



Race to the Top

Panel Review by Applicant

For Missouri, 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 | 74.4 | 81 | 78 | 73 | 71 | 69 |
| (A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it | 65 | 39.4 | 45 | 46 | 37 | 38 | 31 |
| (i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda | 5 | 4.2 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 |
| (ii) Securing LEA commitment | 45 | 26.8 | 32 | 33 | 22 | 25 | 22 |
| (iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact | 15 | 8.4 | 9 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 5 |
| (A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans | 30 | 18.4 | 18 | 17 | 20 | 18 | 19 |
| (i) Ensuring the capacity to implement | 20 | 14.4 | 13 | 13 | 15 | 16 | 15 |
| (ii) Using broad stakeholder support | 10 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 4 |
| (A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps | 30 | 16.6 | 18 | 15 | 16 | 15 | 19 |
| (i) Making progress in each reform area | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| (ii) Improving student outcomes | 25 | 12.6 | 14 | 12 | 12 | 10 | 15 |

| B. Standards and Assessments | 70 | 54.8 | 54 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 55 |
|---|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| (B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards | 40 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| (i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| (ii) Adopting standards | 20 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| (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 | 19.8 | 19 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 |

| C. Data Systems to Support Instruction | 47 | 45.2 | 44 | 45 | 47 | 45 | 45 |
|--|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| (C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| (C)(2) Accessing and using State data | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| (C)(3) Using data to improve instruction | 18 | 16.2 | 15 | 16 | 18 | 16 | 16 |
| (i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems | 6 | 5.2 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 5 |
| (ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional | 6 | 5.8 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-----|---|---|---|---|---|
| improvement systems | | | | | | | |
| (iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers | 6 | 5.2 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 5 |

| D. Great Teachers and Leaders | 138 | 84.2 | 91 | 76 | 81 | 100 | 73 |
|---|------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| (D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals | 21 | 8.6 | 9 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 7 |
| (i) Allowing alternative routes to certification | 7 | 2.6 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| (ii) Using alternative routes to certification | 7 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| (iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage | 7 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 2 |
| (D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance | 58 | 41 | 41 | 37 | 40 | 50 | 37 |
| (i) Measuring student growth | 5 | 4.2 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| (ii) Developing evaluation systems | 15 | 12.6 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 15 | 12 |
| (iii) Conducting annual evaluations | 10 | 8.6 | 9 | 7 | 9 | 10 | 8 |
| (iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions | 28 | 15.6 | 18 | 13 | 14 | 20 | 13 |
| (D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals | 25 | 10 | 15 | 10 | 6 | 12 | 7 |
| (i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or | 15 | 6.2 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 5 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|--|
| high-minority schools | | | | | | | | |
| (ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas | 10 | 3.8 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 2 | |
| (D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs | 14 | 9.6 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 11 | 8 | |
| (i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly | 7 | 5.4 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 5 | |
| (ii) Expanding effective programs | 7 | 4.2 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 3 | |
| (D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals | 20 | 15 | 16 | 12 | 17 | 16 | 14 | |
| (i) Providing effective support | 10 | 6.6 | 8 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 7 | |
| (ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support | 10 | 8.4 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 7 | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|
| E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools | 50 | 38.8 | 40 | 40 | 24 | 50 | 40 | |
| (E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | |
| (E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools | 40 | 28.8 | 30 | 30 | 14 | 40 | 30 | |
| (i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | |
| (ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools | 35 | 23.8 | 25 | 25 | 9 | 35 | 25 | |

| F. General | 55 | 19 | 18 | 17 | 20 | 21 | 19 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| (F)(1) Making education funding a priority | 10 | 1.8 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| (i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools | 5 | 1.8 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| (F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools | 40 | 16.8 | 16 | 14 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| (i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)" | 8 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| (ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes | 8 | 6.8 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| (iii) Equitably funding charter schools | 8 | 7.6 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| (iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities | 8 | 0.4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions | 5 | 0.4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Subtotal (Calculated before determining whether the applicant met the Competitive Preference Priority on STEM) | 485 | 316.4 | 328 | 311 | 300 | 342 | 301 |
|--|------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|
| Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on | 15 | 0* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
|--|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| STEM | | | | | | | |
| Individual Reviewer Score (see individual reviewer technical review forms) | 485 | -- | 328 | 311 | 300 | 342 | 316 |

| | | |
|--------------|------------|--------------|
| Total | 500 | 316.4 |
|--------------|------------|--------------|

| | 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](#)