	9,634
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	New Mexico FIT KIDS and PED Data - Dec 1st 2013 Count			
<b>Programs funded under Title I of ESEA</b>	0	530	6,530	7,060
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	PED STARS Data 2014-2015			
<b>Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program</b>	187	826	946	1,959
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	CYFD Child Care Assist. Family Automated Client Tracking System December 2014			
<b>Other 1</b>	1,185	771	104	2,060
<i>Specify:</i>	CYFD Home Visiting Program Children Served in identified investment zones.			
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>	2014 UNM Continuing Education HV database			
<b>Other 2</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
<b>Other 3</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
<b>Other 4</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
<b>Other 5</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				
<b>Other 6</b>				
<i>Specify:</i>				
<i>Data Source and Year:</i>				

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

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

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

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

Title 1 numbers are unduplicated counts; the number of children shown here are not also participating in NM PreK programs. The previous year count included children also served by NM PreK programs that supplement their PreK funding with Title 1 funds. For CCDF and Home Visiting programs, the reported numbers of children with high needs are based on the identified New Mexico Early Childhood Investment Zones.

The PreK Program is dually administered by CYFD and PED. In this section of this APR, both Departments reported their numbers under the State Funded Preschool category.

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

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

Number of Children							
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	Number of Hispanic Children	Number of Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Asian Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Black or African American	Number of Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Children	Number of Non-Hispanic Children of Two or more races	Number of Non-Hispanic White Children
State-funded preschool	5,334	1,220	124	0	0	0	2,263
<i>Specify:</i>	Includes CYFD and PED PreK Programs						
Early Head Start and Head Start <sup>1</sup>	5,401	1,465	137	91	137	92	1,832
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	8,715	1,075	91	80	14	229	2,732
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	2,378	476	31	80	5	62	1,112
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	4,613	1,250	54	107	6	132	1,510
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	13,263	1,093	81	622	34	0	2,770
Other 1	1,956	331	42	56	0	38	453
<i>Describe:</i>	CYFD Home Visiting Program						
Other 2							
<i>Describe:</i>							

<sup>1</sup> Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.

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

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

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

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

The PreK Program is dually administered by CYFD and the PED. In this section of this APR, both Departments reported their numbers under the State Funded Preschool category.

The Head Start and Early Head Start data obtained from the State's Program Information Report includes children under 3 (Early Head Start, Migrant and Seasonal Head Start Infant and Toddler participation) and Head Start preschoolers. The information also includes Migrant, Seasonal and Tribal Head Start within New Mexico.

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

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

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

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

**Funding for each Fiscal Year**

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

<sup>1</sup> Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.

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

<sup>3</sup> 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.

TANF Funds are distributed as follows:

- \$3,050,000 allocated to support CYFD Community based PreK Program
- \$1,000,000 allocated to support the New Mexico Home Visiting Program

**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.

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

<sup>1</sup> Include all Children with High Needs served with both Federal dollars and State supplemental dollars.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

For PreK, CCDF and Home Visiting programs, children with high needs reported are based on the identified New Mexico Early Childhood Investment Zones. The PreK Program is dually administered by CYFD and the PED. For this section of this APR, both Departments reported their numbers under the State Funded Preschool category.

The Head Start and Early Head Start data obtained from the PIR includes children under three (Early Head Start, Migrant, and Seasonal Head Start Infant and Toddler participation) and Head Start preschoolers. The information also includes Migrant, Seasonal and Tribal Head Start within New Mexico.

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

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

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

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

Enter text to explain or clarify information as needed.

The *New Mexico Early Learning Guidelines* and the FOCUS provide:  
 Common Early Learning Standards, standardized criteria for a common, authentic, observation documentation curriculum-planning process.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Child Trends was contracted to validate the New Mexico Comprehensive Assessment: Authentic Observation Documentation and Curriculum Planning (AODCP). The plan includes parent interviews, winter classroom observations and child assessment. An application was submitted for an IRB modification for the format of the FOCUS director survey and teacher incentives structure. The FOCUS director survey protocol has been finalized. Child Trends developed a plan for appropriately gathering preliminary portfolio and other data from teachers to help inform the development of the fidelity of implementation measurement tools for the AODCP validation study which is scheduled to conclude in 2016.

For IDEA, Part B, section 619 and Title 1 programs, New Mexico will phase in the use of *Measures of Environmental Quality* and *Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions (ECERS-Rand E OR ECERS-3)* beginning Summer 2016.

## Budget and Expenditures

### Budget Summary Table Narrative

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

New Mexico has increased their spending rate by 50% from year 2 to year 3 comparatively.

The projects are being implemented, and funds are being spent, although not necessarily at the originally estimated timelines. There are no concerns about our ability to complete the grant activities and spend the remaining funds.

Budget figures often do not reflect actual or obligated spending as there can be delays between obligation, expenditure, and accounting. A significant number of projects are administered by other state agencies and community partners. Invoicing periods vary by entity, and there can be a delay before invoices reach the Lead Financial agency (PED).

### Budget Summary Table Explanation of Changes

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

We do not anticipate any significant changes to the 2016 budget. Funds unspent in 2015 will be used for the activities that are deemed high priority in 2016. If necessary, the team will solicit approval through the established budget amendment process. Underspent funds may need to be assigned to additional activities.

## Project Budget 1

**Project Name: Grants Management**

---

### Project Budget Narrative

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

Total Budget for Project Year 3: \$592,810.00

Actual Expenditures for Project Year 3: \$331,829.74

The Public Education Department (PED) hired the Race to the Top Project Manager and a Communications Manager which helped increase expenditures in the Grants Management area. Also, the technical assistance needs were identified and we moved forward in contracting for the data Project, Kindergarten Readiness Assessment, and training/travel relevant to the RTT-ELC projects.

The Training and Technical Assistance budget was not spent as planned. Training and Technical Assistance has been accessed at little or no cost to the grant. The RTT-ELC Team continues to evaluate training needs and will be accessing these resources as needed.

### Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

There are no major changes in the State RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year. Funds from the last year (year three) will be reallocated within originally budgeted categories and redistributed within the remaining one year of the grant.

The Communications plan identifies an RFP for a communications and marketing firm to carry out the task of establishing a comprehensive-aligned outreach process for the New Mexico Early Learning System. The RFP will be carried out during the month of February and the contract is scheduled to be in place by April 2016.

## Project Budget 2

**Project Name:** Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System

---

### Project Budget Narrative

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

Total Budget for Project Year 3: \$10,170,444.00

Actual Expenditures for Project Year 3: \$6,797,324.37

TQRIS continues to move forward for the Cross Sector team, this being the last phase of the project. There are still several items that need to be implemented originating from the implementation phase, such as updates in the validation process, training and consultation competencies, quality grants, full participation of each child, and the TQRIS Cross-Sector Logic Model. Some of these projects begun last calendar year but will need to carry forward to this year for completion.

The work of the Family Infant Toddler (FIT) Program TQRIS is moving ahead with the development of the criteria and we are beginning the pilot for one of the quality elements. Expenditures are on track to fully utilize funding for the current fiscal year.

We have used less of our consultant budget than anticipated to date as it has been difficult to find qualified consultants with both early childhood and special education expertise. We have recently hired additional consultants with this experience and anticipate that we will be able to expend the budgeted funds by the end of the grant period.

### Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

There are no major changes in the budget, however, in addition to the ongoing project for 2016, the implementation of major projects not completed last year will carry forward to this year.

Some of the projects include:

Continuing implementation of essential elements across the early childhood system

Implementation of the Validation Process

Implementation of Quality Grants

Implementation of Training and Consultation Competencies Model

Updates of the Early Learning Guidelines - Public Input, Design, Printing, Training, etc.

At this point, the TQRIS project is only looking at moving the funding forward for completion during the remaining of State Fiscal Year 2016 and State Fiscal Year 2017.

### **Project Budget 3**

**Project Name:** Early Childhood Investment Zones

---

#### **Project Budget Narrative**

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

Total Budget for Project Year 3: \$177,000.00  
Actual Expenditures for Project Year 3: \$89,703.39

The Early Childhood Investment Zones project did not have major discrepancies in the budget. However, some of the expenditures were low due to the implementation of the Leadership Project starting in March.

#### **Project Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

It is projected that ECIZ will continue on track and the expenditures not used the previous year will move forward to conclude State Fiscal Year 2016 and State Fiscal Year 2017.

## **Project Budget 4**

**Project Name: Workforce Development**

---

### **Project Budget Narrative**

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

Total Budget for Project Year 3: \$652,246.00  
Actual Expenditures for Project Year 3: \$896,177.20

The Workforce Development project has been overspent but will adjust budget accordingly for year 4. A waiting list has been developed to address the needs of the demand that has been caused by the implementation of FOCUS.

### **Project Budget Explanation of Changes**

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

If budget allows, the RTT-ELC team will explore the possibility of adding more funds into this project to address the waiting list.

## Project Budget 5

### Project Name: Early Childhood Data

---

#### Project Budget Narrative

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

Total Budget for Project Year 3: \$3,514,451.00

Actual Expenditures for Project Year 3: \$2,080,933.40

The work of the Family Infant Toddler (FIT) Program regarding the Early Childhood Integrated Data System will begin in year 4 and will align with the work conducted in building the data warehouse by PED.

Through the grant, New Mexico is well underway with promoting accountability by developing a data system that integrates data from across early learning programs serving young children to measure child outcomes over time and to enable planning for early learning investments. A Request for Proposal for the creation of a unique identifier and the architecture that allows the information systems within PED, CYFD and DOH to match data and communicate with one another was released on September 18, 2015. New Mexico's ECIDS development vendor was selected with contract negotiations underway in December 2015.

#### Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

The State Leadership Team will be working with the RTT-ELC Project Officers from US Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and the US Department of Education (DOE) to determine changes to the RTT-ELC budget in the upcoming year. Unused funds in categories for the Data Project are projected to be reallocated to contractual category during the remaining year of the grant.

## Project Budget 6

### Project Name: Kindergarten Entry Assessment

---

#### Project Budget Narrative

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

Total Budget for Project Year 3: \$584,670.00

Actual Expenditures for Project Year 3: \$416,755.80

With the KEA field test taking place in Fall 2015, the majority of the remaining funds for this project will be expended in Year Four of the grant as we will be training 1,200 teachers, administrators, and coaches on the KEA administration. The teachers participating in the field test will require a refresher training prior to the full implementation in Fall 2016 to be apprised of adjustments to the KEA based upon field test data. The Public Education Department (PED) will be contracting with Regional Education Cooperative 5 and West Ed to expend the remaining RTT-ELC KEA funds for additional data analysis, revisions to the KEA professional development materials, additional KEA train the trainer sessions to expand capacity, as well as stipends and materials for additional training for teachers, administrators and coaches prior to full-scale launch of the KEA in Fall 2016.

The PED literacy director and literacy coordinator will expend the travel funds in Year 4 with the implementation of additional statewide training as well as implementation of the full launch of the KEA.

#### Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

A budget amendment will be requested to move the remaining funds in contracts not expended in Year 3 to contracts in Year 4, as well as travel dollars in order to complete the KEA work with full statewide implementation in Fall 2016 and to conduct the necessary data analyses and professional development.

Technical assistance funds will be expended in Year 4 to provide for increased communications and marketing as well as professional development content expertise.

## Project Budget 7

**Project Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

### Project Budget Narrative

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

THE NEW MEXICO RTT-ELC APPLICATION INCLUDED 6 PROJECTS.  
PAGES 78-100 HAVE BEEN DELETED.

### Project Budget Explanation of Changes

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

### RTT-ELC Budget Summary of Actual Expenditures

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Grant Year 3 (c)	Grant Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$24,796.00	\$285,532.00	\$448,629.54	\$0.00	\$758,957.54
2. Fringe Benefits	\$9,158.00	\$82,038.00	\$152,830.11	\$0.00	\$244,026.11
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$5,891.00	\$39,547.27	\$0.00	\$45,438.27
4. Equipment	\$50.00	\$27,208.00	\$23,168.60	\$0.00	\$50,426.60
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$19,577.00	\$10,359.68	\$0.00	\$29,936.68
6. Contractual	\$458,529.00	\$4,460,462.00	\$9,750,727.35	\$0.00	\$14,669,718.35
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$16,112.00	\$29,765.35	\$0.00	\$45,877.35
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$492,533.00	\$4,896,820.00	\$10,455,027.90	\$0.00	\$15,844,380.90
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$43,800.00	\$142,674.66	\$0.00	\$186,474.66
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$7,675.00	\$13,653.00	\$15,021.34	\$0.00	\$36,349.34
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$500,208.00	\$4,954,273.00	\$10,612,723.90	\$0.00	\$16,067,204.90
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$1,231,846.00	\$63,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,294,846.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$1,732,054.00	\$5,017,273.00	\$10,612,723.90	\$0.00	\$17,362,050.90

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.

**Actual Expenditures for Project 1 - Grant Management**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$4,029.00	\$36,268.00	\$91,204.88	\$0.00	\$131,501.88
2. Fringe Benefits	\$1,059.00	\$12,936.00	\$34,652.21	\$0.00	\$48,647.21
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$3,949.00	\$29,602.33	\$0.00	\$33,551.33
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$692.00	\$6,424.32	\$0.00	\$7,116.32
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$12,250.00	\$0.00	\$12,250.00
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$5,088.00	\$53,845.00	\$174,133.74	\$0.00	\$233,066.74
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$43,800.00	\$142,674.66	\$0.00	\$186,474.66
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$7,675.00	\$13,653.00	\$15,021.34	\$0.00	\$36,349.34
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$12,763.00	\$111,298.00	\$331,829.74	\$0.00	\$455,890.74
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$63,000.00	\$63,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$126,000.00
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$75,763.00	\$174,298.00	\$331,829.74	\$0.00	\$581,890.74

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.

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

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$13,714.00	\$53,222.40	\$0.00	\$66,936.40
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$1,870.00	\$18,857.84	\$0.00	\$20,727.84
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,076.12	\$0.00	\$5,076.12
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$676.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$676.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$18,885.00	\$3,159.21	\$0.00	\$22,044.21
6. Contractual	\$2,594.00	\$2,533,750.00	\$6,716,438.80	\$0.00	\$9,252,782.80
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$570.00	\$0.00	\$570.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$2,594.00	\$2,568,895.00	\$6,797,324.37	\$0.00	\$9,368,813.37
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$2,594.00	\$2,568,895.00	\$6,797,324.37	\$0.00	\$9,368,813.37
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$1,138,846.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,138,846.00
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$1,141,440.00	\$2,568,895.00	\$6,797,324.37	\$0.00	\$10,507,659.37

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Actual Expenditures for Project 3 - Early Childhood Investment Zones**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$76,521.00	\$89,703.39	\$0.00	\$166,224.39
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$76,521.00	\$89,703.39	\$0.00	\$166,224.39
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$76,521.00	\$89,703.39	\$0.00	\$166,224.39
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$15,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$15,000.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$15,000.00	\$76,521.00	\$89,703.39	\$0.00	\$181,224.39

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Actual Expenditures for Project 4 - Project 4 Name Professional Development**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$32,720.00	\$341,788.00	\$896,177.20	\$0.00	\$1,270,685.20
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)	\$32,720.00	\$341,788.00	\$896,177.20	\$0.00	\$1,270,685.20
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$32,720.00	\$341,788.00	\$896,177.20	\$0.00	\$1,270,685.20
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$15,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$15,000.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$47,720.00	\$341,788.00	\$896,177.20	\$0.00	\$1,285,685.20

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Actual Expenditures for Project 5 - Data System**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$20,767.00	\$235,550.00	\$304,202.26	\$0.00	\$560,519.26
2. Fringe Benefits	\$8,099.00	\$67,232.00	\$99,320.06	\$0.00	\$174,651.06
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$1,942.00	\$2,918.57	\$0.00	\$4,860.57
4. Equipment	\$50.00	\$26,532.00	\$23,168.60	\$0.00	\$49,750.60
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$776.15	\$0.00	\$776.15
6. Contractual	\$423,215.00	\$1,312,864.00	\$1,621,352.41	\$0.00	\$3,357,431.41
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$16,112.00	\$29,195.35	\$0.00	\$45,307.35
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$452,131.00	\$1,660,232.00	\$2,080,933.40	\$0.00	\$4,193,296.40
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. <b>Total Grant Funds Requested</b> (add lines 9-12)	\$452,131.00	\$1,660,232.00	\$2,080,933.40	\$0.00	\$4,193,296.40
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. <b>Total Statewide Budget</b> (add lines 13-14)	\$452,131.00	\$1,660,232.00	\$2,080,933.40	\$0.00	\$4,193,296.40

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.

**Actual Expenditures for Project 6 - Kindergarten Readiness Assessment**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Grant Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Grant Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Grant Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Grant Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,950.25	\$0.00	\$1,950.25
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Contractual	\$0.00	\$195,539.00	\$414,805.55	\$0.00	\$610,344.55
7. Training Stipends	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8. Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	\$0.00	\$195,539.00	\$416,755.80	\$0.00	\$612,294.80
10. Indirect Costs*	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
13. Total Grant Funds Requested (add lines 9-12)	\$0.00	\$195,539.00	\$416,755.80	\$0.00	\$612,294.80
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
15. Total Statewide Budget (add lines 13-14)	\$0.00	\$195,539.00	\$416,755.80	\$0.00	\$612,294.80

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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