Race to the Top

Panel Review by Applicant

For Minnesota, Phase I

Selection Criteria / Status	Available	Average Total Score	Reviewer 1 / Completed	Reviewer 2 / Completed	Reviewer 3 / Completed	Reviewer 4 / Completed	Reviewer 5 / Completed
A. State Success Factors	**125**	*81.6*	**78**	**90**	**86**	**77**	**77**
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	42.6	41	55	40	32	45
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	4.4	4	5	3	5	5
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	28	30	35	30	15	30
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	10.2	7	15	7	12	10
(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	20	20	20	22	21	17
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	13.4	15	10	13	17	12
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	6.6	5	10	9	4	5
(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	19	17	15	24	24	15
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	14	12	10	19	19	10
B. Standards and Assessments	**70**	*66.4*	**66**	**70**	**66**	**70**	**60**
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	39.6	40	40	38	40	40

(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	19.6	20	20	18	20	20
(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	9.4	8	10	9	10	10
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	17.4	18	20	19	20	10
C. Data Systems to Support Instruction	**47**	**37.2**	**37**	**37**	**37**	**41**	**34**
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	18	18	18	18	18	18
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	4.2	4	4	4	5	4
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	15	15	15	15	18	12
D. Great Teachers and Leaders	**138**	**83.4**	**77**	**102**	**86**	**81**	**71**
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	9.6	12	10	10	8	8
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	44.4	39	56	44	42	41
(i) Measuring student growth	5	4.8	4	5	5	5	5
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	10.8	9	15	10	10	10
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	7.4	8	10	8	6	5
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	21.4	18	26	21	21	21
(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers	25	9.2	6	12	13	10	5

and principals							
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	*15*	*6.2*	*4*	*7*	*10*	*7*	*3*
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	*10*	*3*	*2*	*5*	*3*	*3*	*2*
(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	6.4	5	10	4	6	7
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	13.8	15	14	15	15	10

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools	**50**	**38.6**	**33**	**50**	**30**	**35**	**45**
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	6.6	3	10	0	10	10
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	32	30	40	30	25	35
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	*5*	*5*	*5*	*5*	*5*	*5*	*5*
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	*35*	*27*	*25*	*35*	*25*	*20*	*30*

F. General	**55**	**52.8**	**53**	**55**	**52**	**55**	**49**
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	9	8	10	7	10	10
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	38.8	40	40	40	40	34
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Subtotal (Calculated before determining whether the applicant met the Competitive Preference Priority on STEM)	485	360		344	404	357	359	336
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15*		15	15	15	15	15
Individual Reviewer Score (see individual reviewer technical review forms)	500	--		359	419	372	374	351

Total	500	375

	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