



Race to the Top

Panel Review by Applicant

For Louisiana, Phase I



Selection Criteria	Available	Average Total Score Tier 1	Average Total Score Tier 2
Status			
A. State Success Factors	125	101.2	101.6
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	53.8	54.2
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5	5
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	39.6	39.6
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	9.2	9.6
(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	25	25
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	16.4	16.4
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	8.6	8.6
(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	22.4	22.4
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	4.4	4.4
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	18	18
B. Standards and Assessments	70	65.2	65.2

Reviewer 1		Reviewer 2		Reviewer 3		Reviewer 4		Reviewer 5	
Completed									
Tier 1	Tier 2								
72	72	100	100	118	118	113	113	103	105
38	38	51	51	61	61	65	65	54	56
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
30	30	42	42	43	43	45	45	38	38
3	3	4	4	13	13	15	15	11	13
14	14	26	26	29	29	30	30	26	26
8	8	16	16	20	20	20	20	18	18
6	6	10	10	9	9	10	10	8	8
20	20	23	23	28	28	18	18	23	23
5	5	5	5	5	5	3	3	4	4
15	15	18	18	23	23	15	15	19	19
66	66	70	70	61	61	67	67	62	62

(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	38.4	38.4
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	19.2	19.2
(ii) Adopting standards	20	19.2	19.2
(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	8.6	8.6
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	18.2	18.2

38	38		40	40		38	38		40	40		36	36	
20	20		20	20		18	18		20	20		18	18	
18	18		20	20		20	20		20	20		18	18	
10	10		10	10		8	8		7	7		8	8	
18	18		20	20		15	15		20	20		18	18	

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction	47	34	36.2
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	18	18
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	4.4	4.4
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	11.6	13.8

31	31		35	35		35	35		35	41		34	39	
18	18		18	18		18	18		18	18		18	18	
3	3		5	5		5	5		5	5		4	4	
10	10		12	12		12	12		12	18		12	17	

D. Great Teachers and Leaders	138	119	122.2
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	16.4	18.6
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	52.4	52.4
(i) Measuring student growth	5	4.8	4.8
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	13.6	13.6
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	9.2	9.2
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	24.8	24.8
(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	25	22	22.4
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	13.2	13.2

86	90		132	132		132	132		133	136		112	121	
13	15		20	20		19	19		18	21		12	18	
37	37		58	58		58	58		58	58		51	51	
4	4		5	5		5	5		5	5		5	5	
10	10		15	15		15	15		15	15		13	13	
7	7		10	10		10	10		10	10		9	9	
16	16		28	28		28	28		28	28		24	24	
12	14		25	25		25	25		25	25		23	23	
7	7		15	15		15	15		15	15		14	14	

(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	8.8	9.2
(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	12	12
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	16.2	16.8

5	7		10	10		10	10		10	10		9	9	
10	10		14	14		12	12		12	12		12	12	
14	14		15	15		18	18		20	20		14	17	

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools	50	45	45
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	5	5
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	40	40
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	35	35

45	45		45	45		45	45		45	45		45	45	
5	5		5	5		5	5		5	5		5	5	
40	40		40	40		40	40		40	40		40	40	
5	5		5	5		5	5		5	5		5	5	
35	35		35	35		35	35		35	35		35	35	

F. General	55	46.4	48
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	9.6	9.6
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	32.4	34
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	4.4	4.4

43	45		46	52		51	51		55	55		37	37	
10	10		10	10		10	10		10	10		8	8	
28	30		31	37		36	36		40	40		27	27	
5	5		5	5		5	5		5	5		2	2	

Subtotal (Calculated before determining whether the applicant met the Competitive Preference Priority on STEM)	485	410.8	418.2
--	------------	--------------	--------------

343	349		428	434		442	442		448	457		393	409	
-----	-----	--	-----	-----	--	-----	-----	--	-----	-----	--	-----	-----	--

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	0*	0*
---	----	----	----

0	0		0	0		15	15		15	15		0	0	
---	---	--	---	---	--	----	----	--	----	----	--	---	---	--

Individual Reviewer Score (see individual reviewer technical review forms)	485	--	--
---	-----	----	----

343	349		428	434		457	457		463	472		393	409	
-----	-----	--	-----	-----	--	-----	-----	--	-----	-----	--	-----	-----	--

Total	500	410.8	418.2
--------------	------------	--------------	--------------

	FINAL**		
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform	Yes		

Reviewer 1			Reviewer 2			Reviewer 3			Reviewer 4			Reviewer 5		
No	No		No	No		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](#)