Race to the Top

Panel Review by Applicant

For Oklahoma, 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**	*91.8*	**95**	**80**	**97**	**72**	**115**
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	45.4	55	34	48	35	55
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	*5*	*4.2*	*5*	*4*	*4*	*3*	*5*
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	*45*	*31.4*	*40*	*22*	*32*	*25*	*38*
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	*15*	*9.8*	*10*	*8*	*12*	*7*	*12*
(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	24.2	23	23	26	19	30
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	*20*	*16*	*15*	*16*	*17*	*12*	*20*
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	*10*	*8.2*	*8*	*7*	*9*	*7*	*10*
(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	22.2	17	23	23	18	30
(i) Making progress in each reform area	*5*	*4.8*	*5*	*4*	*5*	*5*	*5*
(ii) Improving student outcomes	*25*	*17.4*	*12*	*19*	*18*	*13*	*25*

B. Standards and Assessments	**70**	*64.8*	**67**	**64**	**66**	**60**	**67**
(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	14.8	17	14	16	10	17

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction	**47**	*31.2*	**31**	**30**	**34**	**27**	**34**
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	16	16	16	16	16	16
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	3.8	3	3	4	4	5
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	11.4	12	11	14	7	13
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	*6*	*4.4*	*4*	*4*	*6*	*3*	*5*
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional	*6*	*3.8*	*4*	*4*	*5*	*2*	*4*

improvement systems							
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	3.2	4	3	3	2	4
D. Great Teachers and Leaders	**138**	*106.4*	**123**	**93**	**105**	**92**	**119**
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	13.4	13	11	15	13	15
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	4.4	4	3	5	5	5
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	4.6	5	4	5	4	5
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	4.4	4	4	5	4	5
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	47.8	55	43	44	46	51
(i) Measuring student growth	5	4.2	5	5	4	3	4
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	12.6	15	9	11	15	13
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	8.8	10	9	8	8	9
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	22.2	25	20	21	20	25
(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	25	18.8	22	15	21	13	23
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or	15	11.4	13	9	13	8	14

high-minority schools							
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	7.4	9	6	8	5	9
(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	11	13	9	11	10	12
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	6.8	7	7	7	7	6
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	4.2	6	2	4	3	6
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	15.4	20	15	14	10	18
(i) Providing effective support	10	7.6	10	7	7	5	9
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	7.8	10	8	7	5	9
E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools	**50**	**40.2**	**50**	**35**	**45**	**27**	**44**
(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	30.2	40	25	35	17	34
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	4.8	5	5	5	5	4
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	25.4	35	20	30	12	30

F. General	55	42.4	39	42	39	47	45
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	6.4	6	6	7	6	7
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	2.8	3	2	3	3	3
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	3.6	3	4	4	3	4
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	32	29	31	29	36	35
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	7	6	8	6	8	7
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	7	7	7	6	8	7
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	7.6	7	7	8	8	8
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	4.4	4	2	4	4	8
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	6	5	7	5	8	5
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	4	4	5	3	5	3

Subtotal (Calculated before determining whether the applicant met the Competitive Preference Priority on STEM)	485	376.8	405	344	386	325	424

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

STEM							
Individual Reviewer Score (see individual reviewer technical review forms)	500	--	420	359	401	340	439

Total	**500**	**391.8**

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