



Race to the Top

Panel Review by Applicant

For Connecticut, Phase 2



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	96	97	103	103	73	104
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	51	50	56	55	44	50
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	4.8	5	5	5	4	5
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	34.2	35	37	36	30	33
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	12	10	14	14	10	12
(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	24.2	24	25	25	17	30
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	15.2	16	15	15	10	20
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	9	8	10	10	7	10
(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	20.8	23	22	23	12	24
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	4.4	5	4	5	4	4
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	16.4	18	18	18	8	20

B. Standards and Assessments	70	68.4	70	67	68	69	68
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	18.4	20	17	18	19	18

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction	47	27.4	29	30	28	22	28
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	10	10	10	10	10	10
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	3.6	3	4	4	3	4
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	13.8	16	16	14	9	14
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	5.2	6	6	6	4	4
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional	6	3.6	4	4	4	2	4

improvement systems							
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	5	6	6	4	3	6

D. Great Teachers and Leaders	138	88.6	92	87	101	79	84
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	19	17	18	20	20	20
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	6.6	5	7	7	7	7
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	5.8	6	5	6	6	6
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	6.6	6	6	7	7	7
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	30.2	34	28	34	28	27
(i) Measuring student growth	5	2.6	3	3	3	2	2
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	9.4	10	8	7	11	11
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	6.8	6	7	8	7	6
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	11.4	15	10	16	8	8
(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	25	17.4	17	21	22	13	14
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or	15	10.2	10	13	13	7	8

high-minority schools								
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	7.2	7	8	9	6	6	6
(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	7.4	8	6	9	6	8	8
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	4.6	5	4	5	4	5	5
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	2.8	3	2	4	2	3	3
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	14.6	16	14	16	12	15	15
(i) Providing effective support	10	8.2	8	8	8	7	10	10
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	6.4	8	6	8	5	5	5

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools	50	36.6	30	38	43	33	39	
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	26.6	20	28	33	23	29	29
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	21.6	15	23	28	18	24	24

F. General	55	47	48	44	49	47	47
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	7.8	8	7	8	8	8
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	3	3	3	3	3	3
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	4.8	5	4	5	5	5
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	36.6	37	34	38	37	37
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	4.8	5	3	6	5	5
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	7.8	8	7	8	8	8
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	2.6	3	3	3	2	2

Subtotal (Calculated before determining whether the applicant met the Competitive Preference Priority on STEM)	485	364	366	369	392	323	370
--	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------

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

STEM							
Individual Reviewer Score (see individual reviewer technical review forms)	500	--	381	384	407	338	385

Total	500	379
--------------	------------	------------

	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](#)