



# RACE TO THE TOP - EARLY LEARNING CHALLENGE

PANEL REVIEW BY APPLICANT

**NEW MEXICO**

(REVISED 3/2012)



Selection Criteria	Available Points	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Average Points
<b>A. Successful State Systems</b>							
(A)(1) Demonstrating past commitment to early learning and development	20	15	17	18	18	15	<b>16.6</b>
(A)(2) Articulating the State's rationale for its early learning and development reform agenda and goals.	20	16	16	16	18	10	<b>15.2</b>
(A)(3) Aligning and coordinating early learning and development across the State	10	8	5	7	8	4	<b>6.4</b>
(A)(4) Developing a budget to implement and sustain the work of this grant.	15	12	10	11	13	3	<b>9.8</b>
<b>B. High-Quality, Accountable Programs</b>							
(B)(1) Developing and adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System	10	6	8	8	9	4	<b>7</b>
(B)(2) Promoting participation in the State's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System	15	11	12	14	13	5	<b>11</b>
(B)(3) Rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs	15	12	12	13	13	5	<b>11</b>
(B)(4) Promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs	20	16	12	18	16	10	<b>14.4</b>
(B)(5) Validating the effectiveness of the State Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System.	15	12	11	12	13	8	<b>11.2</b>
<b>C. Promoting Early Learning and Development Outcomes for Children</b>							
(C)(1) Developing and using statewide, high-quality Early Learning and Development Standards.	30	26	28	26	27	26	<b>26.6</b>
(C)(2) Supporting effective uses of Comprehensive Assessment Systems.	30	23	23	27	28	12	<b>22.6</b>
(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.	-	-	-	-	-	-	

<b>D. A Great Early Childhood Education Workforce</b>							
(D)(1) Developing a Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and a progression of credentials.	20	20	20	19	20	18	<b>19.4</b>
(D)(2) Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities.	20	15	17	17	18	12	<b>15.8</b>
<b>E. Measuring Outcomes and Progress</b>							
(E)(1) Understanding the status of children's learning and development at kindergarten entry.	20	16	14 <sup>1</sup>	16	16	8	<b>14<sup>1</sup></b>
(E)(2) Building or enhancing an early learning data system to improve instruction, practices, services, and policies.	20	20	16	19	16	16	<b>17.4</b>
<b>Total Points for Selection Criteria</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>218.4<sup>1</sup></b>
Competitive Preference Priority 2:* Including all Early Learning and Development Programs in the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System	10	8	8	9	8	6	<b>7.8</b>
Competitive Preference Priority 3:** Understanding the Status of Children's Learning and Development at Kindergarten Entry	Yes/No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	<b>10</b>
Absolute Priority: *** Promoting School Readiness for Children with High Needs.	Yes/No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<b>Yes</b>
						<b>Total Score</b>	<b>236.2<sup>1</sup></b>

<sup>1</sup> The scores of five States (including New Mexico) have been revised to correct scoring errors. These corrections do not affect the funding of any applicant for Fiscal Year 2011. With respect to New Mexico, reviewer #2's score on selection criterion E(1) is corrected from 13 points to 14 points. This correction results in an increase in the average overall score across reviewers from 236 to 236.2.

\* Applicants are eligible to earn up to 10 points for Competitive Preference Priority 2: Including all Early Learning and Development Programs in the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System. The total awarded to the applicant for Priority 2 is based on an average of individual reviewer scores in this section.

\*\* Applicants are eligible for either 0 or 10 points for Competitive Preference Priority 3: Understanding the Status of Children's Learning and Development at Kindergarten Entry. The total awarded to the applicant for Priority 3 is not based on an average of individual reviewer scores in this section. Rather, 10 points are added to the applicant's Average Total Score if a majority of reviewers determined that the applicant has met the priority.

\*\*\* The Applicant will be determined to have met the absolute priority if the majority of reviewers responded "yes".

- Applicants could choose to respond to two or more criteria from Section C, one or more criteria from Section D and one or more criteria from Section E, as well as either or both of the competitive preference priorities. A dash (-) indicates that the applicant did not choose to respond to a particular criterion or priority.

