



Race to the Top

Panel Review by Applicant

For South Dakota, 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	25.8	18	32	24	26	29
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	11.4	9	16	10	12	10
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	1	1	2	0	1	1
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	7.4	5	10	6	10	6
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	3	3	4	4	1	3
(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	6.6	1	8	8	6	10
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	3.2	0	5	3	3	5
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	3.4	1	3	5	3	5
(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	7.8	8	8	6	8	9
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	1.6	2	3	1	1	1
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	6.2	6	5	5	7	8
B. Standards and Assessments	70	27.6	25	30	25	30	28
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	22.6	20	25	20	25	23

(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	2.6	0	5	0	5	3
(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	5	5	5	5	5	5

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction	47	21.6	18	24	20	19	27
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	14	14	14	14	14	14
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	3	1	5	3	1	5
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	4.6	3	5	3	4	8

D. Great Teachers and Leaders	138	38.8	30	40	28	39	57
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	9.4	8	8	7	10	14
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	13	7	14	11	13	20
(i) Measuring student growth	5	1.4	1	1	1	2	2
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	4.2	3	5	4	4	5
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	2.8	2	3	2	2	5
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	4.6	1	5	4	5	8
(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers	25	6.6	7	8	5	6	7

and principals								
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	4.2	5	5	2	4	5	
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	2.4	2	3	3	2	2	
(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	3.8	5	4	2	4	4	
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	6	3	6	3	6	12	

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools	50	6	5	7	6	5	7	
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	6	5	7	6	5	7	
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	2.4	1	3	3	2	3	
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	3.6	4	4	3	3	4	

F. General	55	1	0	0	3	2	0	
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	0.2	0	0	0	1	0	
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	0.8	0	0	3	1	0	
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Subtotal (Calculated before determining whether the applicant met the Competitive Preference Priority on STEM)	485	120.8	96	133	106	121	148
--	------------	--------------	-----------	------------	------------	------------	------------

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15*	15	15	15	15	15
Individual Reviewer Score (see individual reviewer technical review forms)	500	--	111	148	121	136	163

Total	500	135.8
--------------	------------	--------------

	FINAL**		Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform	No		No	No	No	No	No

* 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](#)