Race to the Top

Panel Review by Applicant

For Pennsylvania, Phase I

Selection Criteria / Status	Available	Average Total Score Tier 1	Average Total Score Tier 2	Reviewer 1 Tier 1	Reviewer 1 Tier 2	Reviewer 2 Tier 1	Reviewer 2 Tier 2	Reviewer 3 Tier 1	Reviewer 3 Tier 2	Reviewer 4 Tier 1	Reviewer 4 Tier 2	Reviewer 5 Tier 1	Reviewer 5 Tier 2
				Completed		*Completed*		*Completed*		*Completed*		*Completed*	
A. State Success Factors	**125**	*105.6*	*107*	**110**	**110**	**95**	**102**	**105**	**105**	**115**	**115**	**103**	**103**
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	58.4	59.8	62	62	50	57	55	55	65	65	60	60
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	42.6	44	45	45	35	42	■	45	45	45	43	43
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	10.8	10.8	12	12	10	10	5	5	15	15	12	12
(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	27.4	27.4	29	29	24	24	30	30	30	30	24	24
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	18	18	19	19	16	16	20	20	20	20	15	15
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	9.4	9.4	10	10	8	8	10	10	10	10	9	9
(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	19.8	19.8	19	19	21	21	20	20	20	20	19	19
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	4.2	4.2	5	5	3	3	5	5	4	4	4	4
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	15.6	15.6	14	14	18	18	15	15	16	16	15	15
B. Standards and Assessments	**70**	*65.2*	*65.2*	**67**	**67**	**61**	**61**	**65**	**65**	**70**	**70**	**63**	**63**

Criterion													
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	38	38	40	40	35	35	35	35	40	40	40	40
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	18.4	18.4	20	20	17	17	15	15	20	20	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	19.6	19.6	20	20	18	18	20	20	20	20	20	20
(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	9.6	9.6	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	8	8
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	17.6	17.6	17	17	16	16	20	20	20	20	15	15
C. Data Systems to Support Instruction	**47**	**35.4**	**36.2**	**39**	**39**	**29**	**33**	**39**	**39**	**36**	**36**	**34**	**34**
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	4.8	4.8	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	14.6	15.4	18	18	8	12	18	18	15	15	14	14
D. Great Teachers and Leaders	**138**	**105.2**	**106.2**	**107**	**111**	**95**	**95**	**115**	**115**	**96**	**96**	**113**	**114**
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	12	12	8	8	13	13	13	13	10	10	16	16
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	48	49	53	57	38	38	53	53	44	44	52	53
(i) Measuring student growth	5	1.8	2.6	1	5	1	1	0	0	4	4	3	3
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	13.4	13.4	15	15	13	13	15	15	10	10	14	14
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	9.6	9.6	10	10	8	8	10	10	10	10	10	10
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	23.2	23.4	27	27	16	16	28	28	20	20	25	26
(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	25	19.4	19.4	19	19	16	16	22	22	19	19	21	21
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	13.2	13.2	12	12	10	10	14	14	15	15	15	15

Criterion	Max			A1	A2		B1	B2		C1	C2		D1	D2		E1	E2	
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	6.2	6.2	7	7		6	6		8	8		4	4		6	6	
(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	9.4	9.4	7	7		12	12		7	7		9	9		12	12	
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	16.4	16.4	20	20		16	16		20	20		14	14		12	12	
E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools	**50**	*43.4*	*45.4*	**40**	**50**		**48**	**48**		**44**	**44**		**40**	**40**		**45**	**45**	
(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	33.4	35.4	30	40		38	38		34	34		30	30		35	35	
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	4.8	4.8	5	5		5	5		4	4		5	5		5	5	
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	28.6	30.6	25	35	■	33	33		30	30		25	25		30	30	
F. General	**55**	*42.4*	*45*	**42**	**42**		**40**	**45**		**39**	**39**		**47**	**47**		**44**	**52**	
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	8.6	8.6	6	6		10	10		7	7		10	10		10	10	
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	28.8	31.4	31	31		25	30	■	27	27		32	32		29	37	■
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5	5	5	5		5	5		5	5		5	5		5	5	
Subtotal (Calculated before determining whether the applicant met the Competitive Preference Priority on STEM)	**485**	**397.2**	**405**	**405**	**419**		**368**	**384**		**407**	**407**		**404**	**404**		**402**	**411**	
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15*	15*	0	0		15	15		0	0		15	15		15	15	

Individual Reviewer Score (see individual reviewer technical review forms)	485	--	--		405	419		383	399		407	407		419	419		417	426	

Total	**500**	**412.2**	**420**

	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