Race to the Top

Panel Review by Applicant

For Nevada, 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**	*108.6*	**115**	**122**	**104**	**89**	**113**
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	59.8	60	65	59	55	60
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	*5*	*4.8*	*5*	*5*	*4*	*5*	*5*
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	*45*	*41*	*40*	*45*	*40*	*40*	*40*
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	*15*	*14*	*15*	*15*	*15*	*10*	*15*
(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	26	30	29	26	19	26
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	*20*	*16.8*	*20*	*19*	*16*	*12*	*17*
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	*10*	*9.2*	*10*	*10*	*10*	*7*	*9*
(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	22.8	25	28	19	15	27
(i) Making progress in each reform area	*5*	*4.8*	*5*	*5*	*4*	*5*	*5*
(ii) Improving student outcomes	*25*	*18*	*20*	*23*	*15*	*10*	*22*

B. Standards and Assessments	70	*66.6*	70	70	63	60	70
(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	9.8	10	10	9	10	10
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	*5*	*4.8*	*5*	*5*	*4*	*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	16.8	20	20	14	10	20

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction	47	*38*	45	33	37	32	43
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	22	22	22	22	22	22
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	3.4	5	3	3	2	4
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	12.6	18	8	12	8	17
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	*6*	*4.2*	*6*	*2*	*5*	*2*	*6*
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional	*6*	*4*	*6*	*2*	*4*	*2*	*6*

improvement systems							
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	4.4	6	4	3	4	5
D. Great Teachers and Leaders	**138**	*84.6*	**127**	**64**	**72**	**74**	**86**
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	9.6	13	10	9	5	11
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	2.2	2	2	3	1	3
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	3	4	3	2	2	4
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	4.4	7	5	4	2	4
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	39	58	33	29	37	38
(i) Measuring student growth	5	4.4	5	4	5	4	4
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	12.4	15	14	10	11	12
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	7.4	10	6	6	7	8
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	14.8	28	9	8	15	14
(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	25	12.4	22	6	10	12	12
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or	15	6.8	12	4	5	7	6

high-minority schools							
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	5.6	10	2	5	5	6
(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	8	14	5	6	6	9
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	4.2	7	2	4	3	5
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	3.8	7	3	2	3	4
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	15.6	20	10	18	14	16
(i) Providing effective support	10	8.8	10	8	9	9	8
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	6.8	10	2	9	5	8
E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools	**50**	**45**	**50**	**49**	**40**	**45**	**41**
(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	35	40	39	30	35	31
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	30	35	34	25	30	26

F. General	55	*38.4*	47	31	37	42	35
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	6.4	8	4	6	6	8
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	*5*	*3.6*	*3*	*4*	*3*	*3*	*5*
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	*5*	*2.8*	*5*	*0*	*3*	*3*	*3*
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	27	34	22	26	31	22
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	*8*	*5.6*	*5*	*5*	*5*	*8*	*5*
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	*8*	*4.2*	*8*	*1*	*4*	*5*	*3*
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	*8*	*7.2*	*8*	*8*	*7*	*8*	*5*
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	*8*	*2.2*	*5*	*0*	*2*	*2*	*2*
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	*8*	*7.8*	*8*	*8*	*8*	*8*	*7*
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

| Subtotal (Calculated before determining whether the applicant met the Competitive Preference Priority on STEM) | 485 | 381.2 | 454 | 369 | 353 | 342 | 388 |

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

STEM							
Individual Reviewer Score (see individual reviewer technical review forms)	500	--	469	369	353	342	403

Total	500	381.2

	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