| Selection Criteria | Available Points | Reviewer 1 | Reviewer 2 | Reviewer 3 | Reviewer 4 | Reviewer 5 | Average Points |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **A. Successful State Systems** | | | | | | | |
| (A)(1) Demonstrating past commitment to early learning and development | 20 | 17 | 19 | 17 | 19 | 13 | **17** |
| (A)(2) Articulating the State's rationale for its early learning and development reform agenda and goals. | 20 | 18 | 18 | 17 | 20 | 16 | **17.8** |
| (A)(3) Aligning and coordinating early learning and development across the State | 10 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 10 | **9.2** |
| (A)(4) Developing a budget to implement and sustain the work of this grant. | 15 | 14 | 15 | 13 | 12 | 13 | **13.4** |
| **B. High-Quality, Accountable Programs** | | | | | | | |
| (B)(1) Developing and adopting a common, statewide Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System | 10 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 10 | **9** |
| (B)(2) Promoting participation in the State's Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System | 15 | 15 | 14 | 13 | 12 | 13 | **13.4** |
| (B)(3) Rating and monitoring Early Learning and Development Programs | 15 | 10 | 13 | 14 | 13 | 12 | **12.4** |
| (B)(4) Promoting access to high-quality Early Learning and Development Programs for Children with High Needs | 20 | 20 | 20 | 18 | 15 | 16 | **17.8** |
| (B)(5) Validating the effectiveness of the State Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System. | 15 | 15 | 13 | 14 | 8 | 15 | **13** |
| **C. Promoting Early Learning and Development Outcomes for Children** | | | | | | | |
| (C)(1) Developing and using statewide, high-quality Early Learning and Development Standards. | 30 | 25 | 28 | 26 | 28 | 26 | **26.6** |
| (C)(2) Supporting effective uses of Comprehensive Assessment Systems. | 30 | 25 | 28 | 22 | 29 | 30 | **26.8** |
| (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. A Great Early Childhood Education Workforce** | | | | | | | |
| (D)(1) Developing a Workforce Knowledge and Competency Framework and a progression of credentials. | 40 | 30 | 35 | 34 | 25 | 30 | **30.8** |
| (D)(2) Supporting Early Childhood Educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities. | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| **E. Measuring Outcomes and Progress** | | | | | | | |
| (E)(1) Understanding the status of children's learning and development at kindergarten entry. | 20 | 20 | 18 | 16 | 19 | 16 | **17.8** |
| (E)(2) Building or enhancing an early learning data system to improve instruction, practices, services, and policies. | 20 | 20 | 18 | 16 | 17 | 16 | **17.4** |
| **Total Points for Selection Criteria** | **280** | **247** | **258** | **237** | **234** | **236** | **242.4** |
| Competitive Preference Priority 2:* Including all Early Learning and Development Programs in the Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System | 10 | 10 | 9 | 6 | 9 | 9 | **8.6** |
| Competitive Preference Priority 3:** Understanding the Status of Children's Learning and Development at Kindergarten Entry | Yes/No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | **10** |
| Absolute Priority: *** Promoting School Readiness for Children with High Needs. | Yes/No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | **Yes** |
| | | | | | | **Total Score** | **261** |

\* 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.