



Proposal Considerations: Pre-K 4 SA Evaluation Year 2

Submitted to
Early Childhood Education Municipal Development
Corporation

November, 2014

Proposal Considerations: Pre-K 4 SA Evaluation Year 2

The purpose of this document is to present eight proposal considerations for additional assessment and evaluation work in supporting Pre-K 4 SA during the second year of implementation. These particular proposals are being presented to achieve the provision of important information to Pre-K 4 SA while remaining mindful to maintain a low level of additional cost.

A preliminary discussion of the proposal options was held October 21, 2014 with Elaine Mendoza and Kathy Bruck. From that meeting, an initial recommendation of focus concerning four of the proposal was suggested. Per this recommendation, the proposal options have been divided into 3 categories; 1) recommended for action by the Board, 2) recommended for action by the Board as a back-up strategy only if needed, and 3) not recommended for action by the Board.

Each presented proposal option includes a brief explanation of the proposed work, a timeline of expected activities, and a budget. All proposals (with the exception of Proposal Option 5) have been planned so all activities would be completed within the current year of work (Year 2 ending August 31, 2015). Any proposal could also be completed in future program years. A brief overview of all eight proposals follows:

Recommended for action by the Board

- Option 1: Pre-K 4 SA Research Review Board documentation and processes
 - *Need* – persons entering Pre-K 4 SA facilities with data collection intentions not previously vetted before conducting data collection.
 - *Purpose* – to provide Pre-K 4 SA with a systematic, standardized process through which Pre-K 4 SA can receive and process research requests.
 - *Benefit* – to protect child and family confidentiality and be aware of all research involving Pre-K 4 SA.
- Option 2: Pilot comparison group during the pre-K year
 - *Need* –for stronger causal statements to be made concerning effectiveness of Pre-K 4 SA.
 - *Purpose* – to gather nutrition and social-emotional competencies information using two brief parent-report surveys on a sample of 50 comparison and Pre-K 4 SA children.
 - *Benefit* – a rigorous comparison to similar children as the Pre-K 4 SA children from which causal statements of effectiveness may be made.
- Option 3: Increase in classroom observations
 - *Need* – to receive adherence and quality information on all teachers as opposed to select few teachers.
 - *Purpose* – to increase the amount of information analyzed for the fidelity of implementation evaluation as well as descriptive information on classroom quality in Pre-K 4 SA classrooms.
 - *Benefit* – more confidence fidelity of implementation, classroom quality, and subsequent recommendations are reflective of Pre-K 4 SA implementation.

- Option 4: Reach of Pre-K 4 SA professional development activities
 - *Need* – to understand the level of reach and services, by Pre-K 4 SA, to teachers in the city of San Antonio.
 - *Purpose* – to provide information related to Pre-K 4 SA professional development efforts (both external and internal).
 - *Benefit* – understand reach Pre-K 4 SA professional development across the city and interest of educators in returning to Pre-K 4 SA for further opportunities.

Not recommended for action by the Board at this time

- Option 5: Open records data request as backup to district-submitted data
 - *Need* – protection in lieu of concern of obtaining data from partner districts on comparison students.
 - *Purpose* – open data requests to such state databases as the Education Research Centers (ERCs) or directly to the Texas Education Agency (TEA) in the event that district partners do not agree to provide comparison student data in addition to former Pre-K 4 SA student data.
 - *Benefit* – backup to non-cooperation from districts and the ability to track students throughout the state of Texas longitudinally.

Not recommended for action by the Board

- Option 6: Individual CLASS reports for Pre-K 4 SA teachers
 - *Need* – teachers requested information about their own observations as ways to support targeted improvement of teacher quality.
 - *Purpose* – to provide confidential, individual reports created and supplied to each teacher who receives an observation.
 - *Benefit* – feedback to teachers on classroom quality from which teachers may take a more active approach to requesting tailored professional development support from Pre-K 4 SA.
- Options 7 & 8: Alignment study: In-depth investigation into the Revised Texas Pre-K Guidelines and alignment to national standards
 - *Need* – to better understand how Texas standards compare to other state and national standards.
 - *Purpose* – to provide (option 7) an overview of the standards in comparison to other published standards and (option 8) a more in-depth examination of the standards.
 - *Benefit* – critical examination of standards as well as recommendations for potential modification of Pre-K 4 SA goals beyond the Revised Texas Pre-K Guidelines.

Proposal Option 1: Development of review board processes and documentation

Recently, Edvance was made aware that other parties may be interested in conducting research with or about Pre-K 4 SA. Based on this information, Edvance suggested that Pre-K 4 SA form an Institutional Review Board or Research Review Board that would evaluate each research request and determine appropriateness of Pre-K 4 SA's participation in such research activities. An Institutional Review Board (IRB) is a committee established to review and approve research involving human subjects. The purpose of IRB review is to assure, both in advance and periodic review, that appropriate steps are taken to protect the rights and welfare of individuals participating as subjects in the research and that it is conducted in accordance with all federal/state, institutional & ethical guidelines. To accomplish this purpose, IRBs use a group process to review research protocols and related materials (e.g., informed consent documents) to ensure protection of the rights and welfare of subjects of research.

This proposal option would include Edvance developing the IRB application process including the development of all electronic forms/documents (in Adobe) to be completed as part of the process. These electronic forms could be posted to the Pre-K 4 SA website and completed by all interested researchers. Forms could then be automatically emailed to designated Pre-K 4 SA staff.

Information typically requested in research proposals:

- A. Researcher qualifications.
- B. Brief statement of theoretical basis for study from prior published research and what contribution the work is expected to make in the field (including purpose of research and description of benefit to Pre-K 4 SA and/or profession of education)
- C. Research type, research questions, hypotheses and methodology (including research design, sampling & recruitment, measures to be used, data collection & procedures)
- D. Analytic approach and planned analyses including a description of research activities and school/student/staff involvement (burden on the Pre-K program)
- E. Research study timeline with start/end dates for all activities up to and including final report submission
- F. Copies of surveys and instruments, consent forms, and recruitment materials (if applicable)
- G. Specific data requested (if requesting existing data from Pre-K 4 SA)
- H. Security and background clearance for any individual/researcher who will have contact with students/staff and/or confidential data.

In addition to development of electronic IRB forms, Edvance would also create IRB processes such as review schedules and deadlines for submission to be considered for review, potential cost to cover time of a review team, suggestions of appointment of review team and potential outcomes of review processes.

It is important to note this proposal option does not include Edvance serving or participating in the IRB review committee, as this would be a potential conflict of interest; rather this proposal option allows for

the creation of documents and processes that would be used by a Pre-K 4 SA appointed IRB review committee.

Benefits of this option include a systematic, standardized process through which Pre-K 4 SA can receive research requests, process and approve or deny such requests, protect child and family confidentiality and be aware of research involving Pre-K 4 SA while allowing appropriate access to interested research parties.

Timeline

Task	Date
Meet with Pre-K 4 SA board and staff to discuss wants/needs in IRB documentation and processes	January 2015
Draft all IRB documentation and processes	February – March 2015
Submit drafts to Pre-K 4 SA and discuss feedback	April 2015
Revise IRB documentation and processes based on Pre-K 4 SA feedback	May 2015
Convert IRB documents into electronic Adobe forms	June 2015
Finalize IRB documentation and processes with Pre-K 4 SA for use beginning in August 2015	July 2015

Budget

Expenditure code	Expenditure description		
6100	Payroll costs	\$	18,924
6200	Professional & Contracted Services	\$	-
6300	Supplies & Materials	\$	403
6400	Other operating Costs	\$	-
6600	Capital outlay	\$	-
7000	Indirect Costs	\$	2,470
	Total Budget	\$	21,796

Proposal Option 2: Pilot comparison group during the pre-K year

During the random selection of Pre-K 4 SA cohort 2 children, information was maintained on those children who were not randomly selected to attend Pre-K 4 SA. With this information, it would be possible to contact families to share whether those children are enrolled in some type of pre-K and if so select from several options to understand the type of pre-K children are experiencing (district pre-K, friend's in-home care, Head Start, private pre-K, etc.). In addition, this option proposes to gather information using two brief parent-report surveys gathering information on nutrition and social-emotional competencies of both the comparison children and Pre-K 4 SA children so as to provide a stringent comparison in family nutrition and an important area of kindergarten readiness; social-emotional competencies. These surveys would be sent in the spring of the current school year to a randomly selected group of Pre-K 4 SA children's families and to a randomly selected group of comparison children's families.

Sample

This proposal option will include roughly 50 children (25 Pre-K 4 SA children and 25 comparison children). Consent forms will be distributed to approximately 350 children and those who return consent forms agreeing to participate will make up the sample from which participants are randomly selected to participate. In selection, care will be taken to select children representing all four Pre-K 4 SA centers to geographically represent the city of San Antonio.

Measures

Two parent-report measures are proposed to be collected from both Pre-K 4 SA and non-Pre-K 4 SA children's parents or guardians. These measures were selected to be included in this proposal option to address an area that is not currently being investigated (nutrition) and one that was of focus as a result of the Year 1 evaluation report (social-emotional competencies). In addition, these measures and outcomes were selected to maintain lower costs and increase the likelihood of participation as children and families will not need to travel to a location, children will not receive any direct assessments and for families that have email, surveys can be emailed directly to participating families from which all responses can be submitted online. This last point also considers cost as researchers will not have to spend time entering as much paper data if many responses are collected online and populated into a database.

Nutrition Screening Tool for Every Preschooler (NutriSTEP™). NutriSTEP™ is a parent-administered, 17-item nutrition questionnaire developed to assess nutritional risk. The NutriSTEP™ has been validated in multicultural Canadian preschool aged children with a detailed assessment by a registered dietitian including nutritional history and a 3 day dietary recall. Items on the NutriSTEP™ questionnaire have been found to have adequate ($\kappa > 0.5$) to excellent ($\kappa > 0.75$) agreement.

Devereux Early Childhood Assessment (DECA). The DECA would be used to measure children's social-emotional competencies, through parent report. Parents report on the frequency of children's behavior on items comprising four sub-scales in the DECA (initiative, self-control, attachment/closeness

with adults, and behavioral concerns). The DECA is completed using a 5-point Likert-type scale to indicate how often within the past 4 weeks a child exhibited behaviors described by assessment items (0 = never, 1 = rarely, 2 = occasionally, 3 = frequently, and 4 = very frequently).

Both proposed measures will be available in English and Spanish so family members can complete the measure using the language in which they feel most comfortable.

Benefits of this proposal option include a rigorous comparison to similar children as the Pre-K 4 SA children as well as more information on the pre-K experience of children who were not randomly selected to attend Pre-K 4 SA during Year 2 of implementation (2014-2015 school year).

Timeline

Task	Date
Obtain lottery database from Pre-K 4 SA, purchase survey materials, and submit to IRB for study approval	December 2014 – February 2015
Send consent forms to families/Receive consent forms	February – March 2015
Select sample from consenting families, send links to electronic survey and hard copies of surveys	April – May 2015
Clean electronic data/Enter and clean hard copy data	June 2015
Analyze data	July 2015
Draft and finalize additional results section of Year 2 final report	August 2015

Budget

Expenditure code	Expenditure description		
6100	Payroll costs	\$	37,027
6200	Professional & Contracted Services	\$	-
6300	Supplies & Materials	\$	1,183
6400	Other operating Costs	\$	2,703
6600	Capital outlay	\$	-
7000	Indirect Costs	\$	5,229
	Total Budget	\$	46,142

Proposal Option 3: Increase in number of observations to include more classrooms

During Year 1 all 36 classrooms were able to receive classroom observations due to inclusion in both the evaluation and the alignment study. During Year 2, however, the amount of classrooms able to be included in classroom observations is fewer while the number of classrooms has doubled due to the opening of two new centers. This option would allow for the remaining 48 classrooms to be included in the classroom observations.

Increasing the number of classroom observations increases the number of teachers that participate in observations which, in turn, increases the amount of information to be analyzed for the fidelity of implementation results as well as descriptive information on the classroom quality in Pre-K 4 SA classrooms. If Proposal Option 6 is also of interest, additional classrooms that participate in observations can also be eligible to receive individual CLASS reports (at an incremental cost increase to Proposal Option 6).

With an increase in the number of observations being conducted, more confidence can be taken that fidelity of implementation and classroom quality results are reflective of the Pre-K 4 SA implementation. In other words, benefits include more wide spread representation of Pre-K 4 SA classroom quality and fidelity which would also lead to a broader perspective from which to base professional development recommendations.

Timeline

Task	Date
Recruitment, training, and certification of additional CLASS and fidelity observers (number dependent upon number of additional observations selected)	January – February 2015
Collect additional CLASS and fidelity measure data through observations	March – April 2015
Clean/Analyze additional CLASS and fidelity measure data	May 2015
Draft and Finalize fidelity section of final report incorporating additional observation results	June 2015
Incorporate fidelity report section into Year 2 final report	July – August 2015

Budget

Budget includes Other Operating Costs (ODCs) to certify 3 additional classroom observers and to recertify 2 current classroom observers in the CLASS. CLASS certification classes also require travel to the training location, which included in the total price. Professional & Contracted Services includes labor for consultants/classroom observers.

Expenditure code	Expenditure description		
6100	Payroll costs		\$ 21,966
6200	Professional & Contracted Services		\$ 8,625
6300	Supplies & Materials		\$ -
6400	Other operating Costs		\$ 8,913
6600	Capital outlay		\$ -
7000	Indirect Costs		\$ 5,049
	Total Budget		\$ 44,552

Proposal Option 4: Reach of Pre-K 4 SA professional development activities

The mission of Pre-K 4 SA is to reach the larger early childhood population in San Antonio by providing professional development to educators outside of the Pre-K 4 SA centers. This option would provide information related to the reach of this professional development effort through the descriptive analysis of the number of educators who participate in the professional development provided, what roles are represented by participants as well as how often educators return to receive more professional development from Pre-K 4 SA. Information on professional development within Pre-K 4 SA would also be provided as well as the percent of Pre-K 4 SA teachers who attend the broader Pre-K 4 SA professional development efforts outside the centers.

Discussions have already occurred with Pre-K 4 SA professional development staff and Edvance has received information from those discussions that the type of information proposed to be investigated is currently being collected concerning the professional development activities being provided.

Benefits include the understanding of the reach Pre-K 4 SA professional development is having across the city as well as interest in educators returning to Pre-K 4 SA professional development for further opportunities.

Timeline

Task	Date
Pre-K 4 SA provides requested data concerning fall semester professional development activities (both in and out of the centers)	January 2015
Clean professional development information from first semester	January – February 2015
Pre-K 4 SA provides requested data concerning spring semester professional development activities (both in and out of the centers)	June 2015
Clean professional development information from second semester	June – July 2015
Analyze professional development information	July 2015
Draft and finalize professional development section of Year 2 final report	August 2015

Budget

Expenditure code	Expenditure description		
6100	Payroll costs	\$	8,561
6200	Professional & Contracted Services	\$	-
6300	Supplies & Materials	\$	-
6400	Other operating Costs	\$	-
6600	Capital outlay	\$	-
7000	Indirect Costs	\$	1,094
	Total Budget	\$	9,655

Proposal Option 5: Open records data request as backup to district-submitted data

During the Year 1 result discussions, questions arose about the dependence on data from districts rather than from open requests to such state databases as the Education Research Centers (ERCs) or directly to the Texas Education Agency (TEA). Proposing use of such requests to obtain data on Pre-K 4 SA and comparison children may also allow for more of the Pre-K 4 SA sample to be included in longitudinal analyses even if they move from participating school districts (as long as children attended school within the state of Texas). However, it is important to note two key points. First, 'open' requests only refer to aggregated data at a campus or district level while the data necessary to conduct the analyses for the evaluation require student-level data. Second, there may be a significant delay in the ability to obtain the necessary student-level data in a timely manner as TEA usually must finalize all data from a school year before making such data available for requests.

This option would include the creation of a request for data, presentation and time to clarify questions concerning the request if necessary. It is important to note that in conversations with multiple TEA staff Edvance has verified that for pre-K and kindergarten children there is limited information available. The information that is currently collected about academic or social outcomes for children only include kindergarten entry assessment scores and TELPAS scores for limited English proficient children. As Edvance has submitted requests in the past, we have also learned that TEA fits requests for data into schedule of existing personnel. As a lower priority, such requests often get delayed from anticipated timelines. Because of these potential risks, this proposal option may be one that would not be able to be completed during the current year.

Benefits include the ability to track students throughout the state of Texas as well as the provision of data to be included in the evaluation even in the event of district lack of cooperation in providing Pre-K 4 SA and comparison child data.

Timeline

Task	Date
Prepare request documentation including list of requested information	January – February 2015
Address questions and requests for more information if applicable	March 2015
Receive approval for data request	April – May 2015
Receive requested data	July – September 2015
Clean/Analyze data	October – November 2015
Draft and finalize results	December 2015

Budget

It should be noted, the fee for requests may be substantially lower than the fee for the ERC (which is included in the budget below: \$19,090). However, it is typical for the Texas Education Agency to direct such request to the ERC for approval and data analysis, therefore it is included in this budget.

Expenditure code	Expenditure description		
6100	Payroll costs	\$	32,458
6200	Professional & Contracted Services	\$	-
6300	Supplies & Materials	\$	-
6400	Other operating Costs	\$	19,090
6600	Capital outlay	\$	-
7000	Indirect Costs	\$	6,588
	Total Budget	\$	58,136

Proposal Option 6: Individual CLASS reports for Pre-K 4 SA teachers

During Year 1, some teachers requested information concerning their individual observation results so they may understand areas in which they could improve. This option would provide for confidential, individual reports to be created and supplied to each teacher who receives an observation in the spring. It is important to note that these reports would only be supplied to individual teachers not to Pre-K 4 SA leadership. This is to protect from inappropriate use of information; this information was collected for evaluation of the program, not for potential punitive action against individual teachers. Therefore, individual information will be shared with respective teachers who would be free to share with leadership if that is the wish of the teacher. Information that will be reported will include:

- Average CLASS score on three domains
 - Emotional Support
 - Classroom Organization
 - Instructional Support

- Average CLASS score on all 10 dimensions within the three domains

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Positive Climate ○ Negative Climate ○ Teacher Sensitivity ○ Regard for Student Perspectives ○ Behavior Management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Productivity ○ Instructional Learning Formats ○ Concept Development ○ Quality of Feedback ○ Language Modeling
---	---

All domain and dimension scores will also include brief discussions of findings as well as brief descriptions of the meaning behind each dimension.

It is important to note that CLASS observations are conducted to include both the lead teacher as well as the teacher assistant as both adults are in the classroom interacting with children for the majority of the day and children view both adults as teachers in their classroom. Because of this, the individual CLASS reports for a classroom will be sent both teachers. It is up to the teachers whether they would like to discuss their results with one another or outside the pair.

Benefits include feedback to teachers on classroom quality as well as dimensions of quality for teachers to request assistance, information or professional development to improve skills. This information will allow teachers to take a more active approach to requesting professional development support provided by Pre-K 4 SA.

Timeline

All 24 CLASS reports would be drafted after data analysis was completed. Final reports would be expected to be sent to teachers in July 2015. A high-level timeline follows:

Task	Date
Collect CLASS data through observations (24 classrooms)	March – April 2015
Clean/Analyze CLASS data by individual observation	May 2015
Draft and Finalize 24 individual CLASS reports	June 2015
Send out CLASS reports to all participating classroom teachers	July 2015

Budget

Budget for 24 confidential individual teacher reports.

Expenditure code	Expenditure description		
6100	Payroll costs	\$	9,027
6200	Professional & Contracted Services	\$	-
6300	Supplies & Materials	\$	-
6400	Other operating Costs	\$	575
6600	Capital outlay	\$	-
7000	Indirect Costs	\$	1,227
	Total Budget	\$	10,829

Proposal Options 7& 8: Alignment study: In-depth investigation into the Revised Texas Pre-K Guidelines and alignment to national standards

Background

The Revised Texas Prekindergarten Guidelines were published in 2008 (RTPG; Texas Education Agency, 2008). The guidelines state the following intention: “The Texas Prekindergarten Guidelines offer detailed descriptions of expected behaviors across multiple skill domains that should be observed in 4- to 5-year-old children by the end of their prekindergarten experience.”

We have learned much about child development and standards and expectations for young children in the six years since the publication of these standards. This understanding leads to a logical next step which is to review the current standards in light of new knowledge and understanding. NIEER has developed this proposal with two alternatives for PreK-4 SA to consider in response to their request to describe and cost out an evaluation of the RTPG.

Method

Two design options are presented below. Option 7 provides an overview of the standards in comparison to other published standards. Option 8 provides all of the same information as option 7, but also provides a more in-depth examination of the standards. The notable difference between these options is depth of analysis provided in the final product prepared for PreK-4 SA.

Option 7

We propose an alignment study of the RTPG and other published standards to answer the following questions:

1. What are the differences between the RTPG and other published standards?
2. To what extent do the standards highlight the same content and developmental indicators?

In order to answer these questions, we will first evaluate and adjust as necessary a crosswalk between the RTPG and The Head Start Child Development and Early Learning Framework. This alignment is reported by The Texas Training & Technical Assistance Early Childhood Education Center in 2011 and can be found at <http://thssco.uth.tmc.edu/documents/TXPre-KHS-CDELF-alignment-2011%20%282%29.pdf>. Our examination of this alignment will include a critical examination of the alignment and an explicit identification of the similarities and differences.

This option also includes an examination of the RTPG to The National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) accreditation criteria. Also, we will review the standards in relation to the prekindergarten standards of another state. The comparison state standards will be selected based on quality of standards from other published reviews.

The final report for Option 7 would include the following:

1. Critical examination of existing crosswalk between RTPG and Head Start standards
2. Brief narrative summary of the gaps and overlaps in domains covered in the RTPG versus the two (2) comparison standards
3. Crosswalk tables between the RTPG and the two (2) comparison standards
4. Recommendations for modifying the RTPG document

Timeline

Task	Date
Collect resources for comparison and enter standards into comparison templates	December 2014
Complete charts for RTPG and comparison standards	January 2015
Finalize alignment charts and write a short narrative describing overlap between RTPG and other standards	February & March 2015
Submit final report	March 30, 2015

Budget

Expenditure code	Expenditure description		
6100	Payroll costs	\$	5,839
6200	Professional & Contracted Services	\$	28,750
6300	Supplies & Materials	\$	-
6400	Other operating Costs	\$	-
6600	Capital outlay	\$	-
7000	Indirect Costs	\$	746
	Total Budget	\$	35,335

Option 8.

We propose an in-depth analysis of the RTPG that examines the standards for balance, coverage, depth, difficulty, and age range. This evaluation will include the answers to the following questions for the RTPG:

1. *Balance*: Are the number/percentage of items across multiple domains of development relatively consistent?
2. *Coverage*: Are all the key domains of learning and development addressed in the standards?
3. *Depth*: Do the standards and indicators within each domain address needed skills at sufficient depth?
4. *Difficulty*: Are the items across standards at a similar level of development or cognitive demand?
5. *Age range*: Are standards taking into account differences among preschoolers of different ages? Are standards reflecting what is known about children's developmental learning trajectories?"

In order to answer these questions, our first step will be similar to Option 7. We will first evaluate and adjust as necessary a crosswalk between the RTPG and The Head Start Child Development and Early Learning Framework. Our examination of this alignment will include a critical look at the crosswalk and will provide an explicit identification of the similarities and differences between these two sets of standards.

We will also prepare a comparison of the RTPG to The National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) accreditation criteria. We will review the standards in relation to the prekindergarten standards of 2-3 state prekindergarten standards. The comparison state standards will be selected based on quality of standards from external published reviews. Having more than one state to compare to will be of value as we consider recommendations for revisions to the standards. Lastly, the RTPG will be compared to and evaluated against best practice specialized standards within a given domain, where possible/available (e.g., RTPG mathematics domain compared to the NCTM math standards, 2000).

The final report for Option 8 would include the following:

1. In-depth information for each domain in RTPG, including
 - a. *Coverage*: Are all the key domains of learning and development addressed in the standards?
 - b. *Balance*: Are the number/percentage of items across multiple domains of development relatively consistent?
 - c. *Depth*: Do the standards and indicators within each domain address needed skills at sufficient depth?
 - d. *Difficulty*: Are the items across standards at a similar level of development or cognitive demand?
 - e. *Age range*: Are standards taking into account differences among preschoolers of different ages? Are standards reflecting what is known about children's developmental learning trajectories?
2. Detailed narrative for each section, including critical examination of existing crosswalk of RTPG and Head Start standards.
3. Crosswalk tables between RTPG and all comparison guidelines
4. Recommendations for modifying the RTPG document

Timeline

Task	Date
Literature review of existing standards evaluations	December 2014-Jan 2015
Collect resources for comparison (e.g., NCTM, 2000), and enter standards into comparison templates	December 2014
Complete charts for RTPG and comparison standards	January-February 2015
Begin narrative describing overlap between RTPG and HS, and areas that appear in only one set of standards	March 2015
Submit preliminary report	April 2015
Finish narrative describing overlap between RTPG and HS, and areas that appear in only one set of standards	April-May 2015
Submit final report	May 31, 2015

Budget

Expenditure code	Expenditure description		
6100	Payroll costs	\$	5,839
6200	Professional & Contracted Services	\$	42,550
6300	Supplies & Materials	\$	-
6400	Other operating Costs	\$	-
6600	Capital outlay	\$	-
7000	Indirect Costs	\$	746
	Total Budget	\$	49,135