2013 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

Maryland

Race to the Top
Early Learning Challenge

Race to the Top
Early Learning Challenge

Annual Performance Report

Maryland

2013

Table of Contents

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

APR Cover Sheet

General Information

1. PR/Award #: S412A120016

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

3. Grantee Address: 200 West Baltimore Street, Baltimore, MD, 21201

4. Project Director Name: Dr. Rolf Grafwallner

   Title: Assistant Superintendent for the Division of Early Childhood Development

   Phone #: (410) 767-0342   **Fax #:** (410) 333-6226

   Email Address: rgrafwal@msde.state.md.us

Reporting Period Information

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

Indirect Cost Information

6. Indirect Costs

   a. Are you claiming indirect costs under this grant? ☑ Yes ☐ No

   b. If yes, do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s) approved by the Federal Government? ☑ Yes ☐ No

   c. If yes, provide the following information:

      Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement(s):   07/01/2013 to 06/30/2014

      Approving Federal agency: ☑ ED ☐ HHS ☐ Other

Certification

The Grantee certifies that the State is currently participating in:

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

☑ Yes ☐ No

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

☑ Yes ☐ No

The Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) program

☑ Yes ☐ No

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

Signed by Authorized Representative

Name: Lillian M. Lowery, Ed.D.

Title: Maryland State Superintendent of Schools

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.

Maryland has received one of twenty Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge Fund Grant (RTT-ELC) award for a total of $50 million over four years. The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) has been designated as the lead agency to coordinate a multi-agency approach to submitting Maryland's state plan. The current Governor's State Advisory Council on Early Care and Education, working with the Division of Early Childhood Development (DECD) and the Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS) staff, implemented the ELC projects in years 1 and 2. This team will continue to supervise and monitor the progress of the ELC projects.

Maryland's application included 10 thematic projects, designed to improve the school readiness results from 81 percent in 2010 to 92 percent in 2015, the last year of the grant. In addition, it strives to reduce the readiness gap for low income children, English language learners, and young children with disabilities.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Both lead divisions, the Divisions of Early Childhood and Special Education/Early Intervention Services, have embarked on implementing the ten projects which are broken down into 698 specific tasks which have been outlined in Maryland's approved Scope of Work (SOW). As of December 2013, after 24 months of implementation, the majority of all tasks have been completed on time in accordance with the project plan.

In terms of project accountability, MSDE has closely monitored all ten projects by:

- Monitoring all subgrants using the monitoring instrument approved by USDE in 2012;
- Finalizing the Validation Study for Maryland EXCELS, the state's Quality Rating and Improvement System;
- Monitoring the Progress of Performance Measures, and providing technical assistance to subgrantees.

A detailed accounting of the progress for each of the ten projects is documented in GRADS, and all projects (except Raising a Reader which is beginning its year 1) are working toward meeting the second set of milestones and deliverables.

The major accomplishments are related to the RTT-ELC team's ability to solve problems regarding the two major anchors to Maryland's RTT-ELC plan:

- Completion of the TQRIS, i.e., Maryland EXCELS field test, and full implementation of the TQRIS.
- Completion of the pilot study and field test of the Kindergarten Entry Assessment - first phase of the Comprehensive Assessment System (CAS).

Maryland's TQRIS, known as Maryland EXCELS, was field tested from November, 2012 through May, 2013. Full statewide implementation began July 1, 2013. Participation in the system quickly grew from 330 programs to 1579 in the first six months, exceeding the target for total participation. Outreach to child care and early education programs serving high needs children is focused and prioritized, as is recruitment of accredited programs. Targeted and continuous outreach began in August, 2013 to programs receiving Child Care Subsidy. The group for which participation in TQRIS will be mandatory by 2015. Regional information sessions and peer support groups are forming statewide with collaboration and cooperation of the Resource and Referral Network and Quality Assurance Specialists.

The revision of the CAS, including the Kindergarten Assessment, is a joint project between the States of Ohio and Maryland. The states are joined by two partners - Johns Hopkins University - Center for Technology in Education and WestEd. The project has a number of procedural as well design challenges.

The initial procedural challenges, which were overcome, included the fund arrangements between the two states with Maryland being the fiscal agent for both states, the coordination of assessment development on an aggressive timetable, and the nature of collaboration between two states of different size, governance, and early childhood policies.

Although initial design challenges were rooted in the development of a new and innovative assessment system, once the governance structure of the project and the initial draft of the assessment framework were established the challenges became the validation of the system components and the development of the technology infrastructure to support the system components. Developing two different components of the system (Kindergarten Readiness Assessment and Formative Assessments) that would be linked through technology required MSDE to develop further tests of the system then was initially planned. These additional efforts required MSDE to adjust the development and implementation timeline slightly, but allowed for maintenance of the timeline for major project benchmarks, project deliverables, and the integrity of the project.

LESSONS LEARNED

Maryland entered the "Race" with all of its early care and education programs within the department of education. This has proven to be critical in proceeding with the development of the Scope of Work (SOW) and setting the infrastructure for the projects. Working from a consolidated governance structure reduced the level of effort in terms of getting organized at the state level, including the related administrative processes required to manage such a large project.

Maryland also benefitted from prior reform efforts in early childhood education and had the capacity to quickly move to the next level. The approved state plan built on the existing infrastructure which allowed for existing staff to begin the preliminary planning while the SOW still had to be worked out.

The management of the RTT-ELC had many "firsts" for Maryland. They are:

- Establishment of formally chartered local early childhood advisory councils, and the awarding of planning and implementation grants,
- Establishing a new infrastructure for continuous program improvement (i.e., Maryland EXCELS);
- Establishing a new model of capacity building (beyond the typical child care resource and referral work) through the Early Childhood Breakthrough Centers;
- Development of prekindergarten component of the Maryland College and Career Ready Standards (formerly known as Common Core standards), including research-based executive functioning standards;
- Collaboration with another state on developing a new comprehensive assessment system, and the piloting and field testing of the Kindergarten Entry Assessment;
- Formal mechanisms to coordinate early childhood services with pediatricians and family practitioners through the training of physicians on developmental screens and offering physicians early childhood mental health consultation;
- Creating a Maryland specific framework on family engagement; and
- Developing a comprehensive data system.

All these new developments are shaping the infrastructure of Maryland's early childhood education system significantly.

The RTT-ELC award raised the profile of early learning in Maryland. While MSDE had strong support from the state's legislature, other critical stakeholders expressed their support and interest in the projects, including the business and investment community. MSDE has been approached by a number of private investors to explore effective investment options in early childhood education programs. In addition, the legislature has responded by introducing legislation to establish the State Early Childhood Advisory Council in statute, and legislation to increase the number of PreK slots.

CHALLENGES

MSDE faced with two major challenge during the second year of implementation:

- Delays in hiring personnel because the positions were contractual;
- External changes affecting the timelines of specific projects.

Recruitment of candidates was hampered by MSDE's inability to hire for permanent state positions. All positions were only approved by the Governor as contractual positions for the duration of the grant. This arrangement led to delays and inopportune turnovers that delayed specific projects.

External changes impacted the implementation of three projects: (1) revising the early learning standards was delayed due to late approvals of science and social studies standards (Project 4); (2) new national research information and concurrent work outside of MSDE delayed the editing of the Guide to Early Childhood Pedagogy (Project 4); and (3) personnel changes with respect to the implementation of the developmental screening tasks (Project 7).

STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS CHALLENGES

The Early Learning Standards alignment document- Working Off the Same Page reflects the new Prekindergarten curriculum standards and frameworks in the areas that have been completed in the Division of Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability. It will be updated again when all of the content areas have been completed. The Guide to Early Childhood Pedagogy will complete the editing process and be published by summer 2014. A new staff person for the developmental screening project (7) will begin work full time in January 2014. Tasks for the project will continue under the new staff person's leadership.

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).

MANAGEMENT OF THE GRANT:

MSDE's Division of Early Childhood Development (DECD) is charged with managing all aspects of the RTT-ELC grant. The Governor's State Advisory Council on Early Care and Education is overseeing the implementation of the grant on behalf of the Maryland State Board of Education. DECD works closely with other divisions within MSDE as well as other agencies, namely the Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene and the Maryland Department of Human Resources. A breakdown of the grant's scope of collaboration for Year 2 is outlined in Attachment A.

GOVERNANCE:

In addition to the existing governance structure (Maryland RTT-ELC application, p. 74), the grant enabled the establishment of 24 local early childhood advisory councils (Project #1). The councils were established by the local county executives in collaboration with local school superintendents. Attachment B provides a breakdown of the governance structure for each of Maryland's RTT-ELC project.

The Annie E. Casey Foundation, Division of Strategic Planning, developed and delivered leadership training to local Early Childhood Advisory Councils through the RTT-ELC grant. The curriculum included modules on:

- Results-Based Accountability
- Results-Based Facilitation
- Strategic Planning (Cohort Training)

Up to five (5) members of each Council participated in the leadership training program. Local councils used the skills learned in these trainings to prepare planning and implementation grants that were results driven. DECD issued planning grants to each local council in spring 2013, and established a formula-driven allocation for each eligible jurisdiction after submission of an approved implementation plan. Implementation plans were submitted in December 2013, and awards were disbursed in January 2014.

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.

In order to support the implementation of the RTT-ELC, DECD established a broad-based involvement of stakeholders, i.e., subject matter experts, representing all constituency groups of early childhood education. Attachment B provides a listing of committees, councils, and workgroups by project.

The DECD communications plan ensures transparency and regular updates on the progress of the RTT-ELC implementation. The major communication tools are:

- Partners Newsletter (published quarterly) which is disseminated to 13,000 subscribers including licensed child care, nursery schools, public schools, Head Start, and policymakers.
- RTT-ELC Monthly Progress Reports are distributed to constituency groups and posted on the DECD website.
- DECD Website provides regular updates and project specific information.

In addition, periodic presentations were scheduled with major stakeholder groups, such as Maryland State Board of Education, Public School Superintendents' Association of Maryland, LEA Assistant Superintendents of Instruction, LEA Early Childhood Supervisors, LEA Local Accountability Coordinators, Maryland Head Start Association, Maryland State Child Care Association, Maryland Family Child Care Association, Maryland Association of the Education of Young Children, as well as various committees at the Maryland General Assembly.

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.

MSDE has proposed the following legislation to the Maryland General Assembly for Session 2014 which would directly impact the implementation of the RTT-ELC:

Task Force on Early Learning Teacher Education

This draft legislation was submitted as a departmental bill to the Governor for the legislative session of 2013. The Governor returned it with the instruction to have the Task Force established by the State Superintendent. The State Superintendent installed the Task Force in September 2013 (See Attachment C for Membership list and scope of work).

State Advisory Council on Early Care and Education

This draft legislation was submitted as a departmental bill to the Governor for the legislative session of 2013. The Governor returned it with the instruction to have the Governor issue an Executive Order. The bill has been resubmitted for the 2014 legislative session, and the Governor has it posted as an administration bill.

The Maryland Early Learning Challenge and School Readiness Act (Race to the Tots)

This draft legislation is scheduled to be posted in late January. It includes a fiscal note of $30 million for three years.

Improving School Readiness through Prekindergarten Act of 2014

The draft legislation has been introduced by the Governor for the 2014 legislative session. It provides for expansion of prekindergarten and the establishment of a Improving School Readiness through Prekindergarten Fund. The Governor has included $4.3 million in his FY2015 budget as a "down payment" toward multi-year, incremental funding increases and expansion of the program.

Participating State Agencies

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

No changes.

High-Quality, Accountable Programs

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The partnership with Johns Hopkins University, Center for Technology in Education (JHU/CTE) has continued through this reporting year. The field test of Maryland EXCELS TQRIS Program Standards began in November 2012 and continued through May 2013. The 330 programs in the field test represented center-based child care, family child care homes, public Pre-Kindergarten and school-age child care who volunteered to participate and test the online system. These programs provided valuable feedback by participating in surveys and focus groups held during and at the conclusion of the field test.

On July 1, 2013 Maryland EXCELS TQRIS opened for statewide participation. The number of programs participating grew from 330 to 1,579 from July 1, 2013 to December 31, 2013. Also, as of December 31, 2013, 221 programs had published their ratings on the EXCELS website. As the evaluation of information gained from the field test was reviewed, the decision was made to enter into a revision phase of the Program Standards. As of December 31, 2013 the revised Program Standards have been released for comment, reviewed by early childhood and child care stakeholder groups, national experts and technical assistance providers. The revised Program Standards will be released early in 2014. Programs currently participating or published in Maryland EXCELS will have 12 months to meet the revised standards.

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

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

The State's focus for ensuring continued progress to increase the number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs participating in the TQRIS is to focus resources on identifying and reaching programs serving children with high needs and those receiving Child Care Subsidy in Title 1 attendance areas. Targeted technical assistance and recruitment efforts are provided by a network of Quality Assurance Specialists located in Regional Licensing offices. Child Care Resource and Referral staff provide information on the TQRIS to programs, providers and the public. Local Early Childhood Advisory Councils, Early Childhood Breakthrough Centers in Title 1 attendance areas and Community Hubs in selected Baltimore City neighborhoods only recruit programs and publicize the benefits of the TQRIS to the community.

The publicity and marketing campaign to programs and providers has continued with a fully-developed website where programs register to participate in Maryland EXCELS, upload documentation for review and access resources to support program improvement. The website includes a search feature to locate rated programs and links to the program's website and/or contact information. A mobile app to search for rated providers and a targeted public awareness campaign will begin as participation increases across the state in 2014. The financial incentives for programs and access to grants and funds for program improvement have continued during the past grant year. Targeted outreach to programs receiving Child Care Subsidy reimbursement began in 2013 and included an insert in the Subsidy Invoices that programs receive bi-weekly, reminding them of the requirement to participate in the TQRIS by 2015. An invitational post card was mailed to all regulated programs and providers in the state, inviting them to participate in the TQRIS and highlighting the benefits. Testimonials from providers who participated in the field test and from others who joined the system, have been featured online and in print materials distributed to all regulated providers statewide. A marketing video for providers and the public was developed and disseminated widely prior to the launch of the TQRIS. The website for Maryland's TQRIS is www.marylandexcels.org.

Performance Measure (B)(2)(c)

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

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

Targets Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs in the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	0	0%	8	1.2%	24	3.80%	45	7.20%	80	12.8%
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	1	0.4%	9	3.4%	21	8%	42	16%	50	19.2%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619										
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA										
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	35	0.70%	173	3.40%	411	8.00%	820	16.00%	983	19.20%

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

Actuals Number and percentage of Early Learning and Development Programs									
Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Baseline			Year 1			Year 2		
	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%	# of programs in the State	# in the TQRIS	%
State-funded preschool	729	0	0.0%	729	1	0.1%	743	1	0.4%
Specify:									
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	260	1	0.4%	260	5	1.9%	220	57	25.9%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C									
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619									
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA									
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	4,259	35	0.7%	4,259	57	1.3%	2,944	291	9.8%

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

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

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

Children served by IDEA funding are enrolled in diverse early childhood programs (Head Start, childcare, PreK).

LEAs use Title I funds for extended hours of mandated PreK services. In this chart, the targets stated for 2012 – 2015 therefore already incorporate IDEA and Title I programs. State-funded Pre-K programs serve the same children with high needs who receive program services under IDEA Parts B and C and Title I. For this reason, while the number of IDEA and Title I programs that serve children with high needs can be separately determined, those programs will be recruited for, and tracked in, Maryland's Tiered/QRIS under the rubric of State-funded Pre-K programs. In this chart, the annual targets and the related percentages therefore already incorporate IDEA and Title I programs.

All baseline data are actual. All Early Head Start/Head Start entries refer to the number of program sites. 625 was the baseline figure for State-funded preschool stated in the original application, and 729 is the number for 2011. 4,259 was the total number of CCDF programs stated in APR year 2 (2012).

NOTE: Regarding EHS/HDST baseline year, there is an error in number of programs participating in T/QRIS, which was stated as 48. Since the total number of EHS/HDST programs in Maryland during that year was 260, and since only 0.4% of those programs participated during the baseline year, the associated number of participating programs could not have been 48. Instead, there was one program participating. Forty-eight was probably the number of children served by that one (1) program.

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.

PreK targets were not met. MSDE is developing strategies of how to incentivize their participation (e.g. more intensive work Judy Centers, School Turnaround Grant (SIG) review process, and LEA Master Plan process). All activities will be in years 3 and 4. Programs receiving CCDF funds – Maryland will require all programs receiving Child Care Subsidy reimbursement to participate in the TQRIS by January 1, 2015. This requirement is expected to increase the numbers for this target area in 2014.

Head Start/Early Head Start – numbers of Head Start programs participating in the TQRIS are increasing although targets were not met for 2013. Additional targeted outreach and collaboration with state Head Start association is occurring.

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

Has the State made progress during the reporting year in developing and enhancing a system for rating and monitoring the quality of Early Learning and Development Programs that participate in the TQRIS that:

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

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

Progress in enhancing a system for rating programs participating in the TQRIS:

Johns Hopkins University/Center for Technology in Education has continued its work as the developer of the web-based system for Maryland EXCELS. Enhancements and improvements to the online system were made in this reporting year and include revised Guidebooks and additional resources for participants that support them as they move to higher levels within the TQRIS. Data feeds from the existing Child Care Administrative Tracking System, the Electronic Licensing Inspection System and MSDE's School and Nutrition Branch (to document participation in the Child and Adult Care Food Program) have been enhanced for efficiencies to the rating system. The online system, with the support of the JHU/CTE Program Coordinator, guides participants through the process of uploading documentation of required evidence for verification. A refined system and rubric for evaluating evidence to maintain reliability among Program Coordinators has been developed. The ratio of 1/200 Program Coordinator to participating programs was reached ahead of schedule during this reporting year. As participation quickly grew in 2013, efficiencies were put in place for Program Coordinators to be assigned programs in specific groups, such as programs within one corporate framework, Head Start/Early Head Start programs, and Family Child Care homes. This assignment process allowed Program Coordinators to become `specialized' in a type or system and increased reliability for verification of evidence. Additional Program Coordinators were hired in this reporting year, due to the increase in participation in the first six months of launch. Feedback from the Program Coordinators, in combination with the field test evaluation, provided guidance on areas where the rating system required clarification and was instrumental in the decision to revise the Program Standards for release in early 2014.

Progress for monitoring the quality of programs participating in the TQRIS:

Fifteen (15) Quality Assurance Specialists have been hired by the State, an increase of nine specialists hired in year one of the grant. The last two specialists hired will begin work in January 2014. All are located in Regional

Licensing offices throughout the state and work closely with licensing staff, the local Child Care Resource Center staff, child care associations and local early childhood advisory councils to provide outreach and information on Maryland EXCELS and the benefits of participating. As the first six months of the launch of Maryland EXCELS TQRIS concludes, the Quality Assurance Staff will move into the Monitoring Phase of their role, providing on-site, randomly sampled monitoring of programs to verify check level ratings and determine if evidence of uploaded documentation is implemented in the program.

The online checklist continues to be in development with JHU/CTE to enable monitoring of TQRIS programs during site-visits conducted by Licensing Specialists, Quality Assurance Specialists, Rating Scales Assessors and State Accreditation Validators.

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

Has the State made progress in improving the quality of the Early Learning and Development Programs that are participating in your State TQRIS through the following policies and practices?

Policies and Practices Supporting Program Quality	
Program and provider training	Yes
Program and provider technical assistance	Yes
Financial rewards or incentives	Yes
Higher, tiered child care subsidy reimbursement rates	Yes
Increased compensation	Yes

Number of tiers/levels in the State TQRIS
5

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

	State-funded preschool programs	Early Head Start	Head Start programs	Early Learning and Development programs funded under section 619 of part B of IDEA and part C of IDEA	Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	Center-based Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	Family Child Care Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program
TQRIS Programs that Moved Up at Least One Level	0	0	0			4	3
TQRIS Programs that Moved Down at Least One Level	0	0	0			0	0

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

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

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

Alignments between National and State Accreditation organization standards and TQRIS Program Standards allow accredited programs an alternative pathway to meet criteria at the highest levels of Maryland EXCELS. Public Pre-Kindergarten Standards were developed for the highest levels of the TQRIS, giving credit for the three lower levels and recognizing established school facility approvals and Code of Maryland requirements for teacher certification and renewal.

In the revision of the TQRIS Program Standards to be released in early 2014, an effort was made to refine the pathway toward the highest levels, resulting in program accreditation. Programs at lower levels are introduced to accreditation through a process or accreditation orientation, reflection on program goals, peer interviews and technical assistance. The State's Accreditation Support Fund provides financial support to programs to pay for accreditation fees and materials needed for program improvement.

Head Start programs use the Child Care Center TQRIS Program Standards to meet the highest levels of the TQRIS. Until Head Start programs are able to identify the Performance Standards met at the program level, Head Start Programs will continue to use the Center standards to achieve ratings at the highest levels.

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

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

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

Type of Early Learning & Development Program in the State	Baseline	Targets				Actuals	
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 1	Year 2
Total number of programs covered by the TQRIS	71	117	567	1,372	3,097	333	1,579
Number of Programs in Tier 1		17	85	138	310	11	247
Number of Programs in Tier 2	4	47	227	480	929	16	59
Number of Programs in Tier 3	11	29	142	412	929	9	26
Number of Programs in Tier 4	25	12	56	205	620	9	16
Number of Programs in Tier 5		12	57	137	309	8	92

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 was collected from the Maryland EXCELS (TQRIS) online system for program participation and check level ratings (tiers) of participating programs as of December 30, 2013.

Every program in TQRIS is not on a level until they have achieved a Tier 1 rating. All programs must upload certain items to achieve a Tier 1 rating. Therefore, there are programs not included in the Tier counts that are 'working toward' Tier 1, but are counted in the total number of programs in EXCELS.

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.*

The first six months of full TQRIS implementation, July 1, 2013 - December 31, 2013 resulted in a total of 1,579 programs participating in the system, exceeding the target total for Year Two, of 567 programs.

The target totals for the top tiers (Levels 4 and 5 combined) were reached, with a total of 118 programs, compared with 113 as the combined target for Levels 4 and 5 for Year Two.

The number of programs at Level 2 will increase as Level 1 programs receive technical assistance and support from Quality Assurance Specialists, Program Coordinators and Resource and Referral staff to meet higher levels. The number of Level 3 programs will increase with the support and assistance provided; and as a result of revisions to the TQRIS standards that offer an alternative method for moving toward program accreditation more programs will reach level 4.

Technical support and assistance is offered at these points in the TQRIS system:

1) Maryland EXCELS Quality Assurance Specialists, hired by the Maryland State Department of Education, provide training and outreach to programs on the TQRIS and benefits of participating, personal and on-site assistance with the registration process and technical assistance for programs moving to higher levels. This support is offered prior to, and throughout the program's participation. Quality Assurance Specialists are assigned to specific geographic regions of the state and work closely with the Resource and Referral Network staff.

2) Upon acceptance into Maryland EXCELS, the program/provider is assigned to a specific Maryland EXCELS Program Coordinator, hired by Johns Hopkins University, Center for Technology in Education, who communicates with the program/provider throughout their TQRIS experience. The Program Coordinator offers assistance with the online system, verifies documentation submitted to meet Check Levels, provides guidance for meeting higher check levels and submission of evidence, and offers encouragement and support via phone and email.

3) Resource and Referral Technical Assistance Providers provide training and technical assistance to programs learning about Maryland EXCELS and for those in specific Title 1 school areas to increase participation and to increase the number of programs published at higher levels. Technical assistance is available prior to, and throughout the program's participation.

4) How Did You Hear About Maryland EXCELS? When programs and providers register to participate, they are asked to tell how they learned about the TQRIS. Data from their responses, along with tracking the increase in participation and publication numbers, provides the state with information regarding the effectiveness of the technical assistance being provided and the outreach efforts underway and planned.

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

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

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

Targets Number and percentage of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS										
Type of Early Learning & Development Programs in the State	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State-funded preschool	0	0.0%	344	1.3%	1,032	3.8%	2,279	8.4%	5,719	21.1%
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	48	0.4%	245	1.9%	343	2.7%	588	4.6%	980	7.7%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C										
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619										
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA										
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	145	0.7%	715	3.4%	2,423	11.4%	5,832	27.4%	12,188	57.2%

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

Actuals Number and percentage of Children with High Needs in programs in top tiers of the TQRIS									
Type of Early Learning & Development Programs in the State	Baseline			Year 1			Year 2		
	# 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	27,071	0	0.0%	27,443	148	0.5%	26,358	1,579	6.0%
Specify:									
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	12,676	48	0.4%	12,731	567	4.4%	12,747	605	4.8%
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	8,702			8,406			8,859		
Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	11,870			9,063			12,135		
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	13,441			15,272			16,266		
Programs receiving from CCDF funds	16,682	145	0.7%	1,066			18,729	544	2.9%

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

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

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

TQRIS data are maintained electronically and updated automatically through the online database maintained by the Maryland EXCELS (TQRIS) program.

The figure reported for State-funded Pre-K includes children with high needs who are also separately reported in this table for IDEA and Title I programs. However, while the number of children with high needs who are served by IDEA and Title I programs can be separately determined, it is not possible under MSDE's current data tracking and reporting systems to determine how many of those children are included within the stated number of children served by State-funded Pre-K programs. Thus, the figures given for State-funded Pre-K include children with high needs served by IDEA and Title I programs, but separate projections for IDEA and Title I program children as sub-groups of the Pre-K population cannot currently be made.

The Year One figure given in the 2012 APR report for "Children with High Needs served by programs receiving CCDF funds" was erroneous and has been corrected here. In the 2012 report, the figure given was 6,682. Instead, it should have been 16,682 - the "1" was inadvertently omitted.

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

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

For programs receiving Child Care Subsidy reimbursement, participation in the TQRIS will be required effective January 1, 2015. Programs have 12 months to publish an initial rating in the system and may publish at a higher level at any time the requirements are met. Targeted technical assistance and supports are offered to Child Care Subsidy programs by Quality Assurance Specialists, Resource and Referral staff and Breakthrough Center staff serving programs in Title 1 school zones to increase participation and achievement of higher levels in Maryland EXCELS (TQRIS).

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.

Maryland issued a grant to the Johns Hopkins University, Center for Technology in Education (CTE) to conduct a 2-year validation study of Maryland EXCELS, Maryland's tiered quality rating improvement system (TQRIS), beginning in January 2014, in addition to an ongoing formative evaluation of the QRIS and its related components, which has been in process since June 2011. CTE, along with its contracted experts in psychometrics and system design from the Hopkins Schools of Education and Public Health, and national experts in high-quality early care, submitted a plan for conducting the validation study to the State, which was in turn submitted to the federal Departments of Education and Health and Human Services for review. The plan

detailed a four pronged approach to validating the EXCELS system that is in line with the recommendations from national QRIS experts and approaches endorsed by the U.S. Department of Education:

- Examine the validity of key underlying concepts (currently in process through an expert Comparison of Maryland's standards with other states' QRIS and a review of the research literature on high-quality early care and education)
- Examine the measurement strategy/psychometric properties of the quality measures
- Assess the outputs of the rating process
- Examine how ratings are associated with children's outcomes.

In 2013, a field test that began in June 2012 was concluded. The field test involved 335 recruited program participants, stratified by program types and accreditation status. A 1% attrition rate was seen, with 5 programs becoming "non-participants" as defined by their lack of participation or responsiveness to outreach. Field test analyses were focused into three primary data collection efforts: focus groups of TQRIS participants, a survey, and analysis of data from the online tool that programs use to participate in the Maryland EXCELS TQRIS. Figure 1 shows the number of program participants, by program type, accreditation status, and quality level on a 0 (N) - 5 scale.

See Attachment D for data chart.

Overall findings from all three data sources revealed the following barriers to be addressed within the TQRIS system before statewide implementation:

- Technology access and use was a barrier for 36.6% of the sample. Common ways to address it were through use of public libraries, support from local resource and referral agencies or licensing specialists.
- Credentialing was a common concern, with data been auto-fed into the QRIS system from a separate State credentialing system being reported as incorrect or out-of-date by 29.3% of the sample
- Accreditation requirements, a unique facet of Maryland QRIS for programs seeking quality rating at levels 4 and 5 was reported as a barrier by 24.4% of the sample. This was most frequently reported by family care participants who were statistically significantly more likely to be at levels 3 or lower than their Center-based counterparts. This is because Maryland offers a free, statewide Maryland accreditation for Center providers in addition to recognizing 7 other national accreditations, but NACFA is the only accepted family accreditation, and many programs report issues with cost and time in pursuing that.

Beyond these major challenges, general consensus in the following points (70% or higher agreement) was noted:

- Standards/quality rubrics were self-explanatory
- The online tool was easy to navigate
- EXCELS has helped convey quality to parents.
- The TQRIS will make a positive difference for children

Following the conclusion of the field test, CTE presented a report of findings to MSDE to inform changes to the standards, policies, processes, and web-tool prior to statewide implementation of the Maryland EXCELS. This process of revisions extended beyond the July 2013 roll-out, and was completed in January 2014.

At the same time, CTE continued evaluation and monitoring of programs from July 2013 to December 2013, wherein we exceeded our estimated 300 program enrollment to have over 1,200 programs voluntarily participating in MD EXCELS. Daily data monitoring through the tool, tracking of which version of standards and

requirements a program was using, and monitoring the amount of professional support required by the program to participate and progress in Maryland EXCELS was ongoing.

At the same time, formal planning for the EXCELS validation continued throughout 2013. Based on guidance from the federal government, experts in the field and the INQUIRE research community, the validation focused on only the first three validation processes - as the fourth relating child outcomes to quality levels will be limited by the stability of the new TQRIS in terms of its maturity, children's exposure, and the demonstrated validity of the new kindergarten entry assessment Maryland is constructing. As such, CTE began work in 2013 on the following aspects of the validation.

Process 1: Examine the validity of key underlying concepts.

CTE participated in the development and review process of the proposed standards and revisions of the Maryland EXCELS, and in alignment with the validation, did the following between July and December, 2013:

1) Reviewed standards by current Program Coordinators, front-line assessors, for clarity, feasibility, and distinction.

2) Conducted literature reviews of new standards compared to other states. Primary source: QRISnetwork.org

3) Consulted with members of the INQUIRE national research consortium for compare and contrast of standard elements

4) Examined the QRIS standards to determine specific data elements (criteria) by cell in order to match product with rationale. This also led to several rationale statements to make the standards clearer for participants, another barrier noted in the field test evaluation.

5) Developed cross-matrix of requirements by standard and by level to determine what elements are distinctive per rating.

Process 2: Examine the measurement strategy and psychometric properties of the measures used to assess quality.

CTE will conduct concurrent validation of the standards in comparison to established measures: CLASS and ERS, beginning in 2014. In preparation for this, considerable time was spent recruiting and hiring assessors to serve as direct observers, separate from MSDE assessors, for both scales. CTE hired 8 individuals to conduct these assessments, and they have been trained to reliability in the CLASS instrument in October and December, 2013. ECERS and FCERS reliability training was proposed for spring 2014. A challenge was found in securing trainers in ECERS and FCERS who were reliable to the authors on those instruments. Eventually, two individuals were secured and will obtain reliability through ERSI in 2014.   They will subsequently train the CTE assessors, and serve as reliability anchors through the duration of 2015.

Starting in January 2014, weekly data pulls of all programs within EXCELS; originally anticipated to 1,054 at this point, currently 2,014, are analyzed the researchers toward Validation Process **#3: Assess the outputs of the rating process.**

Programs are being monitored along the following aspects:

   a) Initial level
   b) Current level
   c) Rate of level change - defined by number of days to obtain a level change

d) Total # of level changes
e) Location - by county and zip code
f) Program type
g) Accreditation status
h) Enrollment numbers (self-reported on application - seek to verify with EARS)
i) Subsidy status
j) Number & type of criteria preventing achievement of next highest rating level.

Toward the Validation Process #2: **Examine the measurement strategy and psychometric properties of the measures used to assess quality**, the following procedures will occur starting in July 2014:

A sample of 100 programs - 50 Center-Based stratified by accreditation status, across all 5 levels of quality, and geographic location, and 50 family care providers, stratified by the same dimensions, will be randomly selected from the pool of participating MD EXCELS programs.

The following protocol is used:

- 2 assessors per classroom; 1 classroom per site randomly observed. (Only Pre-K classrooms are being observed).
- A counter-balanced design is used to rotate between CLASS or ERS scale as first delivered instrument. The alternative instrument is then completed.
- July - September - primary observation conducted on each program.
- October - December - second observation conducted on each program.

January 2015 - additional 100 programs randomly selected. Observations continue on original 100sample. In total, the 100 "2014" sample will finish the study with 4-distinct observations; the additional 100 "2015" sample will have had two distinct observations.

20% of visits will have a third "master" rater trained to reliability by authors score also for ERS (FCERS or ECERS)

10% of visits will have a video record of visit for consensus scoring by all raters for CLASS.

Process 4: Examine how ratings are associated with children's outcomes.

As discussed, this is preliminary and all States have been cautioned about the reliability of these data at this point in the QRIS development. With the introduction of the EC-CAS, we will obtain prior care from students and then connect to a QRIS or non-QRIS program, and by check level. Preliminary examination will analyze if any significant differences can be found between K-Readiness test performance and prior care environment. Significant limitations to these analyses will include: length of exposure to prior care (until EARS is online, that will be uncertain); reliability and validity of the EC-CAS scores; reliability and validity of the EXCELS ratings; accuracy of prior care report (again - dependent upon EARS for certainty); influence of confounding effects on children's performance not associated or tracked (poverty, abuse, teacher quality, etc.).

Considering seeking permission from children in programs selected as part of the 100 sample, and in classrooms observed, to then track their performance in either 2014 or 2015 KEA administration. There are several logistical hurdles to this and debate on utility of those data, so uncertain if we will proceed with that idea.

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

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

☑ (C)(1) Developing and using statewide, high-quality Early Learning and Development Standards.

☑ (C)(2) Supporting effective uses of Comprehensive Assessment Systems.

☑ (C)(3) Identifying and addressing the health, behavioral, and developmental needs of Children with High Needs to improve school readiness.

☑ (C)(4) Engaging and supporting families.

☑ (D)(1) Developing a Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and a progression of credentials.

☑ (D)(2) Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities.

☑ (E)(1) Understanding the status of children's learning and development at kindergarten entry.

☑ (E)(2) Building or enhancing an early learning data system to improve instruction, practices, services, and policies.

Promoting Early Learning Outcomes

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

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

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

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

The current alignment document, *Working Off the Same Page*, continues to be revised. The Social Foundations standards were added and the Maryland College and Career Ready Standards will be revised in the areas of science and social studies. The Maryland and Ohio early learning standards were aligned and the document was finalized for use by West-Ed in the development of the learning progressions and assessment items. The standards have been shared with various constituents. Emphasis has been placed on providing professional development on the Social Foundations standards. Professional development will be provided this summer for administrators in Title I school areas that will focus on increasing their knowledge of early learning development and the standards. The MSDE Division of Curriculum and Instruction is presenting the new Social Studies Standards to the MD Board of Education in May 2014 for approval. The Science standards are being revised based on the Next Generation Science Standards over the next several years.

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

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

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

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

The progress made during this reporting year has included development of and finalization of assessment items and validation of the system through pilot and field tests. Leadership teams in Maryland and Ohio utilized stakeholder groups consisting of our National Technical Advisory Committee, State Advisory Councils, and Ad Hoc groups during each step of our development process.

The standards and essential skills and knowledge in each of the seven domains that will be measured were finalized in partnership with Ohio. From that, items were developed and finalized based on learning progressions for each essential skill and knowledge being measured by WestEd after thorough review and edits by each states Leadership Team and our National Technical Advisory Council.

In addition to item development and validation of the assessment, the professional development delivery model and plan for implementation was finalized. Currently, implementation is moving according to the plan, and benchmarks and deliverables are on schedule to be attained over the next two years of the grant period.

Over the next year there are four additional tests to validate our system. First, a field test of a sample of Virtual Performance Assessment (VPA) items that will become part of the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment (KRA) during census administration in the Fall of 2014 is being conducted in April 2014. This test will include 25 or the 80 teachers who were part of the initial KRA field test in the fall of 2013. The data collected will provide a comparison of VPA items to hands-on Performance (HPA) assessment items in preparation for census administration in the fall.

Second, a pilot test of the Formative HPA items and Formative VPA items is being conducted over the next month. VPA items must be tested for usability with children in all age groups who will be served by the EC-CAS: Preschool 3, Preschool 4, and Kindergarten as part of the VPA development process. The usability testing will help guide development of the VPA activities and will provide information regarding children's use of technology (i.e., iPads), whether VPA items are age-appropriate, and include interactive activities that will allow children to demonstrate their understanding of concepts via a computer or mobile tablet device. This effort will allow researchers to observe individual children while they use a VPA activity (or game) on an iPad and assess how children use both the iPad and the VPA activity. Observations will focus on how children navigate the use of the iPad and how well they are able to use a VPA activity. This usability investigation aims to observe children in 3-year-old and 4-year-old classrooms. These two studies will provide data that will be used to refine existing items and develop additional formative HPA and VPA items that will be field tested in Fall of 2014.

Health Promotion (Section C(3) of Application)

Has the State made progress in:

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

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

The revised Maryland EXCELS TQRIS Program Standards to be released in early 2014, include additional requirements related to nutrition for the serving of fresh fruits and vegetables, whole grains and limiting fat, sugar and salt in foods prepared or served by the program.

The revised TQRIS Standards include requirements for programs to incorporate information from the child's IFSP or IEP, when available, for individual planning related to the child's health, physical and social development and activities.

Children's physical, social and emotional development is promoted throughout the progression of Maryland EXCELS TQRIS levels and is specifically addressed in Developmentally Appropriate Learning and Practice and Administrative Policies and Practices.

In 2013, a diverse developmental screening work group met to establish guidelines for the Developmental Screening Initiative. They reviewed developmental screening tools submitted in response to a Request for Information (RFI) which was issued in August of 2013. They established criteria for the selection of the tools and made recommendations on which tools would be appropriate for use in child care settings. In 2014, training curricula will be developed and implemented for child care providers on the recommended tools.

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d)

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

Performance Measure (C)(3)(d): Leveraging existing resources to meet ambitious yet achievable annual statewide targets.

		Targets				Actuals	
	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 1	Year 2
Number of Children with High Needs screened	9,130	9,130	9,130	9,130	9,130	9,153	9,443
Number of Children with High Needs referred for services who received follow-up/treatment	5,623	5,623	5,623	5,623	5,623	5,390	5,562
Number of Children with High Needs who participate in ongoing health care as part of a schedule of well child care	12,009	12,009	12,009	12,009	12,009	12,051	12,434
Of these participating children, the number or percentage of children who are up-to-date in a schedule of well child care							

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

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

Baseline data are estimates, but they are derived from actual FY 2011 data about child participation in Maryland's Judith P. Hoyer Centers ("Judy Centers") program and actual data from the FY 2011 Annual EPSDT Participation Report published by the Maryland Dept. of Health and Mental Hygiene (DHMH). For "Baseline," "Annual Targets," and "Actuals" purposes, the actual percentages of children screened, receiving post-referral follow-up or treatment services, and participating in ongoing health care as recorded in DHMH's annual EPSDT Participation Report are applied to the actual annual census of children participating in Judy Center programs. This methodology provides annual estimates of Judy Center program participants who are screened, receive post-referral follow-up or treatment services, and participate in ongoing health care.

Data on the percentage of participating children who are up-to-date in a schedule of well child care are not available from DHMH.

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.

When a child is screened, one of two things occur: (1) there is no concern and therefore no follow-up OR (2) there is a concern and the child is referred for further assessment. The assessment may confirm a concern, a diagnosis is made and treatment is pursued OR the assessment may indicate that there is no finding and therefore no reason to pursue with further follow-up/treatment. Therefore, the number of children who receive follow-up/treatment is fluid and could fluctuate from one year to the next.

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

Has the State made progress in:

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

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

Maryland successfully implemented five parent engagement strategies during 2013. These activities will continue in 2014 and 2015:

- In October 2013, The Early Childhood Family Engagement Framework: Maryland's Vision for Engaging Families with Young Children was approved by the State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care and by the Maryland State Board of Education. It is posted at: http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/divisions/child_care/announce.html.
  - The Framework, that was developed over a series of meetings in 2012-2013 by the Maryland Family Engagement Coalition and a consultant, is based on the Head Start Parent, Family, and Community Engagement Framework and designed to support intentional thinking and action regarding the implementation of family engagement policies and practices at the state level and among early childhood service providers and educators.
  - Companion pieces to provide orientation to the Framework and guidance on its use will be developed and widely disseminated based on an implementation plan.

- Parent Cafes:
  Since February 2013, 21 Parent Cafes were offered across Maryland to parents and early care and education staff. At each Café, participants share collective knowledge and build a network of community support and review strategies that they can utilize to support their children/students.

- Vocabulary Improvement and Oral Language Enrichment (VIOLETS) Learning Parties:
  Learning Parties are interactive, hands-on, parent/child "parties" that promote the development of school readiness skills of young children. VIOLETS classrooms were matched with PreK classrooms in neighborhood elementary schools to jointly offer Learning Parties that promote parent skill development and interaction in basic language and literacy skills for school readiness. These Learning Parties offer opportunities for promoting a smooth transition for families and children as they transition from child care to PreK in the elementary school.

  Guided by a trained professional, Learning Parties incorporate parent skill development, child learning, practice, networking, home connection activities (homework) and a home learning library.

Families are provided with skills to build on and extend their children's schooling through vocabulary instruction and the development of basic language and literacy skills at home. This year, 11 VIOLETS classrooms in 11 schools were selected to participate in Learning Parties.

- Reach Out and Read:
  Fifteen counties and Baltimore City selected Reach Out and Read as a literacy strategy in their school readiness action plans that were submitted by their local early childhood advisory council. Currently, approximately 30,300 children are enrolled in Reach Out and Read through 32 pediatric/medical practices.

- Library Learning Councils:
  Public libraries have organized Library Learning Cafes to bring in families to network on early childhood topics in Title I school districts. As of December 2013, seven libraries have held their first Library Parent Café, and 5 libraries in their second year have hosted two so far in 2014. Twelve libraries have created Family Resource/Parent Information Centers.

Early Childhood Education Workforce

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

Has the State made progress in developing:

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

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.

In 2013, a committee was formed to review and align the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework with the Core of Knowledge, which outlines the specific knowledge and skills that are essential to work with young children. The committee completed the alignment of the Workforce Competency document and Core of Knowledge. The committee recommended updating the workforce competency document after careful review of several state's workforce competencies, NAEYC Professional Standards, and the Danielson Framework.

When the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework is completed, it will serve several interrelated purposes.

1. Provides a coherent structure to foster the professional development of Maryland's early childhood workforce.
2. Describes the knowledge and skills that early childhood professionals need to support young children's learning and development across program types.
3. Informs pre-service/in-service professional development and the course of study that early childhood professionals follow as they pursue study in institutions of higher education.

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

Has the State made progress in improving the effectiveness and retention of Early Childhood Educators who work with Children with High Needs with the goal of improving child outcomes:

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

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

MSDE staff and early childhood stakeholders worked together to identify areas of alignment between the Workforce Competency Framework and Maryland's Core of Knowledge content areas. The committee aligned and identified several areas of need in the documents. Therefore, MSDE will identify nationally recognized individuals to review and provide comments on the current document and then proceed in revising the Workforce Competency Framework. When completed this document will assist early childhood professionals with the knowledge required to be successful in an early childhood education career.

Maryland continues to provide program incentives that support professional development degree completion through participation in the Maryland Child Care Credential Program. Training Voucher/Reimbursement and Child Care Career and Professional Development Fund are program incentives for child care providers participating in the Maryland Child Care Credential Program. The Child Care Career and Professional Development Fund (CCCPDF) provides funding for providers who are pursuing an Associate's or Bachelor's degree in ECE, ELE, or SPED with the cost of tuition, fees, and textbooks. The CCCPDF provides $1.8 million for scholarship to child care providers, and assists with the cost of completing a college degree. There are currently

223 credentialed child care providers attending community colleges and/or universities throughout Maryland. Since 2008 through spring 2013, 181 child care providers have graduated with Associate's or Bachelor's degrees in Early Childhood Education.

Training Voucher/Reimbursement assists providers with the cost of training and/or training conference registration. Providers can access up to $400 per Credential year. The training voucher/reimbursement has provided $55,000 in support since July 2013. Credentialed child care providers can access approved training and attend professional conferences to enhance their knowledge and skills.

The Maryland Approved Alternative Preparation Program (MAAPP) is for those career changers that want to become certified in early childhood education (i.e. P-3 certifications) and already have a bachelor's degree in a related field. In order to participate, the student must be employed in a licensed child care, and have a bachelor's degree in an approved area. The costs of coursework, program oversight, and substitutes during the internship when the students are away from their jobs are free of charge to the participants. There were 13 students in the first cohort in 2013. The cost per student was $13,461. The New Teacher Project was awarded the contract to provide the coursework and provide oversight for the students. The coursework is approved by MSDE. The students must pass PRAXIS I elementary grade and PRAXIS II to earn certification. Students have internships at their place of employment and in a public school. The first cohort in the program will finish in May 2014 and will earn a Professional Eligibility Certificate which is good for two years while they continue to take exams and have classroom evaluations. The second cohort began in February 2014, with 15 students. Students must commit to remain in a child care setting for 2 years as part of their service agreement.

An integral part of Maryland's ELC grant plan is to examine the system of teacher education with respect to those prepared for early education. The State Superintendent of Schools created a Task Force on Early Learning Teacher Education in July 2013. The Task Force was charged with developing plans to:

- Strengthen alternative pathways to obtaining a post-secondary degree in early childhood development, including a review of the Associate of Arts Degree in Teaching-Early Childhood Education (AAT-ECE), the Maryland Approved Alternative Preparation Program (MAAPP), as well as an articulation agreement between MSDE and community colleges for required training and course work in child care;
- Implement a new degree program, Birth to Five, through a blended curriculum of early childhood special education and regular early childhood education;
- Propose incentives and rewards programs for practitioners in early childhood education to pursue and complete a post-secondary degree in early childhood education; and
- Implement strategies to expand the access to post-secondary programs offering teacher education in early childhood education.

The final report, including recommendations, will be submitted to the State Superintendent of Schools and the Secretary of the Maryland Higher Education Commission by the end of 2014. The Task Force met twice in 2013 - July 17 and December 17. The following topics were presented and discussed:

- Credentialing for licensed child care professionals and supply and demand for these professionals;
- PreK to 3 certification and Special Education birth to 8 certification, and demand and supply for these teachers;
- A survey of certification of requirements in other states for PreK and special education was presented by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC);
- Presentation on child development programs that Maryland high schools offer students through Career and Technology Education (CTE). Students graduate with the sufficient clock hours certificate which enables them to apply for the Child Development Associate (CDA) Credential;

- The Maryland Approved Alternative Preparation Programs (MAAPP) is for those career changers that want to become certified in early childhood education and already have a bachelor's degree in fields related to education.
- Scholarships are funded by the Child Care Career and Professional Development Fund (CCCPDF), and assist child care providers in pursuing a college degree in early childhood education;
- The Associate's degree in the Art of Teaching, and transitioning to four year colleges for early childhood education certification; and
- The articulation of child care credentialing clock hours to college credit.

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

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

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

	Baseline	Targets				Actuals	
	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 1	Year 2
Total number of "aligned" institutions and providers	1,267	1,286	1,305	1,324	1,343	1,523	1,743
Total number of Early Childhood Educators credentialed by an "aligned" institution or provider	17,215	17,301	17,388	17,475	17,562	18,347	13,222

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

Credentialed ECE teaching staff data, as of the end of the calendar year 2013, from the CCATS database. Includes employment records without end-dates of teaching staff who hold an associate degree or higher, plus CDA certificates awarded during 2013.

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.

The Maryland Child Care Credentialing Program is voluntary and subject to annual fluctuations. There are two factors which account for a lower number of participants:

(1) Data clean up. The Credentialing Program is a major component of the Division's Child Care Automated Tracking System (CCATS) and is undergoing extensive modification to bring it up to a fully functional level. Part of that modification is to create unique party associations that eliminate duplicate or erroneous provider and program staff records, which previously resulted in a duplicated count of Credentialing Program participants. We have identified a high number of such records, which were created through misspellings, name changes, and failure to end-date previous Credentialing Program participants whose enrollment lapsed prior to 2013. The lower number of participants reported for 2013 reflects the removal of these records.

(2) Administrative constraints (i.e., backlogs created by staff turnover or mere increase of applications).

Performance Measure (D)(2)(d)(2)

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

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

Targets										
Progression of credentials (Aligned to Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework)	*Number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who have moved up the progression of credentials, aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, in the prior year*									
Progression: Low to High	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Maryland Child Care Credentialing Program (MCCCP) Credential Level 1 (Lowest Level)	1,463	-2.0%	1,739	19.0%	2,101	21.0%	2,582	23.0%	3,233	25.0%
MCCCP Credential Level 2	806	18.0%	958	19.0%	1,157	21.0%	1	23.0%	1,781	25.0%
MCCCP Credential Level 3	2,017	19.0%	2,398	19.0%	2,897	21.0%	3,561	23.0%	4,458	25.0%
MCCP Credential Level 4	625	37.0%	743	19.0%	898	21.0%	1,103	23.0%	1,382	25.0%
MCCCP Credential Level 4+	169	46.0%	187	11.0%	243	21.0%	299	23.0%	374	25.0%
MCCCP Credential Level 5	450	30.0%	535	19.0%	646	21.0%	794	23.0%	994	25.0%
MCCCP Credential Level 6 (Highest Level)	665	32.0%	790	19.0%	955	21.0%	1,173	23.0%	1,469	25.0%

Actuals						
Progression of credentials (Aligned to Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework)	*Number and percentage of Early Childhood Educators who have moved up the progression of credentials, aligned to the Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework, in the prior year*					
Progression: Low to High	Baseline		Year 1		Year 2	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Maryland Child Care Credentialing Program (MCCCP) Credential Level 1 (Lowest Level)	1,463	-2.0%	1386	-5.0%	1125	15.0%
MCCCP Credential Level 2	806	18.0%	901	12.0%	874	11.6%
MCCCP Credential Level 3	2,017	19.0%	2289	13.0%	2303	30.7%
MCCP Credential Level 4	625	37.0%	756	21.0%	1089	14.5%
MCCCP Credential Level 4+	169	46.0%	187	11.0%	212	2.8%
MCCCP Credential Level 5	450	30.0%	525	17.0%	779	10.4%
MCCCP Credential Level 6 (Highest Level)	665	32.0%	828	25.0%	1071	14.3%

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

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

MCCCP participation data by credentialing level are maintained by the program manager in an Excel spreadsheet. The entry of all data into this spreadsheet is done manually, so it is possible for occasional user-entry errors to occur (for example, transposing the letters of a program participant's name or the digits of the participant's MCCCP entry date). Enhancements to CCATS are currently in progress that will allow all participation data to be captured directly in, and reported directly from, the CCATS database. The figures in the percentage columns show the annual plus/minus percentage change for each level. All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.

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

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

The assumption is that the increase is, in part, explained by the increasing number of programs participating in Maryland EXCELS, since Levels 4 and 5 incorporate specific quotas of credentialed child care staff at the higher levels of Credentialing. However, there are two factors which account for a lower number of participants:

(1) Data clean up. The Credentialing Program is a major component of the Division's Child Care Automated Tracking System (CCATS) and is undergoing extensive modification to bring it up to a fully functional level. Part of that modification is to create unique party associations that eliminate duplicate or erroneous provider and program staff records, which previously resulted in a duplicated count of Credentialing Program participants. We have identified a high number of such records, which were created through misspellings, name changes, and failure to end-date previous Credentialing Program participants whose enrollment lapsed prior to 2013. The lower number of participants reported for 2013 reflects the removal of these records.
(2) Administrative constraints (i.e., backlogs created by staff turnover or mere increase of applications).

Measuring Outcomes and Progress

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

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

Kindergarten Entry Assessment	
Is aligned with the State's Early Learning and Development Standards and covers all Essential Domains of School Readiness	Yes
Is valid, reliable, and appropriate for the target population and for the purpose for which it will be used, including for English learners and children with disabilities	Yes
Is administered beginning no later than the start of the school year in the third year of the grant to children entering a public school kindergarten (e.g., the 2014-2015 school year for Round 1 grantee states, the 2015-2016 school year for Round 2 grantees). States may propose a phased implementation plan that forms the basis for broader statewide implementation	Yes
Is reported to the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, and to the early learning data system, if it is separate from the Statewide Longitudinal Data System, as permitted under and consistent with the requirements of Federal, State, and local privacy laws	Yes
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)	Yes

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.

Aligned to both Maryland and Ohio's guidelines and standards for young children, birth to age eight, including the Maryland College and Career Ready Standards, Maryland's KEA covers seven domains: physical well-being and motor development, mathematics, language and literacy, science, social foundations, and fine arts. The identification of the assessment standards and essential skills and knowledge in each domain that will be measured has been completed in partnership with Ohio. Learning progressions for essential skill and knowledge being measured have been developed by WestEd and revised and finalized based on feedback from experts and leadership teams in both Ohio and Maryland.

The KEA has been systematically developed within a framework grounded in theory, research, and best practice to ensure its validity and reliability. During this reporting year, validity and reliability of the KEA has consisted of benchmarking and small-scale piloting of item/task prototypes, review by ad hoc groups and a national technical advisory committee comprised of developmental psychologists, early childhood experts, and psychometricians. Cognitive interviews to test item prototypes were conducted in early January 2013. A small scale pilot for kindergarten populations occurred in April 2013. A more representative sample participated in a field test of the KEA in November 2013. Statewide implementation of the system will occur in the fall of 2014. Thereafter, yearly administration and scoring of the KEA will occur in the fall of the kindergarten year.

The progress made during this reporting year has included development of and finalization of assessment items and validation of the system through pilot and field tests. Leadership teams in Maryland and Ohio utilized stakeholder groups consisting of our National Technical Advisory Committee, State Advisory Councils, and Ad Hoc groups during each step of our development process.

The standards and essential skills and knowledge in each of the seven domains that will be measured were finalized in partnership with Ohio. From that, items were developed and finalized based on learning progressions for each essential skill and knowledge being measured by WestEd after thorough review and edits by each states Leadership Team and our National Technical Advisory Council.

In addition to item development and validation of the assessment, the professional development delivery model and plan for implementation was finalized. Currently, implementation is proceeding according to the initial plan for deployment of the new system.

To ensure that all benchmarks and time lines for deliverables are met, the leadership team develops and approves a 90 day work plan each quarter with tasks, a time line for completion, reports on progress made, and partnership roles. These work plans also include validation of the system through field tests of each component. Each task is developed based on the ultimate goal of complete system validation and implementation by the end of the grant period.

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

The progress made during this reporting year has included development of and finalization of assessment items and validation of the system through pilot and field tests. Leadership teams in Maryland and Ohio utilized stakeholder groups consisting of our National Technical Advisory Committee, State Advisory Councils, and Ad Hoc groups during each step of our development process.

The standards and essential skills and knowledge in each of the seven domains that will be measured were finalized in partnership with Ohio. From that, items were developed and finalized based on learning progressions for each essential skill and knowledge being measured by WestEd after thorough review and edits by each states Leadership Team and our National Technical Advisory Council.

In addition to item development and validation of the assessment, the professional development delivery model and plan for implementation was finalized. Currently, implementation is moving accordingly to the plan, and benchmarks and deliverables are on schedule to be attained over the next two years of the grant period.

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

Has the State made progress in enhancing its existing Statewide Longitudinal Data System or building or enhancing a separate, coordinated, early learning data system that aligns and is interoperable with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System and that:

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

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

Integration of various data systems into the Early Childhood Data Warehouse (ECDW), is an integral component of the Longitudinal Data System:

The MSDE Division of Early Childhood's (MSDE/DECD's) CCATS database includes all child care provider data, provider staff credentialing data, program accreditation data, and child care subsidy program data. The MSDE/DECD's Electronic Licensing Inspection System (ELIS) database provides detailed compliance data from child care provider licensing inspections. Maryland's annual MMSR Kindergarten Assessment datasets provide individual performance scores for children enrolled in public kindergarten. Other MSDE data sources include the Division of Special Education and Early Intervention Services' Infants and Toddlers Program, public Pre-K site and enrollment files, the Child Food and Nutrition Program, and ESEA Title I program lists.

Non-MSDE data sources include the MarylandEXCELS quality rating improvement system for child care and public pre-K programs that is maintained for MSDE/DECD by the Johns Hopkins University's Center for Technology in Education, the Early Childhood Mental Health program that is maintained for MSDE/DECD by the University of Maryland- School of Social Work, and the Social and Emotional Foundations of Early Learning (SEFEL) program, which is also maintained for MSDE/DECD by the University of Maryland. Activities are underway to develop interfaces with Maryland Department of Health data sources pertaining to child immunizations and health screenings, and with Maryland Department of Human Resources data sources on foster care and child adoption data. In addition, new data sources for the ECDW are being developed in connection with other RTT-ELC projects such as the Early Childhood Breakthrough Centers and family support network of centers.

The Child Enrollment and Attendance Record System (EARS):

Originally, the EARS application was conceived and underwent initial development as an integral part of the ECDW, where it was to reside entirely within the Oracle database that underlies the ECDW. In early 2013, the agency decided to move further development of EARS from the Oracle environment to the CCATS environment, where it would be re-designed to become part of the CCATS public portal and could be fully integrated with the rest of the CCATS database. The main reason for this decision was that since a child care subsidy program attendance and enrollment module was being built within the CCATS public portal, maintenance of a separate EARS application outside of CCATS - which would include enrollment/attendance data on children in subsidized care - would lead to data duplication and data integrity risks. A complete set of functional requirements for EARS as part of the public portal was completed in June 2013. Due to contract issues with the CCATS system vendor, technical design work based on the EARS functional requirements was not able to begin until December 2013. At present, it is expected that all design work will be complete and EARS will be ready for user acceptance testing by December 2014.

Building/Enhancing an Early Learning Data System:

A complete set of functional requirements for the Child Care Subsidy Program point-of-service (POS) system was completed in June 2013. These requirements identify essential system functions, define the relationships between those functions, and establish business rules for the system's child enrollment/disenrollment and voucher issuance/tracking processes. As with EARS, contractual issues delayed the beginning of technical design work until December 2013. In conjunction with EARS, the POS system is currently slated for technical completion and migration to a user acceptance testing environment by December 2014.

Data Tables

Commitment to early learning and development

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

Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income families, by age

Table (A)(1)-1: Children from Low-Income[1] families, by age		
	Number of children from Low-Income families in the State	**Children from Low-Income families as a percentage of all children in the State**
Infants under age 1	22,768	1.7%
Toddlers ages 1 through 2	46,489	3.4%
Preschoolers ages 3 to kindergarten entry	46,773	3.5%
Total number of children, birth to kindergarten entry, from low-income families	116,030	8.6%
[1] Low-Income is defined as having an income of up to 200% of the Federal poverty rate.		

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

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

Data Source: 2010 Census Data. Subsequent years use Census Population Estimates for total state population. AEC Kids Count data for total children and percent of children below 200% of poverty.

(1) Total Maryland Population less than 5 years old = 364,488; by age group, 71,523 birth to one years old, 72,035 one year olds, 74,002 two year olds, 74,034 three year olds, and 72,894 four year olds.

(2) Percentage of low income children, 28.5% plus or minus 3.1% from ASEC of CPS 2009 - related children 5-17 years old at or below 200% poverty level.

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

Table (A)(1)-2: Special Populations of Children with High Needs		
Special Populations: Children who…	Number of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who…	Percentage of children (from birth to kindergarten entry) in the State who…
Have disabilities or developmental delays[1]	28,597	7.8%
Are English learners[2]	13,393	3.6%
Reside on "Indian Lands"		
Are migrant[3]	154	0.04%
Are homeless[4]	2,671	0.7%
Are in foster care		

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

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

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

Data Sources:

Number of Children < 5 years old (= basis for calculation of special population percentages): 2010 Census Data

Subsequent years use Census Population Estimates for total state population, AEC Kids Count data total children and percent of children below 200% FPL.

(1) Total Maryland Population less than 5 years old = 364,488; by age group, 71,523 birth to one year old, 72,035 one year olds, 74,002 two year olds, 74,034 three year olds, and 72,894 four year olds.
(2) Percentage of low income children, 28.5% plus or minus 3.1% from ASEC of CPS 2009 - related children 5-17 years old at or below 200% of poverty level.

Have Disabilities/Developmental Delays:
Data source is the MSDE Attendance Data Collection for the specified year.

Are English Learners:
Data source is the MSDE Attendance Data Collection for the specified year.

Are Migrant:
Data source for eligible migrant children is Maryland's Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for the specified year. The numbers shown are the numbers of eligible migrant children birth through 5 who are not in kindergarten.

Foster Care data from the Maryland Department of Human Resources does not currently break down foster care placements down by age groups, so the number of foster children less than 5 years old cannot be reported here.

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

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

Table (A)(1)-3a: Number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program, by age				
Type of Early Learning & Development Program	**Infants under age 1**	**Toddlers ages 1 through 2**	**Preschoolers ages 3 until kindergarten entry**	**Total**
State-funded preschool	0	0	29,811	29,811
Specify:	Public Pre-K programs operated by LEAs			
Data Source and Year:	MSDE pre-K enrollment file as of 9/30/14.			
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	560	1,334	10,270	12,747
Data Source and Year:	2013 Head Start PIR			
Programs funded by IDEA, Part C and Part B, section 619	1,232	2,427	17,335	20,994
Data Source and Year:	MSDE Enrollment Snapshot as of 10/31/13			
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	0	0	16,266	16,266
Data Source and Year:	Maryland's Consolidated State Performance Report for FY 2013			
Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program				
Data Source and Year:	CCATS Child Care Subsidy Program database for FY 2013			
Other 1	0	0	232	232
Specify:	Maryland Pre-K Pilot Sites			
Data Source and Year:	LEA and early care provider attendance data for FY 2013			
Other 2	503	1,280	531	2,314
Specify:	Family Support Centers			
Data Source and Year:	Family Support Center MIS data for FY 2013			
[1] Including Migrant and Tribal Head Start located in the State.				

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

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

Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619: Data are collected according to the setting reporting categories required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA): Home, Community-Based Setting, Service Provider Location, Early Childhood Program (unspecified), Separate Class, School or Residential Facility, Hospital. Data are not collected or reported by the specific program, such as Early Head Start, Head Start, Private Nursery School, and Public Prekindergarten.

Family Support Centers: The figures reported for 2013 are based on the period July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013, with 21 Centers reporting for 12 months. Age calculations are based on the dates of first service at Family Support Centers.

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

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

Table (A)(1)-3b: Number of Children							
Type of Early Learning & Development Program	Hispanic Children	Non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native Children	Non-Hispanic Asian Children	Non-Hispanic Black or African American Children	Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Children	Non-Hispanic Children of Two or more races	Non-Hispanic White Children
State-funded preschool	5,560	133	1,144	11,240	69	1,200	7,012
Specify:							
Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	2,369	380	198	7,608	10	1,278	2,676
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part C	1,275	9	428	2,591	10	333	4,512
Early Learning and Development Programs funded by IDEA, Part B, section 619	1,835	45	583	4,069	25	515	4,978
Early Learning and Development Programs funded under Title I of ESEA	3,972	101	355	7,955	29	634	3,139
Early Learning and Development Programs receiving funds from the State's CCDF program	1,158	130	170	24,158	73	971	4,722

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

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

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

ESEA Title I figures represent only the number of pre-school children. Children enrolled in kindergarten are not included.

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

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

Table (A)(1)-4: Funding for each Fiscal Year				
Type of investment	**Baseline**	**Year 1**	**Year 2**	**Year 3**
Supplemental State spending on Early Head Start & Head Start[1]	$1,800,000	$1,800,000	$1,800,000	$5,900,000
State-funded preschool	$99,048,693	$84,791,740	$117,968,722	
Specify:	Pre-K programs located in public elementary schools			
State contributions to IDEA, Part C	$54,706,114	$75,241,171	$75,691,195	
State contributions for special education and related services for children with disabilities, ages 3 through kindergarten entry	0	0	0	
Total State contributions to CCDF[2]	$66,667,874	$54,795,119	$54,142,145	
State match to CCDF Exceeded / Met / Not Met	Exceeded	Exceeded	Exceeded	
If exceeded, indicate amount by which match was exceeded	$12,819,067	$768,467	$172,418	
TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs[3]	$14,749,769	0	0	
Other State contributions 1		$4,565,548	$4,590,343	$4,590,343
Specify:	Home Visiting Program			
Other State contributions 2	0	$1,713,077	$1,713,077	$1,713,077
Specify:	Early Mental Health Program			
Other State contributions 3	0	$4,667,677	$4,667,677	$4,667,677
Specify:	Family Support Centers			
Other State contributions 4	0	$1,505,784	$1,205,789	$1,205,789
Specify:	Resource and Referral Centers			
Total State contributions:	$236,972,450	$229,080,116	$261,518,948	

[1] Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.
[2] Total State contributions to CCDF must include Maintenance of Effort (MOE), State Match, and any State contributions exceeding State MOE or Match.
[3] Include TANF transfers to CCDF as well as direct TANF spending on Early Learning and Development Programs.

Data Table (A)(1)-4 Data Notes

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

State-funded preschool: The mandate to provide services also requires local spending as necessary to serve enrolled children. The figures provided in this row are estimates. They do not include CCDF match amounts. For SFY2014 the Governor increased Head Start by $4.1m to fill in the funding gap caused by the federal sequestration.

** **State contributions to IDEA Part C:** State contributions include local funding sources.

*** In our 2012 APR report, we included the amounts of spending on the Early Mental Health Program, the Family Support Centers, and the Resource and Referral Centers in the "State Match to CCDF" line for 2012. For 2012 and out years, the spending amounts for the Early Mental Health Program, Family Support Centers, and Resource and Referral Centers are shown in the "Other State Contributions" line.

**** In our agency's original grant application, and then again in our 2012 APR report, we showed the amount of spending on the Home Visiting Program during 2011 as a sub-item in this "TANF Spending" cell. The figure currently shown in this cell ($14,927,769) still includes the 2011 Home Visiting expenditure, but the specific reference to Home Visiting has been removed. In 2012 and out years, the Home Visiting Program is funded with State funds and is included under "Other State Contributions."

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

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

Table (A)(1)-5: Total number of Children with High Needs participating in each type of Early Learning and Development Program[1]			
Type of Early Learning and Development Program	**Baseline**	**Year 1**	**Year 2**
State-funded preschool *(annual census count; e.g., October 1 count)*	27,071	27,443	29,811
Specify:			
Early Head Start and Head Start[2] *(funded enrollment)*	12,676	12,731	12,747
Programs and services funded by IDEA Part C and Part B, section 619 *(annual December 1 count)*	17,628	17,469	20,994
Programs funded under Title I of ESEA *(total number of children who receive Title I services annually, as reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report)*	15,070	15,272	16,266
Programs receiving CCDF funds *(average monthly served)*	15,551	10,674	9,615
Other	250	301	232
Describe:	Maryland Pre-K Pilot Sites		

[1] Include all Children with High Needs served with both Federal dollars and State supplemental dollars.
[2] Including children participating in Migrant Head Start Programs and Tribal Head Start Programs.

Data Table (A)(1)-5 Data Notes

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

The figures in the "Programs receiving CCDF funds" line pertain only to children under 5 years old who are receiving subsidized child care.

The baseline and Year One figures previously reported for "Programs and Services funded by IDEA, Part C and B, section 619 were incorrect. Those figures are corrected in the Excel workbook provided by USDE.

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

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

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

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

Enter text to explain or clarify information as needed.

None.

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

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

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

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

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

Programs funded under IDEA Part C:

Screening Measures: Tools include but are not limited to: Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ-III) Best Beginnings Developmental Screening (BBDS), Battelle Developmental Inventory (BDI-2) Screening, Modified Checklist for Autism in Toddlers (M-CHAT).

Formative Assessments: Evaluations/Assessments are completed initially and updated on an annual basis as part of the Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) "Present Levels of Development." In addition, outcomes progress review occurs every 6 months on the "Child and Family Outcomes" page of the IFSP. Multiple sources of information are utilized, both quantitative and qualitative.

Measures of Environmental Quality: The majority of services are provided in the home and/or community. Each Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) includes "Routines in the Natural Environment."

Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions: These measures are optional, not required. The information is gathered as part of the IFSP process using Routines Based Interview (RBI), ASQ, and/or locally developed family interview tools.

Other (Measures): Additional information collected as appropriate and as part of the IFSP process include: targeted specialized assessments, general health information, medical reports, child's strengths and needs summary.

Programs funded under Title I of ESEA:

Screening Measures: USDE requires state administered local projects to use and measure academic gains of child and adult participants enrolled in the program. For children, MSDE is required to report data on the PPVT-3 and PALS screening tools to measure alphabet knowledge and receptive language development. For adults, projects are required to measure reading and math gains using the CASAS. For adult-child interactions, the Parent Education Profile (PEP) tool is utilized.

Measures of Environmental Quality: Some of the environmental measures used by local projects are integrated into the chosen early childhood curriculum such as, High Scope and the Creative Curriculum.

Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions: MSDE's Even Start program recommends that local projects use only assessment tools that are recommended and approved by the State and the LEA. These assessment measures include measures recommended for children birth - school-age (age 8); Dept of Labor, Adult Literacy program requires the CASAS, & BEST. Other adult-child assessments approved by MSDE's Even Start program consists of the Bowdoin, Nurturing Program, Parents As Teachers, Systematic Training for Effective Parenting, Ounce, Ages & Stages.

Current Quality Rating and Improvement System Requirements:

Screening Measures:

Level 3:
- Children are observed for developmental progress using developmental checklists.

Level 4:
- Program has a policy regarding child assessment using developmental checklists.
- Program has a policy for sharing assessment results with families.

Level 5:
- Program has a written policy regarding child assessment using formal and informal assessment measures, including developmental checklists, portfolio development, and observation/anecdotal records.
- Program has a written policy that describes their practices for sharing assessment results with families and/or agencies that may be working with the family, including early intervention or special education services.

Formative Assessments:

Level 2:

- MSDE Healthy Beginnings, MMSR, or approved curriculum guides the development of a written daily schedule that is predictable, yet flexible and responsive to the individual needs of all children.
- The program has a method for curriculum planning that includes planning from children's interests and skills.
- Children are observed for developmental progress.

Level 3:
- Same as Level 2, plus:
- The program's method for curriculum planning includes multiple literacy, language, science, art, health and wellness, physical fitness, and numeracy activities.
- Observations of children for developmental progress use developmental checklists.

Level 4:
- Implementation of a curriculum that is aligned with the MMSR and/or state curriculum and guides the development of a daily schedule.
- The program has a method for curriculum planning that incorporates children's interests and skills, and includes multiple literacy, language, science, art, health and wellness, physical fitness, and numeracy activities on a daily basis.
- Evidence of differentiated instruction for each age group, children with disabilities, special health care needs and/or English-language learners.

Level 5:
- Same as Level 4, plus:
- Evidence of use of an IFSP/IEP for individualized planning for children with disabilities (if applicable). Also, the program has a written policy regarding child assessment using formal and informal assessment measures, including developmental checklists, portfolio development, and observational and anecdotal records.

Measures of Environmental Quality:

Level 3:
- Self-assessment conducted using the appropriate rating scale, such as ERS or CLASS™, for at least one of each age grouping.
- Improvement plan created for any subscale score below 4.0

 Level 4:
- A recommended rating scale conducted for random sample including at least one classroom from · all age groups.
- Improvement plan created for any subscale score below 4.5.

 Level 5:
- A recommended rating scale conducted for random sample including at least one classroom from all age groups.
- Improvement plan created for any subscale score below 5.0.

Measures of the Quality of Adult-Child Interactions:

Level 5:
For Level 5 public pre-K programs only, use of the Classroom Assessment Scoring System™ (CLASS™ - see explanation below) is required. It is optional for other child care programs. The instrument is administered locally by Maryland EXCELS performance monitors. CLASS™ is a reliable, validated observational tool that assesses classroom quality in pre-K --3 based on teacher -student interactions in the classroom rather than evaluation of the physical environment or a specific curriculum. The complete set of Maryland EXCELS standards at all participant levels for Family Child Care Homes, Child Care Centers, School-Age Programs, and Public Pre-K Programs is posted on the MSDE Division of Early Childhood Development website and on the Maryland EXCELS website at www.marylandexcels.org.

State Licensing Requirements:

Maryland child care licensing regulations require that a health inventory signed by a physician must be submitted for each child at the time of admission to care. This inventory must include a review of the child in the following areas: general physical health, physical illness or impairment, vision, hearing, speech/language, allergies, disabilities, modified diet or special feeding needs, mental/emotional/behavioral, and any other condition that might limit the child's participation in child care program activities. The inventory also asks if the child has received any evaluations that could help the child care provider or teacher to meet the child's health or educational needs. MSDE plans to amend State licensing regulations within the next 2 years to explicitly require programs to ensure that each child receives screenings for developmental and learning needs, behavioral health, and oral health.

Other: Judy Centers

- Early Identification and Intervention is a required component standard of all Judy Centers. There is a plan in place to identify all children ages birth through five years of age. This includes those who are enrolled in state or federally regulated programs. Children receive age-appropriate developmental screenings, evaluations and interventions when appropriate.
- Judy Centers do not directly screen and assess children but, rather, screenings and assessments are performed by members of the Judy Center Partnerships. Judy Centers may refer children to its community partners when there are concerns about a particular child. It is up to the community partner to determine the appropriate screening and follow up assessment, if required, that should be done.

Families are requested to sign a release form so that results of the screenings and assessments and any necessary interventions may be shared with the Judy Center. This allows the Judy Center to respond appropriately when including the child and their family in all Judy Center activities and events. All children ages birth through five years, regardless of abilities, are fully included and have access to all programs and services.

Budget and Expenditure Tables

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

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

Budget Summary Table

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	$150,724	$936,344	$1,087,068
2. Fringe Benefits	$12,243	$80,450	$92,693
3. Travel	$9,233	$51,786	$61,019
4. Equipment	$132,596	$27,984	$160,580
5. Supplies	$738	$4,275	$5,013
6. Contractual	$4,198,477	$9,323,640	$13,522,117
7. Training Stipends	$0	$0	$0
8. Other	$30,133	$26,129	$56,262
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$4,534,144	$10,450,609	$14,984,753
10. Indirect Costs	$26,400	$114,396	$140,795
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0	$0	$0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$4,539	$44,582	$49,121
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$4,565,083	$10,609,587	$15,174,669
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$32,466,353	$37,737,078	$70,203,431
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$37,031,436	$48,346,665	$85,378,101

Columns (a) and (b): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for the grant years.
Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first $25,000 of each contract included in line 6.
Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.
Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.
Line 12: The State must set aside $400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.
Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.
Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Budget Summary Table Narrative

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

The budget discrepancies are most pronounced in two areas:

1. Payroll in Project 2 - EXCELS, and the incentives to programs entering and moving up the tiers in EXCELS.
2. Reach Out and Read in Project 8 (see amendment dated February 13, 2014)

Overall, the projects stayed within budget. Any changes were handled by amendments in year 2.

Budget Summary Table Explanation of Changes

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

MSDE is closely monitoring the rate of increase in participation in EXCELS to ensure that the budget stays within the targeted amount.

Budget Table: Project 1 – Local Early Childhood Councils

Budget Table: Project 1			
Budget Categories	**Grant Year 1 (a)**	**Grant Year 2 (b)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$0	$0	$0
2. Fringe Benefits	$0	$0	$0
3. Travel	$1,041	$523	$1,564
4. Equipment	$0	$0	$0
5. Supplies	$0	$0	$0
6. Contractual	$0	$80,000	$80,000
7. Training Stipends	$0	$0	$0
8. Other	$0	$0	$0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$1,041	$80,523	$81,564
10. Indirect Costs	$104	$53	$157
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0	$0	$0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0	$0	$0
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$1,145	$80,576	$81,722
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$120,000	$0	$120,000
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$121,145	$80,576	$201,722

Columns (a) and (b): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for the grant years.
Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first $25,000 of each contract included in line 6.
Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.
Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.
Line 12: The State must set aside $400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.
Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.
Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Project 1 Budget Table Narrative

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

Maryland through amendment moved $1,120,000 from Year 2 to Year 3 so that it could distribute funds to local Early Childhood Advisory Councils based on applications that were submitted by the end of November 2013 with disbursement in January 2014. Please see amendment approval from Ms. Libby Doggett and Ms. Linda Smith dated December 13, 2013.

Project 1 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

No substantive changes expected.

Budget Table: Project 2 – Maryland EXCELS (TQRIS)

Budget Table: Project 2			
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	$67,064	$666,318	$733,382
2. Fringe Benefits	$5,318	$61,679	$66,996
3. Travel	$2,347	$35,465	$37,812
4. Equipment	$68,178	$21,229	$89,407
5. Supplies	$333	$4,076	$4,409
6. Contractual	$668,428	$1,954,443	$2,622,871
7. Training Stipends	$0	$0	$0
8. Other	$17,878	$16,876	$34,755
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$829,546	$2,760,086	$3,589,632
10. Indirect Costs	$9,090	$70,012	$79,103
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0	$0	$0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0	$0	$0
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$838,636	$2,830,098	$3,668,735
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$4,790,401	$4,305,449	$9,095,849
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$5,629,037	$7,135,547	$12,764,584

Columns (a) and (b): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for the grant years.
Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first $25,000 of each contract included in line 6.
Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.
Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.
Line 12: The State must set aside $400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.
Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.
Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Project 2 Budget Table Narrative

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

Project 2 had slower than expected processes for hiring personnel and issuing RFPs for contracts which lead to a savings of $523,123. Through an approved amendment these funds were moved to Project 3 to support additional Judy Center sites. Please see amendment approval from Ms. Libby Doggett and Ms. Linda Smith dated September 20, 2013.

Project 2 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

No substantive changes expected.

Budget Table: Project 3 – Quality Capacity Building

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
Budget Table: Project 3			
1. Personnel	$0	$0	$0
2. Fringe Benefits	$0	$0	$0
3. Travel	$0	$129	$129
4. Equipment	$0	$0	$0
5. Supplies	$0	$0	$0
6. Contractual	$1,711,846	$2,618,965	$4,330,811
7. Training Stipends	$0	$0	$0
8. Other	$0	$0	$0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$1,711,846	$2,619,094	$4,330,940
10. Indirect Costs	$0	$13	$13
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0	$0	$0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0	$0	$0
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$1,711,846	$2,619,106	$4,330,952
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$20,876,813	$24,513,351	$45,390,163
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$22,588,659	$27,132,457	$49,721,116

Columns (a) and (b): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category. Column (e): Show the total amount requested for the grant years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 3 Budget Table Narrative

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

Maryland received amendment approval to redirect $1,050,000 from Year 1 to support two additional Judy Centers. These funds were redirected from Year 1 in project 2 and project 10 (see explanations under project 2 and project 10). Please see amendment approval from Ms. Libby Doggett and Ms. Linda Smith dated September 20, 2013.

Project 3 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

No substantive changes expected.

Budget Table: Project 4 – Promoting Use of Early Learning Standards

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
Budget Table: Project 4			
1. Personnel	$28,284	$11,063	$39,347
2. Fringe Benefits	$2,243	$324	$2,566
3. Travel	$539	$1,065	$1,604
4. Equipment	$9,725	$458	$10,183
5. Supplies	$0	$0	$0
6. Contractual	$167,674	$160,679	$328,353
7. Training Stipends	$0	$0	$0
8. Other	$1,596	$1,530	$3,126
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$210,060	$175,119	$385,179
10. Indirect Costs	$5,546	$3,331	$8,877
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0	$0	$0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0	$0	$0
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$215,606	$178,450	$394,056
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$230,373	$118,117	$348,490
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$445,979	$296,566	$742,546

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 4 Budget Table Narrative

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

The reductions are primarily due to the following:
- reduction in personnel for an Education Specialist position (.75 FTE) that was vacant for 10 months;
- reduction in personnel for stipends for the Guide to Pedagogy;
- reduction in contractual for the Guide to Pedagogy; and
- reduction in contract for VIOLETS.

Project 4 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

No substantive changes expected.

Budget Table: Project 5 – Professional Development Maryland Model for School Readiness

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
Budget Table: Project 5			
1. Personnel	$21,867	$42,134	$64,002
2. Fringe Benefits	$1,734	$3,341	$5,075
3. Travel	$120	$0	$120
4. Equipment	$7,070	$2,232	$9,302
5. Supplies	$0	$33	$33
6. Contractual	$201,608	$400,000	$601,608
7. Training Stipends	$0	$0	$0
8. Other	$1,597	$1,530	$3,127
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$233,996	$449,271	$683,267
10. Indirect Costs	$2,532	$3,954	$6,486
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0	$0	$0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0	$0	$0
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$236,528	$453,226	$689,753
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$974,641	$931,140	$1,905,781
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$1,211,169	$1,384,365	$2,595,534

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 5 Budget Table Narrative

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

The reductions for personnel and travel was due to an Education Specialist position vacancy for 6 months. Other staff members covered during the vacancy and their travel was not charged to the project.

Project 5 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

No substantive changes expected.

Budget Table: Project 6 – Comprehensive Assessment System

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
Budget Table: Project 6			
1. Personnel	$15,994	$104,608	$120,602
2. Fringe Benefits	$1,268	$6,402	$7,670
3. Travel	$5,186	$11,854	$17,041
4. Equipment	$9,194	$458	$9,652
5. Supplies	$0	$92	$92
6. Contractual	$746,036	$898,956	$1,644,993
7. Training Stipends	$0	$0	$0
8. Other	$1,910	$1,530	$3,440
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$779,589	$1,023,901	$1,803,490
10. Indirect Costs	$2,109	$11,690	$13,800
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0	$0	$0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0	$0	$0
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$781,698	$1,035,591	$1,817,290
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$1,575,865	$1,794,577	$3,370,442
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$2,357,563	$2,830,168	$5,187,731

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Maryland, through amendment approvals, moved $579,071 that was unspent mainly due to hiring delays into an existing contract to support development of interactive touch screen technology that will allow the State to deliver assessments to young children. As well, $472,785 from project 6 that was not needed for salary stipends was moved to project 8 to implement the Raising a Reader program. Maryland moved $533,814 from Year 1 to Year 3 in order to align the grant year funding to reflect the actual funding portion of Ohio (collaborative partner on the CAS), and will not in any way affect the scope, size or impact of this project.

Please see amendment approval letters from Ms. Libby Doggett and Ms. Linda Smith dated:
- September 20, 2013
- December 11, 2013
- December 13, 2013

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

Please see submitted amendment request dated February 3, 2014. This amendment requests moving funds to establish subgrants for LEAs so they can access technology and professional development in order to administer early childhood assessments.

Budget Table: Project 7 – Child Development Innovations

Budget Table: Project 7			
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	$4,043	$24,284	$28,328
2. Fringe Benefits	$321	$1,926	$2,247
3. Travel	$0	$1,176	$1,176
4. Equipment	$4,598	$229	$4,827
5. Supplies	$0	$0	$0
6. Contractual	$220,504	$114,574	$335,078
7. Training Stipends	$0	$0	$0
8. Other	$795	$801	$1,596
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$230,261	$142,990	$373,251
10. Indirect Costs	$516	$2,585	$3,101
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0	$0	$0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0	$0	$0
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$230,777	$145,575	$376,352
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$1,713,077	$1,706,328	$3,419,405
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$1,943,854	$1,851,903	$3,795,757

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 7 Budget Table Narrative

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

There were no discrepancies in this project budget.

Project 7 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

No substantive changes expected.

Budget Table: Project 8 – Family Engagement and Support

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
Budget Table: Project 8			
1. Personnel	$4,043	$24,284	$28,328
2. Fringe Benefits	$321	$1,926	$2,246
3. Travel	$0	$59	$59
4. Equipment	$4,598	$229	$4,827
5. Supplies	$405	$33	$438
6. Contractual	$195,706	$291,884	$487,590
7. Training Stipends	$0	$0	$0
8. Other	$795	$801	$1,596
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$205,868	$319,216	$525,084
10. Indirect Costs	$556	$2,475	$3,032
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0	$0	$0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0	$0	$0
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$206,425	$321,691	$528,116
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0	$0	$0
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$206,425	$321,691	$528,116

Columns (a) and (b): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for the grant years.
Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first $25,000 of each contract included in line 6.
Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.
Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.
Line 12: The State must set aside $400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.
Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.
Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

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

Maryland, through amendment, moved $472,785 from project 6 that was not needed for salary stipends to project 8 to implement the Raising a Reader program. Please see budget amendment approval letter from Ms. Libby Doggett and Ms. Linda Smith dated December 11, 2013.

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

Please see submitted amendment request dated February 13, 2014 asking to move $321,542 from unspent Raising a Reader funds to develop a related family focused website to connect Maryland families with resources for their young children. The increase for Years 3 and 4 in the "Contractual" line is due to the new "Raising a Reader" program.

Budget Table: Project 9 – Workforce Competency and Leadership Development

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
Budget Table: Project 9			
1. Personnel	$9,428	$3,810	$13,238
2. Fringe Benefits	$748	$108	$855
3. Travel	$0	$1,102	$1,102
4. Equipment	$0	$0	$0
5. Supplies	$0	$42	$42
6. Contractual	$102,267	$99,934	$202,201
7. Training Stipends	$0	$0	$0
8. Other	$0	$0	$0
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$112,442	$104,996	$217,438
10. Indirect Costs	$1,099	$862	$1,962
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0	$0	$0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0	$0	$0
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$113,542	$105,858	$219,400
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0	$0	$0
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$113,542	$105,858	$219,400

Columns (a) and (b): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for the grant years.
Line 6: Show the amount of funds allocated through contracts with vendors for products to be acquired and/or professional services to be provided. A State may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first $25,000 of each contract included in line 6.
Line 10: If the State plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to line 11.
Line 11: Show the amount of funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners through MOUs, interagency agreements, contracts, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. States are not required to provide budgets for how the localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners will use these funds. However, the Departments expect that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs, and other partners spend these funds in accordance with the State Plan.
Line 12: The State must set aside $400,000 from its grant funds for the purpose of participating in RTT–ELC grantee technical assistance activities facilitated by ED or HHS. This is primarily to be used for travel and may be allocated to Participating State Agencies evenly across the four years of the grant.
Line 13: This is the total funding requested under this grant.
Line 14: Show total funding from other sources (including Federal, State, private, or local) being used to support the State Plan and describe these funding sources in the budget narrative.

Project 9 Budget Table Narrative
Please provide a brief explanation of any discrepancies between the State's approved budget and its total expenditures for the reporting year.

The reductions for Personnel are due to the following:
- reduction in personnel for an Education Specialist position (.25 FTE) that was vacant for 10 months; and reduction in personnel for stipends for Early Childhood Leadership Academies;

The increases for the "Contractual" line item are due to the following:
- increase in contractual for Internships for the MAAPP project; and
- increase in contractual for Early Learning Leadership Academy.

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

No substantive changes expected.

Budget Table: Project 10 – Early Learning Data System

Budget Table: Project 10			
Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	$0	$0	$0
2. Fringe Benefits	$291	$0	$291
3. Travel	$0	$0	$0
4. Equipment	$9,250	$458	$9,708
5. Supplies	$0	$0	$0
6. Contractual	$184,408	$2,682,348	$2,866,756
7. Training Stipends	$0	$0	$0
8. Other	$3,231	$1,343	$4,574
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$197,180	$2,684,149	$2,881,329
10. Indirect Costs	$4,418	$12,961	$17,378
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0	$0	$0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$0	$0	$0
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$201,597	$2,697,110	$2,898,708
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$2,185,184	$4,368,118	$6,553,302
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$2,386,781	$7,065,228	$9,452,010

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 10 Budget Table Narrative

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

Maryland realized savings by revamping the point of service attendance system to be an on-line system that does not require additional equipment which reduced the vendor contract by $665,016. Through amendment, most of these funds were moved to project 3 for additional Judy Centers. Please see budget amendment approval letter from Ms. Libby Doggett and Ms. Linda Smith dated September 20, 2013.

Project 10 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

The "Contractual" line item increases in Years 3 and 4 are due to the expansion of the IT Development Team.

Budget Table: Project 11 – Overall Grant Management

Budget Categories	Grant Year 1 (a)	Grant Year 2 (b)	Total (e)
Budget Table: Project 11			
1. Personnel	$0	$59,842	$59,842
2. Fringe Benefits	$0	$4,745	$4,745
3. Travel	$0	$413	$413
4. Equipment	$19,983	$2,690	$22,673
5. Supplies	$0	$0	$0
6. Contractual	$0	$21,856	$21,856
7. Training Stipends	$0	$0	$0
8. Other	$2,331	$1,717	$4,048
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)	$22,314	$91,264	$113,578
10. Indirect Costs	$428	$6,459	$6,887
11. Funds to be distributed to localities, Early Learning Intermediary Organizations, Participating Programs and other partners	$0	$0	$0
12. Funds set aside for participation in grantee technical assistance	$4,539	$44,582	$49,121
13. **Total Grant Funds Requested** (add lines 9-12)	$27,282	$142,304	$169,586
14. Funds from other sources used to support the State Plan	$0	$0	$0
15. **Total Statewide Budget** (add lines 13-14)	$27,282	$142,304	$169,586

Columns (a) and (b): For each grant year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category. Column (e): Show the total amount requested for the grant years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project 11 Budget Table Narrative

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

The reduction for personnel was due to a Procurement position vacancy during all of year 1 and 2.

Project 11 Budget Table Explanation of Changes

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

Please see grant amendment request dated February 13, 2014. This amendment seeks to move funds into the "Contract" line in Year 3 to develop a website tailored to families to help them find early childhood resources in Maryland.

APPENDIX

Attachment A

Scope of RTT-ELC Collaboration

Division/Agency	Type of Activity	GRADS360 Activity Index
MSDE Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services	Establishment of a coaching and mentoring training program for public and private community-based early learning and development programs serving children with IFSP/IEPs	3.11.
MSDE Division of Instruction	Revised early learning frameworks and standards aligned with the MD Common Core Curriculum K-12, and the appropriate alignment documents (e.g., Healthy Beginnings, Head Start Child Development and Early Learning Framework). Development of the Kindergarten Entry Assessment (KEA) and formative assessments (36-72 mos.)	4.1. 6.1.
MSDE Division of Academic Reform and Innovation	Conducting Early Childhood Leadership Academies each year, starting August 2013 Identify the scope of all programs being targeted for quality capacity building Establishment of a statewide Early Childhood Breakthrough Center infrastructure Provided training and orientation on the Early Childhood Breakthrough Center to the Resource and Referral agencies across the state Completed pilot study; Expanded capacity building activities to more than 250 programs.	9.5. 3.1. – 3.4.
MSDE Division of School and Student Support Services	Maryland developed a web-based data outcome monitoring tool for the existing SEFEL initiative.	7.4.
MSDE Division of Library Services	Library Family Councils: Established Library Family Councils in Library Systems serving Title I school districts Library Family Councils: Established Family Information Centers in Library Systems serving Title I school districts	8.12.; 8.13
MSDE Division of Certification and Accreditation	Initiated a Maryland Approved Alternative Preparation Program for Early Childhood Education (ECE-MAAPP)	9.2.
MSDE Division of Assessment and Accountability	Developed Kindergarten Entry Assessment (KEA) and formative assessments (36-72 mos.) ELC Project 10 Data Systems is linked with RTTT Maryland Longitudinal Data System	6.1.

Division/Agency	Type of Activity	GRADS360 Activity Index
Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (DHMH)	Early Childhood Mental Health Phone Consultation for Pediatricians: Developed and implemented phone consultation services for primary care providers in concert with the B-HIPP Project Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation Training for Pediatricians: Recruited and trained primary care providers and ECMH consultants Reach Out and Read (ROR): Established leadership, governance, and structure of statewide coalition to promote Reach Out and Read (ROR) through Local Early Childhood Advisory Councils ROR: Recruited additional jurisdictions/local coalitions to participate in ROR expansion ROR: Worked with local coalitions to recruit additional pediatric practices to participate in ROR	7.1.; 7.2. 8.9-8.11
Maryland Department of Human Resources	Completed Governor's Task Force on Case Management Procedures for Maryland's Child Care Subsidy Program in May 2012. One of the outcomes was the issuance by MSDE of a RFP to solicit a vendor for administering eligibility determination and consumer education for families eligible for child care subsidy. (To be implemented by July 2014).	1.4.

Attachment B

Committees, Councils, Workgroups by RTT-ELC projects (as of December 2013)

RTT-ELC Project	Workgroups
Project 1	Task Force on Improving Early Learning for Low Income and Disadvantaged Children
Project 2	Maryland EXCELS Workgroup DECD Research Advisory Group
Project 3	Judy Hoyer Advisory Council (expansion of Judy Center Partnerships in Baltimore City and Prince George's County) Crossfunctional Steering Committee (Early Childhood Breakthrough Centers)
Project 4	Prek Common Core Standards Workgroups Guide to Early Pedagogy Workgroup
Project 6	State Advisory Council National Technical Advisory Council Ad hoc work groups
Project 7	Developmental Screening Workgroup SEFEL Partnership Committee
Project 8	Coalition of Family Engagement
Project 9	Task Force in Teacher education in Early Childhood Education
Project 10	Early Childhood Data System Committee

Task Force on Teacher Education in Early Childhood Education

Statement of Work

Purpose:

Develop a framework to increase access to teacher training in early childhood education and improve the quality of teacher education in early childhood learning programs.

The Task Force is charged with developing plans to:

1. Strengthen alternative pathways to obtaining a post-secondary degree in early childhood development, including a review of the AAT-ECE, the Maryland Approved Alternative Preparation Program (MAAPP), and the articulation agreements between MSDE and community colleges for required training and course work in child care.

2. Implement strategies to expand the number of programs offering teacher education in early childhood education.

3. Propose incentives and rewards programs for practitioners in early childhood education to pursue and complete a post-secondary degree in early childhood education.

4. Implement a new degree program, Birth to Five, through a blended curriculum of early childhood special education and regular early childhood education.

5. Develop and promote a State plan for teacher education in early childhood education.

Membership:

1. MSDE Assistant State Superintendent for the Division of Early Childhood Development – Chair, Dr. Rolf Grafwallner

2. MSDE Assistant State Superintendent for Special Education/Early Intervention Services, Ms. Marcella Franczkowski

3. MSDE Assistant State Superintendent for Certification , Dr. Jean Satterfield

4. Secretary, Maryland Higher Education Commission, Dr. Danette Howard

5. Maryland Association of Boards of Education, Dr. Edward L. Root

6. President of the Maryland Head Start Association, Ms. Amy Collier

7. President of the Maryland State Child Care Association, Ms. Jennifer Nizer

8. Governor's Office for Children, Ms. Jessica Hargest

9. Maryland State Education Association (MSEA), Mr. Richard Benfer

10. Baltimore Teachers' Union, Ms. Tia Coutroupis

11. Public School Superintendents' Association of Maryland (PSSAM), Dr. John Gaddis

12. One student enrolled in an early childhood teacher education program, Ms. Adriane Dean

13. Chair of the State Interagency Coordinating Council, Dr. Brenda Hussey Gardner

14. Maryland Association of Community Colleges, Dr. Fran Kroll

15. University of Maryland College Park, Dr. Christy Tirrell-Corbin, Ph.D. (Director of Early Childhood Education) and Sarah Rebecca Honberg (Undergraduate, Early Childhood Education Program (going into Senior Year)

16. Morgan State University, Dr. Patricia Welch

17. Maryland Independent College and University Association, Ms. Tina Bjarekull

18. Consortium of Early Childhood Faculty of two and four year colleges, Dr. Stacie Birch

19. Preschool coordinator from a local board of education, Ms. Janine Bacquie

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

Figure 1.

Type	Non-Accredited						Accredited						Totals By Type						Total (330)
Checks	N	1	2	3	4	5	N	1	2	3	4	5	N	1	2	3	4	5	Program
Center Based	62	9	1	1	1	1	25	2	6	5	5	31	87	11	7	6	6	32	149
Family Provider	113	1	3	0	0	4	26	2	2	1	0	16	139	3	5	1	0	20	168
School-Age	1	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	1	7
Public Pre-K	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Large Family	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Totals By Check	182	14	4	1	1	6	51	4	9	6	5	47	233	18	13	7	6	53	330