Race to the Top

Panel Review by Applicant

For Connecticut, Phase I

Selection Criteria	Available	Average Total Score	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5
Status			*Completed*	*Completed*	*Completed*	*Completed*	*Completed*
A. State Success Factors	**125**	*88.2*	**76**	**96**	**98**	**81**	**90**
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	41.8	32	48	49	37	43
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	4.8	5	5	5	4	5
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	28.6	20	33	35	25	30
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	8.4	7	10	9	8	8
(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	23	19	24	26	22	24
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	15.8	14	16	18	15	16
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	7.2	5	8	8	7	8
(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	23.4	25	24	23	22	23
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	4.6	5	5	4	5	4
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	18.8	20	19	19	17	19
B. Standards and Assessments	**70**	*62.4*	**57**	**68**	**62**	**55**	**70**
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	37.6	35	40	38	35	40

(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	19	15	20	20	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	18.6	20	20	18	15	20
(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	9.2	8	10	8	10	10
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	15.6	14	18	16	10	20
C. Data Systems to Support Instruction	**47**	**29**	**30**	**30**	**27**	**28**	**30**
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	10.4	10	10	10	12	10
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	3.2	2	4	3	3	4
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	15.4	18	16	14	13	16
D. Great Teachers and Leaders	**138**	**95.2**	**97**	**104**	**87**	**86**	**102**
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	14.2	12	16	15	13	15
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	41.6	45	40	40	39	44
(i) Measuring student growth	5	4.6	5	5	5	4	4
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	11.4	12	12	12	10	11
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	8	10	8	5	7	10
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	17.6	18	15	18	18	19
(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers	25	14.2	13	18	11	12	17

and principals							
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	8.8	7	13	7	7	10
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	5.4	6	5	4	5	7
(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	8	9	10	6	7	8
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	17.2	18	20	15	15	18
E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools	**50**	**34.8**	**33**	**38**	**35**	**30**	**38**
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	8	5	10	10	5	10
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	26.8	28	28	25	25	28
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	21.8	23	23	20	20	23
F. General	**55**	**35**	**34**	**33**	**36**	**35**	**37**
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	7.8	8	8	7	8	8
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	23	22	20	24	24	25
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	4.2	4	5	5	3	4

Subtotal (Calculated before determining whether the applicant met the Competitive Preference Priority on STEM)	485	344.6	327	369	345	315	367
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	0*	0	0	0	0	15
Individual Reviewer Score (see individual reviewer technical review forms)	485	--	327	369	345	315	382

Total	500	344.6

	FINAL**		Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

* Applicants are eligible for either 0 or 15 points in Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM. The total awarded to the applicant is not based on an average of individual reviewer scores in this section. Rather, 15 points are added to the applicant's Average Total Score if a majority of reviewers determined that the applicant has met the STEM criteria (indicated by the individual reviewer entering 15 points in that field). If a majority of reviewers award 0 points in this area, 0 points are added to the applicant's Average Total Score.

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

Back