Race to the Top

Panel Review by Applicant

For Ohio, Phase I

Selection Criteria / Status	Available	Average Total Score Tier 1	Average Total Score Tier 2	Reviewer 1 Tier 1 (Completed)	Reviewer 1 Tier 2	Reviewer 2 Tier 1 (Completed)	Reviewer 2 Tier 2	Reviewer 3 Tier 1 (Completed)	Reviewer 3 Tier 2	Reviewer 4 Tier 1 (Completed)	Reviewer 4 Tier 2	Reviewer 5 Tier 1 (Completed)	Reviewer 5 Tier 2
A. State Success Factors	**125**	*105.4*	*101.4*	**105**	**92**	**105**	**105**	**108**	**101**	**116**	**116**	**93**	**93**
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	58.4	54.8	65	50	55	55	57	54	65	65	50	50
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	4.8	4.8	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	41.2	38.6	45	35	41	41	40	37	45	45	35	35
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	12.4	11.4	15	10	10	10	12	12	15	15	10	10
(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	29.4	29	30	30	30	30	29	27	28	28	30	30
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	19.4	19	20	20	20	20	19	17	18	18	20	20
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	17.6	17.6	10	12	20	20	22	20	23	23	13	13
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	4.8	4.8	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	12.8	12.8	5	7	16	16	17	15	18	18	8	8
B. Standards and Assessments	**70**	*69.4*	*69.4*	**70**	**70**	**69**	**69**	**70**	**70**	**69**	**69**	**69**	**69**

Criteria													
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	*20*	*20*	*20*	*20*	20	*20*	20	*20*	20	*20*	20	*20*	20
(ii) Adopting standards	*20*	*20*	*20*	*20*	20	*20*	20	*20*	20	*20*	20	*20*	20
(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	9.8	9.8	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	9	9
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	19.6	19.6	20	20	19	19	20	20	19	19	20	20
C. Data Systems to Support Instruction	**47**	***38.8***	***38.6***	**34**	**33**	**40**	**40**	**38**	**38**	**41**	**41**	**41**	**41**
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	4.4	4.2	4	3 ■	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	16.4	16.4	12	12	18	18	16	16	18	18	18	18
D. Great Teachers and Leaders	**138**	***103.4***	***102.8***	**98**	**98**	**95**	**95**	**102**	**99**	**111**	**111**	**111**	**111**
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	16.2	16.2	15	15	14	14	17	17	16	16	19	19
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	50.6	50	45	45	51	51	53	50	50	50	54	54
(i) Measuring student growth	*5*	*4.6*	*4.6*	*5*	5	*4*	4	*5*	5	*4*	4	*5*	5
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	*15*	*13.2*	*13.2*	*10*	10	*15*	15	*15*	15	*11*	11	*15*	15
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	*10*	*9.4*	*9.4*	*10*	10	*8*	8	*10*	10	*9*	9	*10*	10
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	*28*	*23.4*	*22.8*	*20*	20	*24*	24	*23*	20	■ *26*	26	*24*	24
(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	25	13.4	13.4	15	15	10	10	13	13	15	15	14	14
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	*15*	*9.8*	*9.8*	*10*	10	*7*	7	*10*	10	*10*	10	*12*	12

(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	*10*	*3.6*	*3.6*	*5*	5	*3*	3	*3*	3	*5*	5	*2*	2
(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	9.2	9.2	8	8	5	5	9	9	12	12	12	12
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	14	14	15	15	15	15	10	10	18	18	12	12
E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools	**50**	*42.8*	*42.8*	**50**	**50**	**47**	**47**	**39**	**39**	**45**	**45**	**33**	**33**
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	32.8	32.8	40	40	37	37	29	29	35	35	23	23
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	*5*	*4.2*	*4.2*	*5*	5	*4*	4	*4*	4	*5*	5	*3*	3
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	*35*	*28.6*	*28.6*	*35*	35	*33*	33	*25*	25	*30*	30	*20*	20
F. General	**55**	*48.6*	*48.6*	**47**	**47**	**53**	**53**	**42**	**42**	**55**	**55**	**46**	**46**
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	9.8	9.8	10	10	10	10	9	9	10	10	10	10
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	34	34	32	32	38	38	28	28	40	40	32	32
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	4.8	4.8	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4
Subtotal (Calculated before determining whether the applicant met the Competitive Preference Priority on STEM)	**485**	**408.4**	**403.6**	**404**	**390**	**409**	**409**	**399**	**389**	**437**	**437**	**393**	**393**
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15*	15*	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15

Individual Reviewer Score (see individual reviewer technical review forms)	500	--	--		419	405		424	424		414	404		452	452		408	408	

Total	**500**	**423.4**	**418.6**

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