Appendix A1-1: SBAC Organizational Structure
Appendix A1-2: Responsibilities of the Consortium’s Committees and Leadership

The Executive Committee is responsible for the following:
- Oversee development of the assessment system,
- Provide oversight of the Project Management Partner,
- Provide oversight of the Policy Coordinator,
- Provide oversight of the Lead Procurement State,
- Work with project staff to develop agendas,
- Resolve issues,
- Determine what issues/decisions are presented to the Steering Committee and/or Advisory and/or Governing States for decisions/votes,
- Oversee the decisions about expenditure of funds, in collaboration with the Lead Procurement State,
- Receive and act on special and regular reports from the Project Management Partner, the Policy Coordinator, the Content Advisor, and the Lead Procurement State, and
- Prepare additional information as to the pros and cons of the issue to assist voting States in developing consensus and reaching a final decision.

The Executive Committee Co-chairs are responsible for the following:
- Set the Steering Committee agendas,
- Set the Executive Committee agendas,
- Lead the Executive Committee meetings,
- Lead the Steering Committee meetings,
- Oversee the work of the Executive Committee,
- Oversee the work of the Steering Committee,
- Coordinate with the Project Management Partner,
- Coordinate with the Content Advisor,
- Coordinate with the Policy Coordinator,
- Coordinate with the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and
- Coordinate with the Executive Committee to provide oversight to the Consortium.

The Steering Committee is responsible for the following:
- Determine the broad picture of the assessment system,
- Receive regular reports from the Project Management Partner, the Policy Coordinator, and the Content Advisor,
- Determine the issues to be presented to the Governing/Advisory States,
- Oversee the decisions about expenditure of funds, in conjunction with the Lead Procurement State,
- Evaluate and recommend successful contract proposals for approval by the Lead Procurement State, and
- Prepare additional information as to the pros and cons of the issue to assist voting States in developing consensus and reaching a final decision. The Steering Committee may delegate this responsibility to the Executive Committee.
Appendix A1-3: Consortium Processes for Determining Committee/Working Group Members and Electing Leaders

Determining Membership and Leaders

The Steering Committee is composed of one representative from each Governing State in the Consortium. Committee members may be a chief or his/her designee. Steering Committee Members must meet the following criteria:

- Be from a Governing State,
- Have prior experience in either the design or implementation of curriculum and/or assessment systems at the policy or implementation level, and
- Must have willingness to serve as the liaison between the Total State Membership and Working Groups.

The Executive Committee is composed of the Co-chairs of the Executive Committee, a representative from the Lead Procurement State, a representative from higher education, and one representative each from four Governing States.

- The four Governing State representatives will be selected by the Steering Committee. The Higher Education representative will be selected by the Higher Education Advisory Group.
- For the first year, the Steering Committee will vote on four representatives, one each from four Governing States. The two representatives with the most votes will serve for three years, and the two representatives with the second highest number of votes will serve for two years. This process will allow for the rotation of two new representatives each year. If an individual is unable to complete the full term of office, then the above process will occur to choose an individual to serve for the remainder of the term of office.

Leadership:

- Two Co-chairs will be selected from the Steering Committee States. The two Co-chairs must be from two different States. Co-chairs will work closely with the Project Management Partner. Steering Committee members wishing to serve as Executive Committee Co-chairs will submit in writing to the Project Management Partner their willingness to serve. They will need to provide a document signed by their State Chief indicating State support for this role. The Project Management Partner will then prepare a ballot of interested individuals. Each Steering Committee member will vote on the two individuals they wish to serve as Co-chair. The individual with the most votes will serve as the new Co-chair.
- Each Co-chair will serve for two years on a rotating basis. For the first year, the Steering Committee will vote on two individuals and the one individual with the most votes will serve a three-year term, and the individual with the second highest number of votes will serve a two-year term.
- If an individual is unable to complete the full term of office, then the above process will occur to choose an individual to serve for the remainder of the term of office.
Working Groups
The working groups are composed of chiefs, assessment directors, assessment staff, curriculum specialists, professional development specialists, technical advisors, and other specialists as needed from States. Individuals interested in participating on a working group should submit their request in writing to the Project Management Partner, indicating their preferred subgroup. The primary communication for the working groups will be through virtual meetings and individual assignments. Working group Co-chairs will regularly communicate with the Executive Committee Co-chairs to coordinate design decisions with other working groups. Working groups will make decisions as directed by the working group Co-chairs who are selected by the Co-chairs of the Steering/Executive Committee. Decisions that will influence the work of other working groups will need to be communicated to and approved by the Executive Committee.

MOUs for all SBAC States follow this page, in the order presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBAC States</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Washington *</td>
<td>2. Missouri *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Connecticut *</td>
<td>4. Nevada *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Utah *</td>
<td>6. Idaho *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Maine *</td>
<td>8. Wisconsin *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. New Mexico *</td>
<td>12. Hawaii *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Vermont</td>
<td>14. Kansas *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Michigan *</td>
<td>16. Montana *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. West Virginia *</td>
<td>18. Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Iowa</td>
<td>20. South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. North Dakota</td>
<td>24. Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. New Hampshire</td>
<td>28. Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Oklahoma</td>
<td>30. New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Georgia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A2-1: Overview of the Theory of Action

Technology supports increased access and opportunities for students to fully engage in the learning and assessment systems.

Technology supports the design, delivery, scoring, and reporting of innovative comprehensive assessments.

SBAC Adaptive Summative Assessments
A high-quality adaptive summative assessment system, including performance events, establishes high expectations and provides relevant information on achievement and growth to teachers, students, and others.

All students leave high school prepared for post-secondary success in college or a career through increased student learning and improved teaching.

Formative Tools, Processes, Practices
Teachers and students use information from the CCSS and instructionally useful assessments to improve practices and student learning.

SBAC Interim/Benchmark Assessments
Interim assessments, along with formative assessment strategies, provide instructionally useful information to teachers and students.

Policies and standards are communicated to schools, districts, and policymakers.

Professional Capacity Building
Teachers are provided with curriculum and instructional materials and given rich professional development and other supports and resources they need to effectively instruct on the standards.

Consortium and State policies and practices are designed to support high expectations and increased learning opportunities for students.

The Common Core State Standards (CCSS) clearly specify college- and career-readiness and meaningful grade-level expectations.
### Appendix A3-1: Overview of Assessment System

#### Grades 3–8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSESSMENT COMPONENT</th>
<th>REQUIRED FOR EACH STATE</th>
<th>TBD BY STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Grades 3–8 adaptive comprehensive summative assessment**<sup>1</sup> | • Administered annually at each grade level using items from a secure pool  
• 1–2 testing opportunities per student per year | Administration will occur during the last 12 weeks of instruction |
| • ELA and mathematics (separate assessments)  
• Adaptive portion includes multiple-choice, technology-enhanced, and more traditional constructed-response items<sup>2</sup>  
• Used for measuring achievement and growth for Title I accountability purposes (on track to being college- and career-ready)  
• Includes 2 performance tasks (typically 1–2 class periods) in each content area (to be administered only one time per year, contingent on budget and item bank)<sup>3</sup>  
• Secure high-stakes item pool | | |
| **Grades 3–8 adaptive interim/benchmark based on learning progressions and/or CCSS content clusters**<sup>4</sup> | Available for State/local use | Administration window (system will provide a fully open testing window)—States may restrict the window according to their policies  
How scores are used (e.g., State/local accountability) | |
| • Blueprint will provide for more in-depth assessment of what students know and can do based on smaller clusters of content and learning progressions (on track to college- and career-ready)  
• Will include a performance event bank mapped to the content standards for local use  
• A non-secure pool of items | | |

---

<sup>1</sup> Consortium-supported research agenda will include studies to determine the comparability of distributed summative assessments with the comprehensive summative assessment for the purposes of Title I accountability. Comparability will be based on meeting the Consortium definition of on track for college- and career-ready and assessing the full range of the CCSS. The Consortium research activities will also support States that wish to develop and pilot highly innovative assessment tasks—simulations, extended performance tasks—as part of the summative assessment.

<sup>2</sup> The basic preliminary item blueprint across grades includes: For reading, 44% selected-response, 21% technology-enhanced constructed-response, 18% traditional constructed-response, 18% performance assessments. For writing, speaking and listening, 9% selected-response, 32% technology-enhanced constructed-response, 25% traditional constructed-response, and 35% performance event. For mathematics, 22% selected-response, 41% technology-enhanced constructed-response, 14% traditional constructed-response, and 23% performance events.

<sup>3</sup> The proposed number and scope of performance events are estimates. The actual events to be included within the system will be dependent on the final version of the Common Core State Standards and the number and scope of tasks necessary to assess the full range of the standards at each grade.

<sup>4</sup> The number of sequences/learning progressions for each grade and content area will be determined by the content specified in the Common Core State Standards.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSESSMENT COMPONENT</th>
<th>REQUIRED FOR EACH STATE</th>
<th>TBD BY STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grades 3–8 formative tools, processes, and practices</td>
<td>Option available for State/local use</td>
<td>Classroom-focused, on-demand set of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focus on data for formative purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Linked directly to improved teaching and learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence collected during instruction (feedback cycle) that can lead to gains in student achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resources support CCSS implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Different tools for different purposes (e.g., diagnostic, checking a group's level of understanding prior to and following a lesson or unit of instruction, checking for misconceptions, charting progress, differentiating instruction, evaluating an instructional strategy or program)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Grades 9–12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSESSMENT COMPONENT</th>
<th>REQUIRED FOR EACH STATE</th>
<th>TBD BY STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| High school (Grades 9–12) adaptive comprehensive summative assessment | • English language arts and mathematics (separate assessments)  
• Adaptive portion includes multiple-choice, technology-enhanced, and more traditional constructed-response items  
• Used for measuring achievement and growth for Title 1 accountability purposes (college- and career-ready)  
• Includes up to 6 performance events (typically 1–2 class periods) in each content area by the end of grade 11—half of the tasks will assess the English language arts or mathematics content in the context of science or social studies (per the expectations of the CCSS)  
• Secure high-stakes item pool  
• States must administer the summative assessment in grade 11 until research shows that scores from assessments administered earlier (grade 9 or 10) are comparable to those from the grade 11 assessment  
• An adaptive grade 9/10 summative assessment will be available for States whose selected high school growth model requires a comparable score between the grade 8 and grade 11 administrations | • Students may test up to 2 times on the adaptive portion of the summative assessment  
• Any student has the opportunity for retest on the adaptive portion | Administration will occur during the last 12 weeks of instruction |

---

5 Consortium-supported research agenda will include studies to determine the comparability of distributed summative assessments with the comprehensive summative assessment for the purposes of Title I accountability. Comparability will be based on meeting the Consortium definition of on track for college- and career-ready and assessing the full range of the CCSS. The Consortium research activities will also support States that wish to develop and pilot highly innovative assessment tasks—simulations, extended performance tasks—as part of the summative assessment.

6 The basic preliminary item blueprint across grades includes: For reading, 44% selected-response, 21% technology-enhanced constructed-response, 18% traditional constructed-response, and 18% performance events. For writing, speaking and listening, 9% selected-response, 32% technology-enhanced constructed-response, 25% traditional constructed-responses, and 35% performance event. For mathematics, 22% selected-response, 41% technology-enhanced constructed-response, 14% traditional constructed-response, and 23% performance events.
States would have access to the secure summative item pool for the development of CCSS cluster/domain assessments or EOCs for purposes other than Title I accountability.

Optional for State use
States that elect to use the summative item bank for purposes of cluster or EOC assessments are allotted no more than two testing opportunities per grade per cluster (contingent on budget and item bank)

Blueprint for cluster-domain assessments or EOCs to be determined by each State
States are responsible for research studies to demonstrate comparability of cluster/domain assessments or EOCs (if different from the Consortium definition) with the comprehensive summative assessment for purposes of Title I accountability. Comparability must meet Consortium definition of proficiency and assess the full range of the CCSS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades 9–12 adaptive interim/benchmarks based on learning progressions and/or CCSS content clusters</th>
<th>Option available for State/local use</th>
<th>Administration window (system will provide a fully open testing window)—States may restrict the window according to their policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Blueprint will provide for more in-depth assessment of what students know and can do based on smaller clusters of content and learning progressions (on track to being college- and career-ready)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will include a performance event item bank mapped to the standards for local use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A non-secure pool of items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades 9–12 formative tools, processes and practices</th>
<th>Option available for State/local use</th>
<th>Classroom-focused, on-demand set of resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Focus on data for formative purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Linked directly to improved teaching and learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence collected during instruction (feedback cycle) that can lead to gains in student achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resources support CCSS implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Different tools for different purposes (e.g., diagnostic, checking a group’s level of understanding prior to and following a lesson or unit of instruction, checking for misconceptions, charting progress, differentiating instruction, evaluating an instructional strategy or program)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy Note:** For purpose of ESEA accountability, the highest valid score counts.
Appendix A3-2: Access by Design: A Theory of Action and Research

The Access by Design Model is a framework for purposefully engineering accessibility features into all assessment design blueprints and structures from the beginning and throughout the assessment development process. The intention is to address upfront the vast majority of student access needs (e.g., cognitive, processing, sensory, physical, language) with specific accessibility features (e.g., magnification, audio representation of graphic elements, linguistic simplification) that are designed into the structure and delivery of the assessment items and formats. The intention is to do so in a manner that ensures that the integrity of the targeted grade-level constructs is maintained. Additional “accommodations” requiring special documentation and procedures, or additional local resources for implementation, are thereby minimized at every opportunity through the design and development of the assessments. Only for a small subgroup of students will these accessibility features and accommodations not suffice; therefore, the assessments would be modified (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards) (Tier 3 Access).

The SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium assessments will be consistent with the model’s “Tier 1 Access” and “Tier 2 Access.” That is, the assessments will address the access needs of students, primarily through accessibility features designed upfront into the structure and delivery of the assessments, with few, specific accommodations provided. Additionally, the assessments will fully preserve the targeted grade-level constructs, maintaining the integrity of the grade-level constructs with regard to being on track to college- and career-readiness, and provide information related to students’ understanding of grade-level constructs for instructional purposes.

Fedarchuk, G.V., NH Department of Education, 2010.
Guiding Principles for our Technological Approach to Providing Universal Access

1. Use of technology will extensively leverage the interactive nature of the medium (i.e., not used solely for efficiency) to support student access, engagement, optimum effort, and performance.
   i. The technology will assess the varying complexity or depth-of-knowledge of skills and abilities as can be effectively done through the medium (e.g., student interface with innovative items).
   ii. The technology will be developed in such a way that access to this interactive nature is provided to the greatest number of students possible (e.g., use of assistive devices that directly address language needs or needs for tab-entering manipulation and response output based on predefined student access profile information).

2. Interactive technology components that provide meaningful and valid forms of presentation, engagement, and response for students, while rigorously preserving grade-level constructs being tested, will address access barriers including vision, hearing, motor, and other sensory, physical, cognitive, processing, and language needs of students.

3. The use of technology for delivery of accessible test items and formats will be evaluated on a regular basis by experts with current knowledge of research and experience relevant to the specific sensory, physical, cognitive, processing, and language access needs of students (e.g., vision, hearing, motor skills, communication disorders, assistive technology, inclusive education, and English learners). Advice and guidance will be solicited from specialized experts who work with the student populations most impacted by accessible designs.

4. Technology used to support universally accessible item design, development, and delivery will recognize and use tagging structures that support interoperability, accessibility, and construct fidelity (e.g., Accessible Portable Item Protocol [APIP] Standards). These standardized technology “feature tagging” systems will be used to render items in a consistent manner that is both faithful to the construct and accessible to students with specific and identifiable access profiles. This will permit transfer and implementation of test content across different delivery platforms (and vendors) in the various Consortium States. Features “tagged” will include various item structure elements, including but not limited to construct definition and accessibility (or accommodation) features.

5. Content specialists will regularly evaluate the fidelity of the preservation of the rigor of grade-level constructs being rendered in items and design formats made accessible through the implementation of portable item technology tagging standards. Cognitive elements of item design will be included in the evaluation to ensure that such elements do not adversely impact the academic rigor of the grade-level constructs assessed.

6. Use of all digital technologies in our assessment system will be reviewed on a regular basis, with advice and guidance provided by specialists knowledgeable in computer design and human use of interactive interfaces and graphics as well as other elements of technology employed within the assessment system, such as reporting and professional development portals and tools.

7. Findings from research and emerging practices related to access and accessibility options in technology will be integrated through the iterative processes related to the system’s development, refinement, and implementation.

8. The Consortium will seek to provide equity in availability and affordability of technology-based assessment services and tools for all schools regardless of their size, location, or funding status. Technology systems and tools selected for use in assessments under this
proposal will be chosen to maximize each State’s ability to deliver these services and tools in a cost-effective manner to all of their schools and public students Statewide. Equity of student access across small, rural, urban, and other areas will be a high priority.

9. Open-source, nonprofit sources will be used to the maximum extent, provided that the suppliers meet the very high standards of production, delivery, and security protection required of a world-class assessment system.

10. All technology selected, used, or developed will be based on existing or developing (but recognized) technology interoperability standards. This will support a seamless system of assessment delivery across Consortium States, provide item portability as needed, and ensure continuity of universal item design features across multiple platforms and uses.

11. Technology will be used to provide professional and public online portals to serve educators, the community, and our students directly. Technology used for delivery of (FERPA-compliant) public and confidential reports and interpretive materials to parents, teachers, and students will also provide accessibility options for people within the larger community who use these assessment report, interpretation, student, and staff development tools.
Appendix A3-3: Sample Items

The diagram below shows four points that are connected to form square ABCD.

Square ABCD will be transformed into quadrilateral A’B’C’D’ using the rule (x, y) \( \rightarrow \) (2x, 3y). What type of quadrilateral will image A’B’C’D’ be?

- a square
- a rectangle
- a rhombus
- a trapezoid

Next
How does the author create the tone of the first paragraph?

- He uses sarcasm and distorted descriptions to create a cynical tone.
- He uses vivid word choice and lengthy sentences to create an awed tone.
- He uses sophisticated sentences and ornate language to create a superior tone.
- He uses figurative language and humorous comparisons to create an amused tone.

Note: Passage not included.
A straight angle is shown below.

Change the measure of the angle to 35°. Click on the arm of the angle you would like to select. Then click where you would like to place the arm of the angle.

Use the protractor in the toolbar to confirm your measurement.
Fifteen students watched a movie and rated the movie on a scale of 1 (very bad movie) to 20 (very good movie). Their ratings are shown in the table.

a. Using the data in the table, complete the box-and-whisker plot by adding the upper quartile, the lower quartile, and the median. A box will be formed with the three points indicated. You will be able to adjust the box once created if needed.

Click on the line to add the upper quartile, lower quartile, and median.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Movie Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bee</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamal</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasper</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenn</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofie</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. The teacher gave the movie a rating of 8. The teacher's rating was added to the ratings of the 15 students. Explain how the addition of the teacher's rating will affect the:

- minimum
- maximum
- upper quartile
- lower quartile
- median

Enter response here
This is the first draft of a second grade student’s report on dogs. Make the necessary edits to improve this report.

Edit for:

1. correct capitalization and punctuation
2. spelling
3. standard grammar

there is many kinds of dogs. Some dogs are big and some are small ? Puppys are young dogs.
A spinner has 10 sections of equal size. Each section on the spinner is labeled with one letter (A, B, C, or D). The arrow on the spinner was spun 40 times. The results of the spins are recorded in the table below.

### Spinner Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Number of Spins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the data in the table, complete the spinner below to show the number of sections that are most likely labeled with each letter. Click on the letter you want to select. Then click where you would like to place the letter on the spinner.
The spinner below is divided into six equal sections. Each section is marked with a number from 1 to 6.

![Spinner Diagram]

a. The theoretical probability of spinning each number is \( \frac{1}{6} \). Based on this probability, how many times should each number occur in 20 spins?

Enter response here  Submit
You will now conduct an experiment by spinning the spinner 20 times. Use the spinner below to conduct the experiment. Use the spin button to run each trial, then tabulate the results on your scratch paper.

b. Create a frequency table in the template below that shows the results of the spins. Provide appropriate labels for the table.
c. Explain clearly why your answer from part a is different from or the same as the results given in the table above.

Enter response here

Submit

d. If the spinner were spun 200 more times, how would the frequency of the results be affected?

Enter response here

Submit
The Hardwood Furniture Company manufactures small tables and chairs. It costs $30 to make each table and $20 to make each chair. The amount available to produce all the tables and chairs in one week is $1,200. Let $t$ represent the number of tables produced and $c$ represent the number of chairs produced.

a. The equation for the cost of making furniture for one week is $30t + 20c = 1,200$. On the grid below, construct a graph of this equation (with correct labels and scales).

b. The Hardwood Furniture Company always produces two chairs with each table. Write an equation that represents the number of chairs ($c$) in terms of the number of tables ($t$). Graph and label this equation on the same grid used for part a.
c. Determine the number of tables and chairs the Hardwood Furniture Company can produce per week based on the production costs and the amount of money available (i.e., $1,200). Round the answer appropriately.

d. Explain how the answer to part c is indicated on the graph.

Enter response for parts c and d here
The All City Recreation Committee plans to put a fence around a playground area in All City Park. The solid line in the diagram above outlines the sections in the park that the committee wants to surround with a fence. Information about fencing prices is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FENCE-ALL COMPANY</th>
<th>ACME FENCE COMPANY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fencing: $0.30 per foot</td>
<td>Fencing: $0.32 per foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orders totaling $500 or more will receive a 10% discount.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a. How much fencing will the committee need to buy? Show your work.

Enter response here

Submit

b. Based on the information above, determine which fencing company offers the best deal for this project. Explain your reasoning and show all your work.

Enter response here

Submit
Think of something you would like to have changed or added in your school. It could relate to a school policy, a facility or building, or course offerings. Take a position on one specific issue and convince others to agree with you.

Enter response here
Gas Bills, Heating Degree Days, and Energy Efficiency

Here is a typical story about an Ohio family concerned with saving money and energy by better insulating their house.

Kevin and Shana Johnson’s mother was surprised by some very high gas heating bills during the winter months of 2007. To improve the energy efficiency of her house, Ms. Johnson found a contractor who installed new insulation and sealed some of her windows. He charged her $600 for this work and told her he was pretty sure that her gas bills would go down by “at least 10 percent each year.” Since she had spent nearly $1,500 to keep her house warm the previous winter, she expected her investment would conserve enough energy to save at least $150 each winter (10% of $1,500) on her gas bills.

Ms. Johnson’s gas bill in January 2007 was $240. When she got the bill for January 2008, she was surprised that the new bill was $235. If the new insulation was going to save only $5 each month, it was going to take a very long time to earn back the $600 she had spent. So she called the insulation contractor to see if he had an explanation for what might have gone wrong. The contractor pointed out that the month of January had been very cold this year and that the rate had gone up from last year. He said her bill was probably at least 10% less than it would have been without the new insulation and window sealing.

Ms. Johnson compared her January bill from 2008 to her January bill from 2007. She found out that she had used 200 units of heat in January of 2007 and was charged $1.20 per unit (total = $240). In 2008, she had used 188 units of heat but was charged $1.25 per unit (total = $235) because gas prices were higher in 2008. She found out the average temperature in Ohio in January 2007 had been 32.9 degrees, and in January of 2008, the average temperature was more than 4 degrees colder, 28.7 degrees. Ms. Johnson realized she was doing well to have used less energy (188 units versus 200 units), especially in a month when it had been colder than the previous year.

Since she used gas for heating only, Ms. Johnson wanted a better estimate of the savings due to the additional insulation and window sealing. She asked Kevin and Shana to look into whether the “heating degree days” listed on the bill might provide some insight.

(continued)
a. Assess the cost-effectiveness of Ms. Johnson’s new insulation and window sealing. You will need to research on “heating degree days” on the internet. In your response, you must do the following:

- Explain Ms. Johnson’s savings after the insulation and sealing.
- Identify circumstances under which Ms. Johnson’s January 2008 gas bill would have been at least 10% less than her January 2007 bill.
- Decide if the insulation and sealing work on Ms. Johnson’s house was cost-effective and provide evidence for this decision.
b. Create a short pamphlet for gas company customers to guide them in making decisions about increasing the energy efficiency of their homes. The pamphlet must do the following:

- List the quantities that customers need to consider in assessing the cost-effectiveness of energy efficiency measures.
- Generalize the method of comparison used for Ms. Johnson's gas bills with a set of formulas, and provide an explanation of the formulas.
- Explain to gas customers how to weigh the cost of energy efficiency measures with savings on their gas bills.

When you have completed your pamphlet, upload it using the button below.

Select a file... Submit

Performance Event drawn from the Ohio Performance Assessment Project.
Americans Dreaming

We are shaped by the stories we are told and that we tell. One of the most powerful and longstanding stories in the United States of America is one about how, with determination, grit, and maybe a bit of luck, a person can become anything he or she wants to be. This is the legend of the American dream. This idea—and the criticisms of it—is a mainstay of American writing and media. Writers, filmmakers, reporters, and others have long been fascinated by the dream of a land where everything is possible. Evidence of this fascination can be found in the countless stories Americans have produced—whether in private, in print, or in public media. Our lives are wallpapered with the accounts of American dreams—in the making, remembered and romanticized, or broken.

There are two major parts in this performance assessment. In the first part, you will be asked to complete a task in which you synthesize the various perspectives on the American dream you have encountered in high school and elsewhere. Your analyses of these texts and the work you do to select, arrange, and understand the different perspectives each offers are important work in and of themselves, but they also prepare the way for the inclusion of an additional voice—your own. In the second part of the assessment, you will have the chance to offer your own perspective on the American dream by crafting a text of your own about an American dreamer you know.

The parts of this performance assessment are sequenced in a certain order. Be sure to complete them in order because the work you do in the first parts will help you with the later portions of the assessment. The chart on the next page shows what you will be expected to do and submit at the end of this assessment. The specific prompts for each of the tasks are found in the pages that follow.
## Task Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>What You Will Do</th>
<th>What to Submit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1</td>
<td>Select 3–5 texts that you will focus on for your anthology: “Perspectives on the American Dream.” Make notes on each text.</td>
<td>• one page of notes on each selected text saved electronically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2</td>
<td>Synthesize the various perspectives on the American dream represented in your selection of texts.</td>
<td>• 1,000 word typed essay saved electronically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3</td>
<td>Conduct research on an individual to create an original profile of an American dreamer. You may choose someone you know personally or someone that you can learn about through research.</td>
<td>• 750–1,000 word typed essay saved electronically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4</td>
<td>Write a reflective essay on what you learned from completing the performance assessment.</td>
<td>• 250–500 word typed commentary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Word count limits are guidelines and not strict requirements.

(continued)
I. Perspectives on the American Dream

At this point in your career as a reader and writer, you already know a lot about what other people say for and against the American dream. In this task you will have an opportunity to take stock of and reflect on that learning—to gather texts you've read previously that grapple with the theme and to notice the arguments different authors make about whether the American dream is a driving force or an illusion.

Your teacher will lead a whole class brainstorm to list several texts you have read in high school English or that you have encountered elsewhere that touch on the idea of the American dream. These texts may be fiction or nonfiction, print or other media such as film. The aim is to gather a group of texts, each of which makes an argument about the American dream (i.e., where people’s lives are shaped by their belief in, pursuit of, or disappointment in searching for that dream).

**Part 1. Select three to five texts dealing with the American dream for the following task.** The selected texts must represent at least two different perspectives and must include at least two different types of text (e.g., print text, visual media, audio media, multi-media, digital media). **At least two texts must be print (written) texts** (or a form of text with written versions of the text, for example, a transcript, script, or lyrics).

(continued)
For EACH of the texts you chose, make notes in response to the following questions:

- What message or perspective about the American dream is conveyed in the text?

- What methods are used to convey this perspective? How effective are these methods in persuading/appealing to the audience?

- What are the conditions in the world (historical/cultural) in which this text was produced? How does this knowledge help you understand the text? (You may need to do some research to obtain this information.)

- How credible (believable) is this perspective on the American dream?

In your notes, please refer to specific examples from the texts to support your observations. These notes will be submitted to your teacher to be scored as part of this performance event.

You should develop one page of notes per task that can be saved electronically.

You may work in small groups to study and discuss a common set of texts, but you must complete the written portions of the task individually.

(continued)
Possible texts may include (not required):

- The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn — Mark Twain
- Sister Carrie — Theodore Dreiser
- The House of Mirth — Edith Wharton
- The Great Gatsby — F. Scott Fitzgerald
- Beloved — Toni Morrison
- How the Garcia Girls Lost their Accents — Julia Alvarez
- The House on Mango Street — Sandra Cisneros
- A Raisin in the Sun play — Lorraine Hansberry

- “I Have a Dream” speech — Martin Luther King, Jr.
- “A Dream Deferred” poem — Langston Hughes
- “In America” film (2003) — Jim Sheridan
- “When the Levees Broke” film (2006) — Spike Lee
- “American Land” song — Bruce Springsteen
- Photography of Walker Evans, Dorothea Lange, James VanDerZee

(continued)
Part 2. Synthesizing: “Perspectives on the American Dream” Anthology Project

Imagine that you are editing an anthology for 11–12th graders entitled, “Perspectives on the American Dream.” Your job is to prepare the introduction to this anthology. In your introduction, please do the following things:

a) Include the 3–5 texts that you selected in Part 1 of the task and decide how to arrange them in order.

b) Identify and analyze the varied perspectives on the American dream represented in the texts you selected, including the methods used by each text to convey a perspective.

c) Compare/contrast and draw connections across the messages about the American dream found in each text (or, perhaps in the case of poems and photographs, the set of texts).

d) Evaluate and draw conclusions about varied perspectives on the American dream represented in your anthology to convey your own perspective on these texts.

e) Propose a set of questions to focus readers as they consider the perspectives represented in these texts.

As editor of this anthology, you have the opportunity to put forth your own perspective on the American dream as well as to introduce the perspectives on the American dream represented within and across the texts you select. Your introduction should be clear, to the point, and engaging. This work should be typed and saved electronically.

II. Profiling an American Dreamer Task

In the first part of this performance assessment, you synthesized different perspectives on the idea of the American dream. During that work, you paid careful attention to the arguments others have made about the productivity or legitimacy of this idea and, in doing so, you “sampled” an ongoing conversation about the American dream idea, a discussion that has been going (continued)
on for a long time. This task, Profiling an American Dreamer, is designed to give you a chance to become more than a careful observer of this conversation—it is intended to give you a chance to “deal in,” to craft a profile of your own in which you too can weigh in on questions about “the productivity and legitimacy of the American dream.” In this task, you will write a profile about a living American dreamer. You may choose someone you know personally or someone that you can learn about through research.

You may work in small groups to conduct your interviews or research on the person you will profile, but you must compose the profile individually. You may also collaborate with other students to revise and refine your writing (e.g., through writer’s workshop).

Part 3. Profiling an American Dreamer

As a result of your work in Part 1, you are more aware of the perspectives people have on the idea of the American dream. In this assessment task, you will have the chance to provide an additional perspective on the idea of the American dream, as you compose a profile of an American dreamer you know.

Writing the Profile: Write a profile about a living American dreamer. In your profile, aim to represent or record some aspect of that person and his or her experience that communicates a perspective on the nature or legitimacy of the American dream. You should conduct a range of research activities as you work on this project. The results of this research—photographs, the results of interviews and observations, and/or secondary text work—could all be a part of your final product. If you use published sources, properly cite your sources and include a References page that indicates where to find texts that were retrieved from the Internet.

Essays like Dan Barry’s “At an Age for Music and Dreams” (New York Times, April 15, 2009, accessed at http://www.nytimes.com/2009/04/15/us/15and.html) can give you ideas for how your project might eventually look. At the end of your work you should aim to have a 750–1,000 word typed profile that will be submitted electronically.
### Appendix A3-4: Reporting Characteristics by Assessment Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSESSMENT TYPE</th>
<th>PRIMARY PURPOSE</th>
<th>SECONDARY PURPOSE</th>
<th>REPORTING CHARACTERISTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Summative Assessment:** Grade 3–8 | **Primary Purpose**<br>• Accountability<br>• Instructional effectiveness       | **Secondary Purpose**<br>• College- and career-readiness tracking<br>• Indicator of CCSS acquisition<br>  
  o Criterion, grade level, acquisition<br>  
  o Growth                                           | • Rapid results (2 weeks for adaptive portion)<br>• Data-mining customizable<br>• Static AYP configurations<br>• Longitudinal<br>  
  o Growth measures<br>  
  o Previous performance<br>  
  • Credential-based access                       |
| **Interim/Benchmark:** All grades   | **Primary Purpose**<br>• Unit-level acquisition<br>  
  o Overall unit acquisition<br>  
  o Depth of understanding<br>  
  • “On-track” determination for college- and career-readiness | **Secondary Purpose**<br>• Learning progression status<br>  
  o “Early warning” of need for remediation<br>  
  o Targeted instruction to “next step” in progression | • Unit-level reporting<br>• Real-time result (adaptive portion)<br>• Data-mining customizable<br>• Rich learning progression display<br>• Directly linked formative materials<br>• Longitudinal<br>  
  o Growth measures<br>  
  o Previous performance<br>  
  • Credential-based access                        |
Appendix A4-1: Examples of Learning Progressions in ELA and Mathematics

Stages of Listening Comprehension and Speaking Skills


Stage 1

Listening Comprehension

Word Level:
- Comprehend a range of frequently used words (e.g., common vocabulary in the domains of Social Language [SL] and School Navigational Language [SNL])
- Identify and intentionally add a small number of new words to broaden receptive vocabulary in the areas of mortar words and Curriculum Content Language (CCL) (by adding new words) and deepen the lexicon (by adding new meanings and nuances to known words)

Sentence Level:
- Use word order conventions to make meaning of syntactically simple sentences (e.g., subject + verb + object = declarative statement; verb + subject + object = question form; verb + object = imperative form).
- Use high frequency inflectional morphology (plural + s) to make meaning of syntactically simple sentences

Discourse Level:
- Begin to build spoken language genre knowledge (organization of language and ideas) by interpreting the meanings of a range of oral discourse contexts (conversations with a peer, short teacher monologues, simple one-step instructions/directions)
- Begin to build printed language genre knowledge by acquiring story grammar knowledge and interpreting the meanings of a range of short, simple texts read aloud by the teacher (storybooks, simple expository texts, poetry, puns)
- Comprehend frequently used idioms, clichés and expressions used in the classroom (e.g., Once upon a time, The End. Are you sitting nicely?)

Prior/content Knowledge:
- Begin to connect new information heard to that already learned so that general background and content knowledge grow in both depth and breadth

Speaking Skills

Word Level:
- Produce frequently used words (e.g., common vocabulary in the domains of Social Language [SL] and School Navigational Language [SNL])
- Identify and intentionally use a small number of new words to broaden expressive vocabulary in the areas of common mortar words and simple Curriculum Content Language (CCL) (by using new words) and deepen the lexicon (by using the new meanings and nuances of known words)

Sentence Level:
- Produce syntactically simple sentences
- Use high frequency inflectional morphology to produce syntactically simple sentences

Discourse Level:
• Begin to display spoken language genre knowledge by producing discourse on familiar topics in a small range of frequently occurring contexts (short conversations with a peer, short responses to teacher requests, simple requests for clarification of teacher directions)

• Produce frequently used idioms, clichés and expressions found in the classroom, often learned in chunks or unanalyzed strings (e.g., Once upon a time, Mayago [May + I = go] to recess?)

• Use language in service of common social functions (express needs, command) and simple/common academic language functions (describe, label)

Stage 2

Listening Comprehension

Word Level:
• Comprehend a broader range of frequently used words (e.g., common vocabulary in the domains of SL and SNL)

• Identify and intentionally add an increasingly large number of new words to broaden receptive vocabulary in the areas of mortar words and CCL (by adding new words including the academic synonyms of more commonly used words [e.g., feline for cat]), synonyms to provide more precision or information [e.g., replied and asked for said] and continue to deepen the lexicon (by adding new meanings, shades of meaning [e.g., anger vs. furious] and nuances to known words)

• Begin to use word analysis skills to aid in comprehension (e.g., use high frequency derivational morphology (e.g., adjective +ness = noun) to identify parts of speech or understand new meanings (un + adjective and un + verb = opposite in meaning to root word)

Sentence Level:
• Expand repertoire of recognizable sentence structures to include frequently used complex syntax (e.g., relative clauses)

• Use less common inflectional morphology to make meaning of syntactically complex sentences (e.g., participial modifiers [verb + ing] such as The boys running were late for their class)

Discourse Level:
• Continue to build spoken language genre knowledge (organization of language and ideas) by interpreting the meanings of a broader range of oral discourse contexts (dialogues between two peers, longer teacher monologues, two- and three-step instructions/directions)

• Continue to build printed language genre knowledge by interpreting the meanings of broader range of simple texts read aloud by the teacher (storybooks, simple expository texts, poetry, puns)

• Comprehend frequently used idioms, clichés and expressions used in the classroom (e.g., Give it your best, The more the better)

Prior/content Knowledge:
• Continue to connect larger amounts of new information heard to that already learned so that general background and content knowledge grow in both depth and breadth

Speaking Skills

Word Level:
• Produce a broader range of frequently used words (e.g., common vocabulary in the domains of SL and SNL)

• Identify and intentionally use an increasingly larger number of new words to broaden expressive vocabulary in the areas of mortar words and simple CCL (by using new words) and continue to deepen the lexicon (by using the new meanings and nuances of known words)

• Make new words of differing parts of speech from known words using derivational morphology

Sentence Level:
- Produce greater variety of grammatical structures (e.g., inclusion of adjectival and prepositional phrases)
- Use less common inflectional morphology to produce syntactically more complex sentences

**Discourse Level:**
- Continue to expanded use of spoken language genre knowledge by producing discourse on familiar topics in a broader range of contexts (conversation with a peer, conversation with a group of peers, production of simple monologues such as personal narratives or a short book report, responses to teacher multi-part requests, requests for clarification of teacher and peer directions)
- Produce frequently used idioms, clichés and expressions found in the classroom
- Use language in service of a wider range of social functions (command, request) and increasingly complex academic language functions (explain, summarize)

**Stage 3**

*Listening Comprehension*

**Word Level:**
- Comprehend a wide range of common and uncommon words in the domains of SL and SNL
- Continue to identify and intentionally add unfamiliar words to broaden receptive vocabulary in the areas of mortar words and CCL (by adding new words) and deepen the lexicon (by adding new meanings, shades of meaning and nuances to known words)
- Make inferences about a speaker’s stance towards content from their word choices (e.g., *retorted* for *replied*)
- Continue to use word analysis skills to aid in comprehension (e.g., use rarer derivational morphology (e.g. verb +ate, *iterate* = new verb meaning, adjective +ify [*solidify*] = verb)

**Sentence Level:**
- Comprehend the full range of simple and complex grammatical structures (e.g., nominalization of verb forms [*to form vs. formation*] to increase amount of information contained within a sentence), and increase sentence length (e.g., multiple prepositions in a single sentence)
- Continue to use common and uncommon inflectional morphology to make meaning of syntactically complex sentences

**Discourse Level:**
- Continue to build spoken language genre knowledge (organization of language and ideas) by interpreting the meanings of a broader range of oral discourse contexts (dialogues between multiple peers, extended teacher monologues, plays/dramas, multi-step instructions/directions)
- Continue to build printed language genre knowledge by interpreting the meanings of broader range of simple and challenging texts read aloud by the teacher (storybooks with familiar and unfamiliar story grammars, works of literature, complex expository texts, primary source texts in content areas such as history, poetry, plays, pans)
- Comprehend frequently used idioms, clichés and expressions used in the classroom (e.g., *Don’t beat about the bush, All’s well that ends well*)

**Prior/content Knowledge:**
- Continue to connect complex and large amounts of new information heard to that already learned so that general background and content knowledge grow in both depth and breadth

*Speaking Skills*

**Word Level:**
- Produce a wide range of common and uncommon words in the domains of SL and SNL
• Continue to identify and intentionally use a wider range of new words to broaden expressive vocabulary in the areas of uncommon mortar words and low frequency CCL (by using new words) and continue to deepen the lexicon (by using the new meanings and nuances of known words)

• Continue to make new words of differing parts of speech from known words using derivational morphology

Sentence Level:

• Produce full range of simple sentences and complex grammatical structures (e.g., relative clauses) and increase sentence length.

• Use common and uncommon inflectional morphology to produce syntactically complex sentences

Discourse Level:

• Continue to expanded use of spoken language genre knowledge by producing discourse on familiar and unfamiliar topics in a broader range of contexts (conversation with multiple peers, production of extended monologues, such as personal narratives or book and science reports, responses to teacher multi-part requests, requests for clarification of teacher and peer directions)

• Produce frequently used idioms, clichés and expressions found in the classroom

• Use language in service of a wide range of simple and complex social functions (command, persuade) and simple and complex academic language functions (describe, explain, summarize, hypothesize)
# A Developmental Model for Learning Functions


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>General Description</th>
<th>Example Tasks &amp; Understandings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Students have separate numeric and spatial understandings.</td>
<td>Extend the pattern 3, 7, 11, 15, __, __, __. Notice in a bar graph of yearly population figures that each bar is taller than the previous bar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≈ Initial numeric understanding:</td>
<td>Multiply each number in the sequence: 0, 1, 2, . . . by 2 to get a set of pairs: 0-0, 1-2, 2-4, . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students iteratively compute (e.g., “add 4”) within a string of positive whole numbers.</td>
<td>Generalize the pattern and express it as ( y = 2x ). Notice that a graph of daily plant growth must leave spaces for unmeasured Saturday and Sunday values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≈ Initial spatial understanding: students represent the relative sizes of quantities as bars on a graph and perceive patterns of qualitative changes in amount by a left-to-right visual scan of the graph, but cannot quantify those changes.</td>
<td>For every 1 km, a constant “up by” $2 in both the y-column of a table and the y-axis in a graph generates a linear pattern (spatial) with a slope of 2 (numeric). ( y = 2x ) can be read from, or produced in, both a table and a graph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spatial and numeric understandings are elaborated and integrated, forming a central conceptual structure.</td>
<td>Look at the function below. Could it represent ( y = x - 10 )? Why or why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≈ Elaboration of numeric understanding:</td>
<td>If you think it could not, sketch what you think it looks like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--Iteratively apply a single operation to, rather than within, a string of numbers to generate a second string of numbers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--Construct an algebraic expression for this repeated operation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≈ Elaboration of spatial understanding:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--Use continuous quantities along the horizontal axis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--Perceive emergent properties, such as linear or increasing, in the shape of the line drawn between points.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≈ Integration of elaborated understandings:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--See the relationship between the differences in the y-column in a table and the size of the step from one point to the next in the associated graph.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≈ Interpret algebraic representations both numerically and spatially.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>≈ Elaborate initial integrated numeric and spatial understanding to create more sophisticated variations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≈ Integrate understanding of ( y = x ) and ( y = x + b ) to form a mental structure for linear functions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≈ Integrate rational numbers and negative integers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≈ Form mental structures for other families of functions, such as ( y = xn + b ).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3 | Integrate variant (e.g., linear and nonlinear) structures developed at level 2 to create higher-order structures for understanding more complex functions, such as polynomials and exponential and reciprocal functions.  
Elaborate understanding of graphs and negative integers to differentiate the four quadrants of the Cartesian plane.  
Understanding the relationship of these quadrants to each other. | At what point would the function \( y = 10x - x^2 \) cross the x-axis? Please show all of your work. |
Appendix A4-2: Overview of Development Process for Summative Assessment

Adaptive Summative Assessment

Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in ELA and Math

Align Curriculum to CCSS

Teacher Sees Value: Connection to CCSS

Teachers Use Data Formatively

Professional Capacity Building
Use of Formative Tools, Processes, Practices and Curriculum Development

Improved Teaching

Improved Learning

Student is College and Career Ready

Test Design & Development

Evidence-based Approach to Understanding What Students Know and Can Do in a Domain

Develop Assessment Framework/Test Blueprint/Item Specifications

Item Development

Adaptive Summative Assessment
Appendix A4-3: Goals for Enhanced Assessment Grant for Accommodations

Goal 1. Identify, research, and recommend content area assessment-related inclusion and accommodation guidelines and policies pertaining to English learners (ELs) for SBAC.

Objective 1.1: Within the first nine months of the project, summarize definitions of ELs, State policies, practices, and research on accommodations to inform educators, researchers, and other stakeholders across the States in SBAC.

Activity 1.1a: Conduct a survey of States within the Consortium to determine current definitions, inclusion and accommodation guidelines, and/or policies for ELs.

Activity 1.1b: Collect and consolidate available national data from States regarding accommodations allowed.

Activity 1.1c: Conduct an inventory and analysis of State laws, rules, and policies regarding definitions of ELs and inclusion and accommodation of ELs in State content assessments. Identify any State laws, rules, or policies regarding the process by which eligible Statewide accommodations are added, removed, or altered.

Activity 1.1d: Conduct a comprehensive literature review of all research on accommodations for ELs, including the research focused on technology-based assessments. Publish a summary of the literature and an annotated bibliography.

Activity 1.1e: Create a report summarizing definitions, criteria, and guidelines for identifying and including ELs in content assessments. The report will provide a comprehensive list of accommodations, the frequency of use of each accommodation, and analyses of potential responsiveness of these accommodations for ELs. The report also will identify differences in policies, practices, accommodations, and rationales for the use of specific accommodations across the Consortium States.

Objective 1.2: By the end of the first quarter of year two, the project will produce a definition, inclusion policies, and a set of accommodations appropriate for ELs that are commonly accepted by educators, researchers, and other stakeholders across the States in SBAC.

Activity 1.2a: Grant partners will: (1) conduct 3 to 4 update and discussion webinars that include Consortium SEA teams representing assessment, Title III, special education, and curriculum; (2) hold a final meeting with a representative from each State to attain consensus on allowable accommodations for the Consortium.

Activity 1.2b: Summarize and disseminate the consensus process and agreements reached with consortium states. Dissemination strategies will include online materials, conference presentations, and other appropriate means that might be identified.

Goal 2. Identify, research, and recommend content area assessment-related inclusion and accommodation guidelines and policies pertaining to SWDs and 504 students for SBAC.

Objective 2.1: Within the first nine months of the project, summarize definitions of SWDs and 504 students, State policies, practices, and research on accommodations to inform educators, researchers, and other stakeholders across the States in SBAC.
**Activity 2.1a:** Conduct a survey of States within the Consortium to determine current definitions, inclusion and accommodation guidelines, and/or policies for SWDs and 504 students.

**Activity 2.1b:** Collect and consolidate available national data from States regarding accommodations allowed.

**Activity 2.1c:** Conduct an inventory and analysis of State laws, rules, and policies regarding definitions of SWDs and 504 students inclusion, and accommodation of SWDs and 504 students in State content assessments. Identify any State laws, rules, or policies regarding the process by which eligible Statewide accommodations are added, removed, or altered.

**Activity 2.1d:** Conduct a comprehensive literature review of all research on accommodations for SWDs and 504 students, including the research focused on computer-delivered technology-based assessments. Summarize the literature review in a publication and an annotated bibliography.

**Activity 2.1e:** Create a report summarizing the definition, criteria, and guidelines for identifying and including SWDs and 504 students in regular content assessments. The report will provide a comprehensive list of accommodations, the frequency of use of each accommodation and analyses of potential responsiveness of each of the accommodations for SWDs and 504 students. The report also will identify differences in policies, practices, accommodations, and rationales for the use of specific accommodations across the Consortium States.

**Objective 2.2:** By the end of the first quarter of year two, the project will produce a definition, inclusion policies, practices, and a set of accommodations appropriate for SWDs and 504 students that are commonly accepted by educators, researchers, and other stakeholders across the States in SBAC.

**Activity 2.2a:** Grant partners will: (1) conduct 3-4 update and discussion webinars including Consortium SEA teams representing assessment, Title III, special education, and curriculum; (2) hold a meeting with a representative from each State to attain consensus on allowable accommodations for the Consortium.

**Activity 2.2b:** Summarize and disseminate the consensus process and agreements reached with Consortium States. Dissemination strategies will include online materials, conference presentations, and other appropriate means that might be identified.

**Goal 3.** Identify, research, and recommend strategies to address the assessment-related accommodation needs of ELs, SWDs, and 504 students for SBAC specific to computer delivery and other technological assessment enhancements.

**Objective 3.1:** By the completion of the project, identify the characteristics of the accommodation needs of ELs, SWD, and 504 students in a technology-based assessment environment that are commonly accepted by educators, researchers, and other stakeholders across the States in SBAC.

**Activity 3.1a:** Conduct an in-depth study of States currently using a high level of computer-delivered tests and the types of accommodations available to students (highlighting, increased typeface, avatar voices, etc.). Create a report summarizing the findings of the in-depth study of the current use of technology in assessment by States, including the specific types of technology used.
Activity 3.1b: Conduct an in-depth study examining the technology available from vendors. Summarize the accommodations possible through assessment technologies currently available.

Activity 3.1c: Determine the barriers to the use of technology for access to assessments and suggest potential solutions. Create a report explicating the barriers to the use of technology for assessments and the recommended solutions.

Activity 3.1d: Conduct a case study of the Oregon assessment system and the use of technology within the system for ELs, SWDs, and 504 students. Synthesize and report findings describing the use of technology in the Oregon assessment system so that it might be used to inform the SBAC decisions.

Goal 4: Monitor fidelity in application of inclusion and accommodations guidelines and/or policies by States and create a sustainable process by which the research described above may continue to inform decisions regarding appropriate access for ELs, SWDs, and 504 students.

Objective 4.1: Grant partners will provide the SBAC States with an inclusion and accommodations manual that can be used to ensure consistent and streamlined inclusion and accommodation policies across the Consortium States.

Activity 4.1a: Grant partners and Consortium members will compile the findings from Goals 1, 2, and 3 and outline a standard, empirically based inclusion and accommodations manual for ELs, SWDs, and 504 students to be used across all Consortium States.

Activity 4.1b: Using the agreed-upon outline, write sections of the manual. The EL section will address definition, inclusion, and accommodation of ELs in content area assessments and will include a common definition of an EL, recommended inclusion and accommodation guidelines, and valid and effective accommodations for ELs. The SWDs/504 section of the manual will address definition, inclusion, and accommodation of SWDs and 504 students in regular content area assessments and will include recommended inclusion and accommodation guidelines, and valid and effective accommodations for SWDs and 504 students.

Activity 4.1c: Conduct 3 to 4 webinars to obtain stakeholder feedback and consensus on how the manual will be used in the Consortium States.

Activity 4.1d: Support the Consortium States in disseminating the accommodations manual by providing strategies and materials that the SEAs can use with the LEAs throughout the SBAC. Dissemination will be through print volumes, online materials, webinars, training modules, conference presentations, and other appropriate means that might be identified.

Objective 4.2: Create a process to systematically review accommodations for SBAC.

Activity 4.2a: Grant partners will recommend a detailed process (in writing) to be used by SBAC in annual review of inclusion and accommodations guidelines and/or policies.

Activity 4.2b: Create an online standard template for use in evaluating accommodation use for peer review.

Activity 4.2c: Grant partners and Consortium States will establish a research agenda the Consortium can use to study, monitor, evaluate, and improve the validity of accommodations.
Appendix A4-4a: Reporting Exemplar – Colorado Electronic Portal for Review of Performance Data
Appendix A4-4b: Reporting Exemplar – Colorado Growth Model Sample
District-Level Achievement and Growth Charts for Math, Reading, Writing
Appendix A4-4c: Reporting Exemplar – Colorado’s Understanding Your Child’s Academic Progress

Understanding Your Child’s Academic Progress

*How is my child doing?* This is a simple question many parents ask when they see a child’s test score. There are actually two issues involved when tests are given: **Level of Achievement and Growth.**

**Level of Achievement:** Was my child’s test score high enough?  
**Growth:** Are my child’s test scores improving quickly enough to move up to the next level, keep from falling behind, or catch up?

**Growth:** The other half of the story. Most tests we take give only a score reflecting something about our level of achievement (pass/fail, A/B/C/D/F grade, etc.). Until recently, Colorado children received a single test score for each of the CSAP academic areas of reading, writing, and math, plus an Achievement Level of Advanced, Proficient, Partially Proficient, or Unsatisfactory. But we need to recognize kids’ progress towards a higher achievement level, even if they are not quite there yet – high growth means they can get there with more time. Achievement levels provide only one part of the story - a snapshot of performance at a single point in time. The other half of the story is each child’s growth in learning. Growth shows success in the education system, because it shows where positive change is happening for students and schools.

The Colorado Growth Model measures the academic progress each student has made in a year. However, instead of just saying how many points a student has gained or lost since the previous year, the model tells us how a student’s progress compares to other students with a similar CSAP score history. These student growth percentile scores range from 1 (lowest growth) to 99 (highest growth). Percentiles are not percent correct scores, and do not tell us anything about students’ “snapshot” achievement levels. Even students with low test scores can get high student growth percentiles, if they made great progress since the previous year’s test. For example, in the sample plot below, this boy’s reading score between 2007 and 2008 went up, and his growth percentile was 83. His growth was therefore as high or higher than 83% of other students at a similar level of proficiency; in other words, only 17% of similar students progressed more than he did. A 50th percentile growth score is right in the middle, so it’s a typical growth score across the state – not particularly low or high. On the other side of this page are graphs of your child’s growth and achievement history. The sample below will help you to understand what those graphs are telling you about your child’s academic growth.

We hope that this report of your child’s growth scores will help you see your child’s academic progress in a new, more useful way. This new academic growth report can form the basis of fresh, better-informed conversations with your child’s school and teachers because it is more than just a snapshot of what has already happened. We encourage you to discuss your child’s achievement levels and growth in new and more challenging ways. Instead of “How is my child doing?” you can ask a teacher or principal more focused questions such as:

- What steps can we take since my son’s growth in reading wasn’t good enough, and he needs to catch up?  
- Is my daughter’s academic growth enough to keep her Proficient in math next year?  
- What will it take for my son to move up to Advanced in writing next year?

On our website, you’ll find descriptions of situations that might be similar to your child’s, and lots of ideas to refer to in conversations with your child, your child’s teachers, and your school community. You will also find detailed explanations, videos, and interactive tools to help you explore all the exciting information that the Colorado Growth Model provides.

Come and visit us at [www.schoolview.org](http://www.schoolview.org).

---

*Copyright © 1999-2005 Colorado Department of Education/Center for Assessment, Inc. All rights reserved.*
How to Understand an Individual Student Growth and Achievement Report

The white dots show the student’s scores on all CSAP administrations. The gray region each dot lies in is the student’s achievement level from that year. The higher the dot, the higher the test score was.

These colored bars show the probable range of next year’s scores for the student based on the academic history. Low growth would put the student’s 2005 score into the red area; typical growth into the yellow area; and high growth into the green area of scores. The fan tells us how much growth will be necessary for this student to achieve the next proficiency goal.

The horizon lines, left to right, show the percentiles of each student in each year. The growth percentiles appear in this row, directly below the corresponding arrow.

These are the student’s CSAP scores and corresponding achievement levels. Points are produced for math, reading, and writing.

The growth arrows between the dots represent growth, with the color coding the student made in that year of school. The color of the arrow describes the student’s growth level (red = low, yellow = typical, green = high) between two CSAP tests. The color coding gives to the right of the plot tells you the range of growth score belonging to those levels.

The bars represent achievement levels for students at different grades on CSAP.

The green bars show the student’s growth in reading and achievement levels for each year.

The gray bars show the student’s growth in math and achievement levels for each year.

The colored bars show the probable range of next year’s scores for the student based on the academic history. Low growth would put the student’s 2005 score into the red area; typical growth into the yellow area; and high growth into the green area of scores. The fan tells us how much growth will be necessary for this student to achieve the next proficiency goal.

The horizon lines, left to right, show the percentiles of each student in each year. The growth percentiles appear in this row, directly below the corresponding arrow.

These are the student’s CSAP scores and corresponding achievement levels. Points are produced for math, reading, and writing.

The growth arrows between the dots represent growth, with the color coding the student made in that year of school. The color of the arrow describes the student’s growth level (red = low, yellow = typical, green = high) between two CSAP tests. The color coding gives to the right of the plot tells you the range of growth score belonging to those levels.
Interpretation of One Student’s Individual Student Growth and Achievement Report

This student was at the advanced level in 4th grade on Math in 2005, but by year 6 he was identified as needing support in order to maintain his advanced level. He showed growth in the lower part of the proficient range in both Reading and Writing but not in Math. This trend continued to year 7, where he showed some growth in Reading and Writing but not in Math. He showed some growth in the lower range of the proficient category in Reading and Writing but not in Math. He showed some growth in the lower range of the proficient category in Reading and Writing but not in Math. He showed some growth in the lower range of the proficient category in Reading and Writing but not in Math.

Another year of typical growth in Reading and Writing would put him in the lower end of the proficient range, but he should be making academic progress, not losing ground. This student needs high growth in these areas. The next year, as shown by the area covered by the yellow bar, he needs a year of high growth.
INTRODUCTION

The OAKS Online Reporting System allows authorized users to access the following types of reports:

1. **Performance Reports** (formerly known as Oregon Assessment Results Reports)
2. **Participation Reports** (formerly accessible through OAKS Online Test Delivery System)

**Performance Reports** show school-year test data for individual students, rosters, personnel, institutions, and districts, as well as longitudinal reports for students and rosters. Authorized users can perform the following:

- Manage online rosters (groups)
- View district, institution, personnel, roster, and individual student score reports in table and graph formats
- Filter score reports by student subgroup (gender, ethnicity, LEP, Title I, etc.)
- View longitudinal data for students and rosters in graph format
- Access integrated information from ODE's SSID and OAKS Online systems, resulting in a centralized assessment reporting system

**Participation Reports** provide a record of all test activity for a given District or Institution. Authorized users can track all test opportunities and monitor student test progress throughout the year.
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GETTING STARTED

Common Login System (CLS)

OAKS Online has updated the login process for administrators, making it easier for users to switch between OAKS systems without having to sign in to each system separately. This Common Login System (CLS) integrates the following OAKS systems:

- Test Administrator (TA) Interface
- Online Reporting System
- User Management System (UMS)
- TA Training Site

There are two methods to log in to an OAKS system:

1. Through the OAKS Online Portal (https://www.oaks.k12.or.us/)
2. By entering the URL for that system

To log in via the portal, start by selecting your user role from the main page, then select the application from the list of available OAKS systems.

![Figure 1: Selecting Your OAKS System (OAKS Portal)](image)

You will be directed to the CLS login screen. Entering the URL will also direct you to this login screen. All administrators are directed to this screen regardless of their user role and the system they selected. You will automatically be directed to your desired system upon logging in. Enter your Username and Password and click [Log In].

**Reminder:** Your username is your e-mail address.

If you are having trouble, you can receive your password via e-mail. Click the [Forgotten Password?] link in the bottom-right corner. Follow the on-screen instructions to receive an e-mail containing your
password information. If you continue to have problems logging in, please contact your STC or DSA/DTSA.

Navigating Between OAKS Online Systems

The CLS is designed to ease the login process and simplify navigation between OAKS Online systems. After logging in to their account, users will remain signed in to OAKS as long as one of their browser windows remains on an OAKS system (system timeout rules apply).

The top of your browser contains a drop-down menu listing all OAKS Online systems. Your current application is displayed to the left of the drop-down. Select the application you want to switch to from the drop-down menu.

Figure 2: CLS Drop-down Menu

![Figure 2: CLS Drop-down Menu](image)

To exit the system, click the **Logoff** button from the top-right corner of the screen. You will automatically be logged out of all OAKS Online systems. The following message will be displayed:

Figure 3: Logging Out of CLS Confirmation Message

![Figure 3: Logging Out of CLS Confirmation Message](image)

You will be **logoff** out of CLS and all OAKS systems:

- If you click **Logoff** from any OAKS system
- If you close your browser
- If you navigate away from an OAKS system (only if it is the last OAKS system open in your browser)
- After 20 minutes of inactivity
Navigating Between Performance and Participation Reports

The Online Reporting System contains tabs for Performance Reports and Participation Reports. Upon logging in using the Common Login System (CLS), you will be directed to the home screen for the Performance Reports. Use the tabs to switch between the two reports.

Figure 4: Online Reporting System Tabs

![Performance Reports Participation Reports]

User Roles and Access

Your OAKS Online User Role determines the District(s) and Institution(s) you are permitted to view.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User Role</th>
<th>Access To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TT – Test Technician</td>
<td>No access to Online Reporting Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA – Test Administrator</td>
<td>Access to view students in their school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STC – School Test Coordinator</td>
<td>Access to view students in their school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTSA – District Test and Security Administrator</td>
<td>Access to view students in the schools in their district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSA – District Security Administrator</td>
<td>Access to view students in the schools in their district</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Online Reporting System provides information on operational OAKS Online and ELPA tests only. Data from training/practice tests are not included in any reports.
PERFORMANCE REPORTS

Navigation and Layout

These interactive reports are customized for administrators and personnel.

1. To begin, click the icon to expand the school year test listing.
2. Click the link for the Grade and Test reports you want to view.

The tests are listed in order by grade level and subject. We currently provide reports for the following:

- Reading Grades 3-8 and High School
- Math Grades 3-8 and High School
- Social Sciences 5, 8, and High School
- Science 5, 8, and High School

To understand the different features of the system, you should be familiar with the layout. The figure below displays the tabs available within Performance Reports.

**Figure 5: Performance Reports Navigation**

- **Performance Reports**
- **Participation Reports**

**Tab Sections**

**Home:** Click this tab to return to the home page and select a different test grade and subject.

**Dashboard:** Click this tab to view the following data:

- The percent of students who have taken the subject tests so far (within the selected grade). This feature is also available in the Online Score Report mini-dashboard.
- The percent of students who have taken the test one, two and three times (of the students who took the subject tests). This feature is also available in the Online Score Report mini-dashboard.
- The percent of students who met the state standard in each subject for the current year, as well as at the end of the testing window the previous year and at the same time the previous year.
- The percent of students who met the state standard in each content standard category.
Score Reports: Use this tab to view district, institution, roster, and student scores (in table and graph formats). The Online Score Report also includes a mini-dashboard.

Longitudinal Reports: Longitudinal reports can help you analyze test scores over time (for example, across school years). You can build three types of longitudinal analyses:
- Tracking by Successive Cross-Sections
- Tracking by Individual Students
- Tracking by Cohort

View All Students: Use this tab to view all students’ scores within a selected institution. You can choose to display only the highest scale scores for each student, or scores from each opportunity.

Manage My Rosters: Use this tab to view, add, edit, and delete class rosters.

Help: If you have questions, click the Help tab to access the user guide and interactive help section. This section will guide you through the features of the online reporting system. You will also find contact information for the Regional ESD Partners and OAKS Help Desks.

Breadcrumbs

If you are a multi-institution user, you can always confirm which level of aggregation you are viewing by looking at the breadcrumbs below the tab section. Your current level will be in bold green font.

Click here for higher levels of aggregation: STATE > DISTRICT > INSTITUTION > PERSONNEL > ROSTER > STUDENT

NOTE: Breadcrumbs appear only on the Score Report pages; they will not appear in the longitudinal reports or dashboard sections.
Manage My Rosters

Creating customized rosters (online groups) allows you to obtain detailed score reports for a specific group or cross-section of students. This feature allows for more advanced and expanded reporting options. You may assign students to multiple rosters via the Manage My Rosters section. You will also have the ability to view students not currently assigned to any roster(s), as these students will be grouped together under the name “Students With No Group.”

You can manage your data in two ways:

1. Add a new roster to your institution.
2. Edit or delete a roster from your institution.

Figure 6: Manage My Rosters

Adding a New Roster

1. Select a school year from the Select a School Year drop-down list. (Note: The roster you create will only be viewable within the selected school year.)

   NOTE: For multiple-district users, you will also need to select a district from the Select a District drop-down list.

2. Choose your institution from the Select an Institution drop-down list.

3. Select “Add Roster” from the drop-down list under Select task. The page will automatically load with the form to add a new roster.

4. Add the new roster information, including roster ID, roster name, personnel name, subject(s), grade level, and students.

   NOTE: You may not change your roster ID once you have saved it.

5. Click Save.
Figure 7: Add New Roster

Editing a Roster

1. Select a school year from the Select an School Year drop-down list.
   
   NOTE: For multiple-district users, you will also need to select a district from the Select a District drop-down list.

2. Choose your institution from the Select an Institution drop-down list.

3. Select “View/Edit/Delete a Roster” from the Select task drop-down list. A list of the roster(s) in your institution will appear.
4. Click Edit next to the roster name. Refer to Figures 8 and 9 below.
5. Enter the information that needs to be changed, including roster name, teacher, subject(s), grade level, and students. NOTE: You cannot change the roster ID.
6. Click Save.

Deleting a Roster

1. Select a school year from the Select a School Year drop-down list.
   NOTE: For multiple-district users, you will also need to select a district from the Select a District drop-down list.
2. Choose your institution from the Select an Institution drop-down list.
3. Select “View/Edit/Delete a Roster” from the Select task drop-down list. A list of the roster(s) in your institution will appear.
4. Click Delete next to the personnel’s name. Refer to Figure 8 below.
5. A pop-up window will appear, asking for confirmation that you want to delete the roster. Click OK to delete.

After you have saved your roster information, click the Score Reports tab to access the updated reports.

Figure 8: Access Rosters to Edit or Delete
Figure 9: Edit a Roster

Institution Name: [Abbott Albert District (ID: 85908668)]

Step 3 - Enter roster information

Roster ID:

Roster ID must be unique in the online reporting database. If an ID has already been taken, you will need to create a different one. ID names do not appear on your report.

Roster Name:

Roster names do not need to be unique. These are the names that appear on your reports.

Step 4 - Associate personnel to this roster.

Select Personnel:

This field is optional. However, checking off to assign personnel to this roster will result in your students showing up under “Students With No Group.”

Step 5 - Select Subjects

Reading  ☐ Math  ☐ Science  ☐ Social Science  ☐

Option 1 - Select Grade and submenus. Student

Choose  ☐ Grade 3  ☐ Grade 4  ☐ Grade 5  ☐ Grade 6  ☐ Grade 7  ☐ Grade 8  ☐ Grade 9  ☐ Grade 10  ☐ Grade 11  ☐ Grade 12  ☐

TIP

- To move one student from one box to the other, highlight the student’s name, then click the appropriate arrow button.
- To move multiple students from one box to the other, hold down your CTRL key and click the names of the students to move. Release the CTRL key, click the appropriate arrow button. For Mac users, please use the Command key instead of the CTRL key.
- Be sure to click [Done] when you are done reordering students.

Available Students (0)

Students in This Class (1)

To add a student:

Click [Add]

To remove a selected student:

Click [Remove]

To add all students:

Click [Add All]

To move all students to another class:

Click [Move All]
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Students With No Group

This group contains students that currently do not belong to any roster. It will also contain students who were added to a roster, but do not have personnel assigned to that roster.

This group is separate from the group(s) that appear for specific personnel in the system. To move these students to a roster with assigned personnel, follow the instructions above for managing rosters.

Figure 10: Students With No Group
Dashboard

The Dashboard page provides overall data within each Grade regarding how many students have taken the subject tests so far. Three graph reports are presented:

- The percent (%) of students who have taken the subject tests (Reading, Mathematics, Science, and Social Sciences).
- The percent (%) of students who have taken the subject tests one, two, or three times.
- The percent (%) of students who took the test(s) and who met or exceeded the state standards for each subject and score reporting category within each subject.

You can also view comparative data between the current school year and the previous school year—you will see “as of today’s date,” “as of this time last year,” and the “final score last year.” This data will enable you to track state, district, and school progress and compare it to the previous year’s performance.

Figure 11: Percent of Student Tested (by Test Subject)
Figure 12: Percent of Students Tested (by Opportunity Number for each Test Subject)

Figure 13: Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding State Standard (by Test Subject)
Online Score Report

The first report you see is the “Online Score Report.” You can use this report to summarize the results of your institution(s) in the selected test grade and subject.

You will view the institution(s) for which you have access. Click the link of the institution to access corresponding personnel, roster and student reports. Each level of the Online Score Report will show the percentage breakdown of students’ achievement levels and whether they meet state standards.

TIP

Roster reports display only students who have completed tests. Students in your roster who have not yet tested will not appear in reports until after they have completed a test. All students remain in their rosters, even if you do not see their names in the online score report.

District Online Score Report

The district report view shows a summary of results for institutions in the selected test grade and subject. Click any name to access the next lower level (district → institution → personnel → roster → student).

Figure 14: District Online Score Report
Managing Your Report

With this report, you have several options for managing and accessing your data. You can sort data within columns, print roster and student reports, export the data into an Excel spreadsheet, and show and hide specific data columns.

Figure 15: Online Score Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>SSID</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total Earned Score</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>Act. Level</th>
<th>% Score</th>
<th>% Dile</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALVAREZ, JAY T.</td>
<td>0000000000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYALA, JOSEPH T.</td>
<td>0000000000</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERNET, OLIVIA T.</td>
<td>0000000000</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRANDALL, RYAN T.</td>
<td>0000000000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIELD, MARY T.</td>
<td>0000000000</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Invalued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELL, ORIN T.</td>
<td>0000000000</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOWE, TONY T.</td>
<td>0000000000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITCHELL, WALTER T.</td>
<td>0000000000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOORE, JOSEPH T.</td>
<td>0000000000</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENNINGTON, SUSAN T.</td>
<td>0000000000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMITH, JAMES T.</td>
<td>0000000000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On-Screen Tools and Resources

- **Sort Column Data** – View overall scores and individual score reporting category levels from lowest to highest and highest to lowest. Click on the top header of each column to sort from lowest to highest. Click again to sort from highest to lowest.
  - Achievement level symbols are text-based by default and aligned with the exportable spreadsheet.
    - **DM** = Does Not Yet Meet
    - **NM** = Nearly Meets
    - **M** = Meets
    - **E** = Exceeds
  - Click to revert to the old symbol display.

- **Print Roster Reports** – Click . The print window will pop up. Click OK to print the report.

- **Export Data to Excel** – Click . A popup window will appear. Choose either “Open with Excel” or “Save to Disk” and click OK. If you save to disk, you will need to locate the file and open in Excel.
In the **Roster-level** report, you have two options for exporting data.

1. You may export the report with the same symbols that appear online (default option).
2. You may export using codes. The codes are text-based, which will allow you to sort data by individual columns in the Excel file.

**Export Options**
- [ ] Export using symbols
- [ ] Export using codes (for sorting purposes)

---

**IMPORTANT**
FERPA prohibits the release of any personally identifiable information. Printed session details contain personally identifiable student data and must be securely stored and destroyed in accordance with Test Security policies outlined in Part III - Student Confidentiality and Part IV - Test Security of the 2009-10 Test Administration Manual (available at [http://www.ode.state.or.us/pteam](http://www.ode.state.or.us/pteam)).

- **Show/Hide Columns** – Click ![Show/Hide Columns](image). A popup window will appear with column options. Click checkboxes to add columns to and remove columns from your online score report. This function allows you to view specific data for performance levels for each score reporting category.

- **View All Test Opportunities in Online Score Report (Roster Level)** [New!]
  - Default view shows Highest Opportunity score, click ![Show All Student Opportunities](image) to expand the table. Students who have taken more than one test opportunity will appear on subsequent rows, one for each test opportunity taken and submitted.
  - To revert to highest opportunity view, click ![Show Only Highest Score Achieved](image).

**Figure 16: Highest Score and Multiple Opportunities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>SSID</th>
<th>Highest</th>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Opportunity Grade</th>
<th>Total Test Score</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>Bench. Level</th>
<th>CE Test Score</th>
<th>CE SEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALVARADO, KATY T.</td>
<td>99999993425</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4/11/2009</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DURBETT, OLIVIA T.</td>
<td>99999993406</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10/8/2009</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DURBETT, OLIVIA T.</td>
<td>99999993405</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11/08/2009</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DURBETT, OLIVIA T.</td>
<td>99999993404</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10/08/2008</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWARDS, RYAN T.</td>
<td>99999993403</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4/11/2009</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENNEDY, RICKY T.</td>
<td>99999993402</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12/05/2008</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENNEDY, RICKY T.</td>
<td>99999993401</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12/05/2008</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Switch Views or Apply Filters

At any time, you may select another test by changing the subject, grade level, data view (table or graph) or view data using Student Subcategory filters.

- **Changing the Subject** – To change the subject at any time, click the bubble to the left of the subject name. The page will automatically refresh with the new subject report.

- **Changing the Grade Level** – To change the grade level at any time, click the tab for the grade report you need to view. You will be automatically redirected to a new page with the new grade report. 

- **Viewing Data by Student Subgroup** – To view reports that include an AYP category, select the desired category from the “Filter by Student Subgroup” drop-down list. Current filters include Ethnicity, Gender, Limited English Proficiency, Special Education, and Title I status, as well as various combination filters (e.g., Ethnicity by LEP). After you select a category, the report will automatically refresh to include the chosen category.
Achievement Levels and Cut Scores

To view a description of the achievement standard levels and the score ranges for each one, click on individual student names to view graphs and learn more information about his or her score and why he or she was placed within an achievement level range.

Figure 17: Achievement Level Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement Level Descriptions for Overall Test</th>
<th>Score Reporting Category Abbreviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Does Not Yet Meet (75 - 225)  
Students indicate basic but inconsistent performance of fundamental knowledge and skills. They are developing fluency in application of powers, coordinate geometry, calculating missing geometric measures, and practicing and reporting outcomes of probabilities. | Calculations and Estimations (CE) |
| Nearly Meets (225 - 295)  
Students recall and recognize math concepts, terms and properties, yet are inconsistent in application and carrying out routine procedures. They solve problems with what the method or solution is easily recognized and straightforward. | Measurement (ME) |
| Meets (295 - 390)  
Students consistently apply mathematical concepts, terms and properties to problems involving rational numbers. They readily solve problems and can interpret or evaluate a visual or symbolic representation to match a problem situation and purpose. | Statistics and Probability (SP) |
| Exceeds (411 - 298)  
Students readily identify and connect fundamental mathematical concepts, procedures and procedures. They indicate flexibility in representing mathematical relationships by using diagrams, graphs, and numeric algebra. | Algebraic Relationships (AF) |
| Geometry (G) |

X-75
Legend Symbols

At the top of the roster report is a legend that shows symbols that roughly correspond to the achievement levels and cut scores. The symbols in the left column correspond to the students’ overall achievement standard levels in each subject. The symbols in the right column correspond to the students’ achievement level within each score reporting category.

Figure 18: Legend Symbols
Graphs Available

One of the features of this Web site is graph reports that correspond with the online score reports. The following graphs are available:

- Performance by Scale Score
- Performance by Level of Aggregation
- Performance by Score Reporting Categories

Performance by Resolved Highest Total Test Scale Score Graph

- This default graph appears for individual students and acts as the Individual Student Report (ISR). You may also view scale score graphs at the district, institution and personnel levels. Each report includes the following:
  - Highest scale score to date.
  - Scale score results by score reporting category (content standard), as well as Standard Error of Measurement calculations.
  - State, District and School average scale score data (for comparison purposes).
  - The number of attempt(s) the student made in the current test and the scale score for each test.

- To view the graph for another institution, personnel, or student within the current district, select the name from the drop-down list next to “Select ______.”

- To go down to the next level (e.g., institution → personnel), click the link in the yellow box. Note: This graph is not available at the roster level.

- If all opportunities for a student are displayed in the Roster level online score report or View All Students report, clicking on an opportunity will direct you to the graph for that opportunity (not the resolved highest total test scale score).

- In the Individual Student Report, you can click on other opportunities taken by the student to view graphs for those opportunities.

Printing the Scale Score Graph

- State, District, Institution, and Personnel levels—Click the Print icon. The print dialogue box will pop up. Click OK to print.

- Student level—You have four options for printing the student graphs.
  1. You may print the opportunity you are currently viewing.
  2. You may print the highest opportunity achieved by the selected student.
  3. You may print graphs for all opportunities this student has taken.
4. You may print the highest opportunities only for all students in the rostered group.

To print, click Print this Page. The icon will expand to show the options. Select your desired option and then click Print.

Figure 19: Performance by Resolved Highest Total Test Scale Score Graph (Individual Student)

Now! Score Reporting Categories data now also includes Scale Score and Standard Error of Measurement for each reported category.
Performance by Level of Aggregation Graph

This graph report shows the overall performance by level of aggregation (subject) for the selected institution or personnel.

- To view the graph for another institution, personnel, or roster within the current district, select the name from the drop-down list next to “Select ______.”
- To go down to the next level, click the link in the yellow box. Note: This graph is not available at the roster or student levels.

Figure 20: Performance by Level of Aggregation Graph
Performance by Score Reporting Category Graphs

This graph report shows the overall performance for each scoring category within a subject. Individual graphs for each category are shown for the selected institution or personnel.

- To view the graphs for other institutions, personnel or rosters within the current district, select the name from the drop-down list next to “Select ______.”
- To go down to the next level, click the link in the yellow box.
  Note: This graph is not available at the roster or student levels.

Figure 21: Performance by Score Reporting Category Graphs

Reports are updated almost immediately after a student has completed a test. To see the most recent test results, add the student(s) who have just completed a test to a roster so you can see their results.
View All Students’ Scores

The “View All Students” tab allows users to view all students in an institution for a particular grade and subject, regardless of their roster affiliation. If you want to quickly and easily find one student’s score from a test administration, you can use this report to get a listing of all students within a school. This eliminates the need to drill down to the school, teacher, and class levels as you would in the online score report.

This report also allows you to view, at a glance, all the scale scores and overall proficiency levels for all students in one school. You may elect to view the highest scale score achieved by each student or view all test opportunities taken by each student to date. Click a student’s name to view the individual score report for that student.

Note: District-level users and above can change the selected institution using the drop-down list.

Figure 22: View All Students’ Scores
Longitudinal Reports (Graphs)

Longitudinal reports can help you analyze test scores over time (for example, across school years). You can build three types of longitudinal analyses:

- Tracking by Successive Cross-Sections
- Tracking by Individual Students
- Tracking by Cohort

Tracking by Successive Cross-Sections

Build this report to answer this question: “Are students scoring higher this year than last year?”

Select a test grade level to compare groups of students across time. Direct comparisons are made between two groups of students that have a similar attribute for the selected test subject and grade level. For example, how did 3rd graders in 2007 fare in Math compared to the 3rd graders in 2008?

The report shows this analysis in two ways: by the Resolved Highest Total Test Scale Score and by the percent of students who scored at or above the proficient level.

Note: If you filter by a sub-group (e.g., Ethnicity → American Indian) and the entity you are plotting the graph for does not have data for that sub-group, then the graph will not plot the comparative state data.

Figure 23: Tracking by Successive Cross-Sections Graphs
Tracking by Individual Students

Build this report to answer this question: “How much is an individual student’s test score increasing from year to year?”

This report allows you to track individual students from one test grade to the next. For example, a student in 2007 who tested Grade 3 Math may be testing Grade 4 Math in 2008. For past school years, this report shows the Resolved Highest Total Test Scale Score for that student. For the current school year, this report shows all available test opportunities for that student. For example, if “Jane Doe” took the Grade 3 Math test three times in 2007, her resolved highest total test scale score is displayed and can be compared to all her test opportunities so far for Grade 4 Math.

Figure 24: Tracking Individual Students Graph

![Graph showing tracking of individual students]

Note: You may select up to five students to track at once.
Tracking by Cohort

Build this report from your existing roster(s) to answer this question: "How much is my cohort of students’ average score increasing from year to year?"

By selecting a current roster, you can track your group’s (of the same students) performance over time. For example, you might have 20 students in “Roster A” who tested in Grade 3 Math last year, and you would like to analyze the performance of the same 20 students in “Roster A” this year who are taking the Grade 4 Math test. The report shows this analysis in two ways: by the Resolved Highest Total Test Scale Score and by Percent Proficient.

Figure 25: Tracking by Cohort Graph
PARTICIPATION REPORTS

Customizing Your Participation Report

The first screen on the Participation Report allows users to set the search parameters for their report.

Figure 26: Participation Report Customization Screen

Set Filters for Your Report

Refer to the following steps to generate your Participation Report.

- **Select a District and School**
  Select the District from the drop-down (only the Districts you have access to will display). The School drop-down automatically populates based on the District selected. Select the School for your Participation Report.

  Click the "View Schools Only" check box to filter the School drop-down menu so only schools are displayed. Note that some districts may be displayed in the School drop-down menu. Selecting a district from the School drop-down will NOT include all schools for that district in the report. Schools must be selected individually.

- **Choose a Report Filter**
  The characteristics of your report can be customized using filters designed to help administrators target specific information.
You must select one of the five filters before you are able to generate your report. Each filter has one or more user-defined settings, not limited to the following:

**Table 1: Filters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Filter Setting</th>
<th>Available Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled Grade</td>
<td>Select from Grades 3–12, or All Grades (only available Grades will display in the drop-down)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity #</td>
<td>First, Second, Third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test (Grade/Subject)</td>
<td>The specific OAKS Online test for the opportunity (ex: Grade 3 Reading)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set to Expire</td>
<td>The number of remaining days before an opportunity expires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>The status of the test opportunity (see Table 2 for Status definitions)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After setting the options for your selected filter, click [Generate Report] to create your Participation Report. To export the information to a CSV file, click [Export Report]. Your report can also be exported to a CSV on the web-based report screen.
Your Participation Report

Upon clicking [Generate Report], your Participation Report is displayed based on a new page.

**IMPORTANT**

Information displayed in the Participation Report reflects data current as of the time of the request to generate the report (when the report was generated). To update the information displayed in your report, you must generate another report. Do NOT use your browser’s “Refresh” button.

**Figure 28: Sample Participation Report**

This report shows those students who have been entered in the system for the selected test administration and their status for each test opportunity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>SSID</th>
<th>Enrolled Grade</th>
<th>Restricted Subject(s)</th>
<th>Current LEP</th>
<th># Test</th>
<th># Opportunity</th>
<th># Test Name</th>
<th>StatusID</th>
<th># Status</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test Student1</td>
<td>E00000012</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>OAKS-Math-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Test Name</td>
<td>User-108</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
<td>Test1</td>
<td>20100705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Student2</td>
<td>E00000023</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>OAKS-Reading-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Test Name</td>
<td>User-108</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
<td>Test2</td>
<td>20100805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Student3</td>
<td>E00000033</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>OAKS-Math-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Test Name</td>
<td>User-108</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
<td>Test3</td>
<td>20100905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Student4</td>
<td>E00000044</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>OAKS-Reading-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Test Name</td>
<td>User-108</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
<td>Test4</td>
<td>20101005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Student5</td>
<td>E00000055</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>OAKS-Math-4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Test Name</td>
<td>User-108</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
<td>Test5</td>
<td>20101105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Understanding Your Participation Report**

Each report includes a listing of all students under the user-selected filters. Each test opportunity record contains the following attributes (indicated by column headings):

- **Student Name** – Student’s legal name (Last Name, First Name).
- **SSID** – Student’s SSID.
- **Enrolled Grade** – This shows the student’s enrolled grade as indicated in SSID data. This will also be the default test grade except for students that “Challenge Up.” Students that Challenge Up will still appear in reports for their enrolled grade, with the Test column reflecting the Challenged Up test. For example, a Grade 3 student who took a Grade 4 Reading test will have his or her score included in the Grade 3 Participation Report.
- **Restricted Subject** NEW – This indicates any test subjects the student is currently restricted from taking.
- **Current LEP** NEW – This indicates students for whom the Limited English Proficiency flag has been set to “yes” in UMS. This indicator is used for ELPA tests.
- **Test** – Subject and Grade-level of test.
- **Opportunity** – The test opportunity number of the student’s test.
- **TA Name** NEW – The Test Administrator of the session for the student’s test opportunity. For tests taken in multiple sessions, this reflects the Test Administrator who created the session with the student’s most recent test activity.
- **Session ID** NEW – The test session for that student’s test opportunity. For tests taken in multiple sessions, this reflects the session with the student’s most recent test activity.
- **Status** – The status for that specific test opportunity (see Table 2 for a list of status-types defined). Tests that have been started but have not yet been completed now indicate the student’s test progress (the number of items released to the student out of the total number of items on the test).
- **Results ID** – The unique identifier linked to the student’s results for that specific testing opportunity (Note: When reporting a potential testing impropriety or test irregularity to ODE, you will need to include the Results ID in your report).
- **Restarts** – The total number of times a test is resumed after pausing for that test opportunity (this includes Restarts in 20).
- **Restarts in 20** – The total number of times a test is resumed after pausing within 20 minutes of pausing for that test opportunity.
- **Date Started** – Date when the first item was presented for that test opportunity.
- **Date Completed** – Date when the student submitted that test for scoring.
- **Last Activity** – Date of last activity for that test opportunity / record. A “Completed” test can still have test activity (as it goes through the QA and reporting processes).
- **Expiration Date** – The date that the test opportunity expires (45 days after the test start date).

### Table 2: Status Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>An “Approved” status indicates that the TA has approved the student for the test session, but the student has not yet started or resumed his or her test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>The TA has denied the student access to the test session. If a student attempts to enter the session again, his or her status will be changed to “Pending” until the TA approves or denies the student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expired</td>
<td>The student’s test has not been completed and cannot be resumed because the test record (45 days) has expired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalidated</td>
<td>The test result has been invalidated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Paused   | The student’s test is currently paused (as a result of one of the following):  
  - The student pauses his or her test by clicking the [Pause] button  
  - The student’s browser or computer shuts down or crashes |
The following status types are listed chronologically as they are displayed during the testing/scoring process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review</td>
<td>The student has completed all test questions and is reviewing their answers. A test with a &quot;Review&quot; status is not considered complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>The student has completed the test and submitted it for scoring. No additional action can be taken by the student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scored</td>
<td>The student's test is scored, and no additional actions can be taken by the student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted</td>
<td>The test score has been submitted for quality assurance review before it is submitted to the reporting system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>The test scores have been submitted to the reporting system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**On-Screen Tools and Resources**

- **View Definitions of Columns and Student Statuses**
  Click the [Definitions] button to view information about column attributes and other definitions relevant to your report.

- **Sort Results by Attribute**
  Click a heading of a column to sort your report's results by that particular attribute. Depending on your display preference, you may need to click the column heading a second time to change the order of the results.

- **Hide/Show Columns**
  Use the [Hide/Show Columns] drop-down menu to control the attributes displayed on your report.

- **Print Report**
  Click the [Print] button to print your Participation Report.
  **Note:** Set your Print Options to Landscape mode (horizontal) to accommodate the various columns in the report. You can also try adjusting the scale of the content (using your browser’s “Print Preview” feature) to fit on a printed page.

- **Export Report Data**
Users can export their report data to a CSV file by clicking the [Export Data] button. CSV files can be opened using a spreadsheet application (i.e., Microsoft Excel) or a notepad application. The CSV file will display all columns, including those the user may have hidden on-screen.

**IMPORTANT**

FERPA prohibits the release of any personally identifiable information. Printed reports contain personally identifiable student data and must be securely stored and destroyed in accordance with Test Security policies outlined in Part III – Student Confidentiality and Part IV – Test Security the 2009-10 Test Administration Manual (available at [http://www.cde.state.ca.us/tam])

Excel files should not be shared electronically and should not be stored on computers accessible to individuals who are not authorized to view confidential student information.
Lookup Student Tool

The TDS Report contains a tool to look up students by SSID. Users can access this feature by clicking the “Lookup Student” tab on the reporting interface.

**Figure 29: Lookup Student Screen**

To search for a student, enter their complete SSID in the field and click [Lookup Student].

**Note:** Searches with partial SSID information will not work.

**Figure 30: Example Lookup Student Results**

If the SSID exists in the statewide database, your search query will return one result. The result displays the official student information as it exists in the database.

If any of this information is incorrect for a student, the student’s profile must be updated. Incorrect information will need to be updated in CDE’s SSID system via a data upload. For assistance with this process, contact your Regional Assessment ESD Partner.
Appendix A4-4e: Reporting Exemplar – NAEP State Profile Data Base Report

**State Profiles**

*State Profiles* presents key data about each state's performance in the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in mathematics, reading, writing, and science for grades 4 and 8. Quickly see how a state performed over time, view a state's demographics, download snapshot reports, and compare each state's overall performance to the nation and each other. It is inappropriate to compare scores across subjects. Select a state to get started.

**Mathematics:** The average score for fourth-grade students in Oregon in 2009 (238) was not significantly different from their average score in 2007 (236) and was higher than their average score in 1996 (223).

---

**Summary of NAEP results for Oregon**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Scale Score</th>
<th>Achievement Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>238 (0.6)</td>
<td>239 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>236 (1.0)</td>
<td>239 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>238 (0.8)</td>
<td>237 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>236 (0.9)</td>
<td>234 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>224 (1.8)</td>
<td>224 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A6-1: Overview of Professional Capacity Building

**System Portal:**
Includes public website and secure access to modules
A resource for parents, students, educators, administrators, and policymakers to access information about the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), Consortium activities and time lines, and assessment results

**Educator Dashboard**
A resource for parents, students, educators, administrators, and policymakers to access information about the CCSS, Consortium activities and time lines, and assessment results

**Clearinghouse**
- Publicly released assessment items
- PD documentation/videos
- Formative strategies/rubrics
- Model units of instruction (aligned w/CCSS)

**Data/Reports**
- Easy to use
- Agile for advanced users
- Visually engaging
- Secure and public views
- Static reports too

**Item Development/Scoring**
- An application assigned to an educator's dashboard when applicable
- Item development/scoring module will be used for item authoring and for warehousing existing items

**Feedback/Evaluation Mechanism**
- Vetting of submitted materials (like/ unlike, stars, number system)
- Surveys (generated regularly)
- Open feedback capacity

**Online Assessments**

**Adaptive Summative**

**Interim/Benchmark**

**Formative Tools and Processes**
Appendix A6-2: Overview of Development Process for Interim/Benchmark Assessments
Appendix A8-1: RFP for Grant Project Manager

Scope of Work for a Common Assessment Project Manager
(SMARTER Balanced consortium)
Released April 2, 2010

PURPOSE: Vendor will work with a design team comprised of consortium members and technical advisors to facilitate the creation of a grant proposal for a multi-state common assessment to be submitted to the U.S. Department of Education based on requirements established by the U.S. Department of Education. Vendor will facilitate and manage the planning activities and grant writing of the consortium. It is the intent of the consortium that vendors are eligible to subsequently bid for additional work as requested by the consortium. Neither the application for this work nor the receipt of this work is intended to preclude a vendor from additional work on behalf of this consortium during or after the submission of a proposal.

SCOPE OF WORK: Vendor will be responsible for facilitating and organizing the planning, discussion and grant writing activities of the executive and coordinating committee in their efforts to submit a grant proposal to the U.S. Department of Education. Efforts will include:
   a) Participate in all consortium meetings, whether in person or via conference call or web ex format.
   b) Complete preparations for meetings and keep and disseminate consortium meeting notes and decisions.
   c) Work closely with the coordinating group to prepare for larger group conversations and meetings.
   d) Create a detailed project schedule.
   e) Coordinate communication and facilitate decision making among consortium members.
   f) Translate discussions and vision into documented decisions and create a plan of action for decision items.
   g) Frame discussions around critical design issues.
   h) Document and make coordinating committee aware of technical/practical defensibility constraints.
   i) Serve as liaison between consortium members and groups or individuals, such as: CCSSO, consortium grant writer, technical advisors, etc.
   j) Schedule meetings and ensure support materials are provided
   k) Coordinate with another entity for logistics (e.g. CCSSO) for any travel arrangements for consortium members.
   l) The consortium may negotiate an extension of this work for additional duration and/or additional services as it deems necessary.

DELIVERABLES: Provide the following product or services:
   (a) Prepare a working project timeline with detailed project deliverables and tracking of assigned tasks to consortium members.
   (b) Document and disseminate all meeting notes and decisions.
   (c) Attend full consortium and design committee meetings.
(d) Provide weekly summaries of the project status to provide enough information for the coordinating committee to initiate appropriate responses. Summaries should include a recap of recent activities, impending deadlines and milestones, and risk and mitigation strategies.

**Project Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFP from US DOE expected</td>
<td>Week of March 29th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Work Request for prospective proposal writers</td>
<td>April 2, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals from prospective proposal writers due</td>
<td>April 9, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate proposals</td>
<td>April 10-12, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal for hiring staff</td>
<td>April 14, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announce “Apparent Successful Contractor” and send notification via fax or e-mail to unsuccessful proposers</td>
<td>April 15, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft/Execute proposal contract</td>
<td>April 16-19, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin contract work</td>
<td>April 20, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convene assessment design team in Washington DC</td>
<td>April 23, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Outline due</td>
<td>May 3, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting of State Members in Washington DC</td>
<td>May 6, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Draft of Proposal Due</td>
<td>May 21, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Draft of Proposal Due</td>
<td>May 28th, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Draft &amp; Presentation with completed budget</td>
<td>June 11th, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Application Submittal Ready</td>
<td>June 18th, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing teleconference meetings of assessment designers &amp; contractor or optional in-person meetings if appropriate and funds are available</td>
<td>April - June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting of State Members in Washington DC</td>
<td>End of May / early June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal likely due date</td>
<td>End of June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions from US DOE anticipated</td>
<td>End of July / early August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to Questions</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: All dates, including contract commencement date, are tentative based on release of grant proposal and submittal guidelines by the U.S. Department of Education. Actual schedule to be finalized upon release.

**Minimum Qualifications:**

1) Ability to work in a fast-paced environment with multiple deadlines.

2) Ability to keep consortium members on task and to meet deadlines through the use of strong facilitation, mediation and consensus building skills.

3) Demonstrated knowledge and experience with education and the field of large scale assessment/test measurement.
4) Demonstrated experience working with large groups from different agencies/divisions.
5) Demonstrated project planning and project management skills on a large scale project that incorporates resources spread out over large distances
6) Ability to remain neutral and work with 30+ state stakeholders to best meet individual needs and concerns.
7) Preferred experience facilitating substantial grant submissions.

Proposal must include:
(1) A description as to how each of the minimum qualification is met including samples of work as appropriate.
(2) A resume for each key staff who collectively meet the minimum requirements of this request and who will be accountable for the completion of this project.
(3) A description as to which work (if any) will be sub-contracted and the resumes of those subcontractors.
(4) A description of the amount of time that each proposed key staff will be available to allocate to this project and the date key staff will be available to begin work.
(5) 3-4 references/former clients for whom vendor completed similar work as described in this request that the consortium may contact.
(6) A detailed narrative regarding how the vendor would incorporate the expectations included in the statement of work to complete each of the required deliverables.
(7) Vendor’s contact information for this Work Request. Include name, title, email, phone & fax numbers.
(8) A “not to exceed” budget bid with either:
   1. A proposed hourly rate for completing the work, or
   2. A fixed price for project.
The budget should incorporate anticipated travel that includes of three, 2-day meetings in the D.C. area. Contractor is required to pay only the time and effort of the contractor in establishing arrangements to attend these meetings. Costs for all travel (outside of direct meeting engagements), expenses, and office space are the responsibility of the Contractor and should be included in the bid.
(9) A disclosure of the vendor’s conflict of interest or potential conflict of interest
(10) Proposals must be emailed to: Tammy.Morrill@maine.gov by 5:00 p.m. EST on April 9th to be considered. Proposals submitted after 5:00 p.m. EST on April 9th will not be considered.
Scoring of Proposals
Capacity to complete the Work (Questions 1 - 5 above): 25 points
Cost Proposal (Question 8 above): 25 points
Quality of Proposal (Questions 6 above) 25 points
Total possible points: 75 points

If necessary, the consortium may elect to conduct phone interviews with the top candidates. If this is required, the tentative date for interviews is April 13th. However, this date may need to be adjusted based on the availability of consortium members.

Term of Work:
This contract is specifically to coordinate the Race to the Top Assessment grant application. The contact will begin April 2010 and continue through the final submission of the grant in July 2010. There is a potential for this contract to continue with the project should the grant be awarded.
Appendix A8-2: Washington RFP for Project Management Partner

STATE OF WASHINGTON
OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
Acting on Behalf of the SMARTER Balanced Consortium

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) No. 2010-07
Common Assessment Project Management Partner

This RFP is available at the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction website located at http://www.k12.wa.us/RFP/ and at the Office of General Administration, Washington Electronic Business Solution (WEBS) Procurement Website at http://www.ga.wa.gov/webs/. All RFP amendments or bidder questions/OSPI answers will be posted to these sites. All interested Consultants must be registered with WEBS in under the following commodity codes in order to receive notifications: 9815 Educational Consulting Services, 9811 Management Services, and 9852 Educational Testing Services.

PROPOSAL DUE DATE: 4:30 PDT, July 30, 2010

EXPECTED TIME PERIOD FOR CONTRACT:
October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2011 with option to renew through 2014

CONSULTANT ELIGIBILITY: This procurement is open to those Consultants that satisfy the minimum qualifications stated herein and that are available for work in the United States.

CONTENTS OF THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS:
1. Introduction
2. General Information for Consultants
3. Proposal Contents
4. Evaluation and Award
5. Exhibits
   A. Race To The Top Notice Inviting Applications
   B. Common Core Standards
   C. Staffing & Responsibilities Table
   D. Budget Submission Form
   E. Personal Service Contract Format including General Terms and Conditions
   F. Certifications and Assurances
   G. Evaluation Criteria
   H. Service Level Expectations and Remedies

Message to Consultants: Effective November 1, 2008, the State of Washington is required to publish all bidding opportunities on the Office of General Administration’s Washington Electronic Business Solution (WEBS) website. Please register at http://www.ga.wa.gov/webs/, under the commodity codes listed above and any other commodity code for which you would like to receive notification of future bidding opportunities.
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE

The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), acting on behalf of the SMARTER Balanced Consortium, is initiating this Request for Proposal (RFP) to solicit proposals from CONSULTANTS interested in serving as the SMARTER Balanced Consortium’s Project Management Partner pending award of Comprehensive Assessment System grant from the U.S. Department of Education’s Race to the Top Assessment Program (Exhibit A). SMARTER, which stands for Summative Multi-State Assessment Resources for Teachers and Educational Researchers, is a collaborative of states mutually aligned to generating the assessment tools and instructional resources for associated school and district constituencies to access as part of the federal government’s, and each member state’s education, reform efforts. In accordance with grant eligibility requirements, the SMARTER Balanced Consortium, hereafter referred to as “CONSORTIUM,” seeks a Project Management Partner to coordinate the assessment development objectives of the CONSORTIUM.

1.2 BACKGROUND

Authorized under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA), the Race to the Top Assessment Program provides funding to consortia of States to support the development and implementation of new common high-quality assessments that are: 1) aligned with the consortium’s common set of college- and career-ready, K-12 standards (basis of which will be the Common Core standards released by the Department of Education, refer to Exhibit B), 2) valid and instructionally useful, 3) provide accurate information about what students know and can do, and 4) measure student achievement against standards or expectations designed to ensure that all students gain the knowledge and skills needed to succeed in college and the workplace. Over the past decade, State assessment results have brought much-needed visibility to disparities in achievement among groups of students and helped meet increasing demand for data that can be used to improve teaching and learning. These new assessments are intended to play a critical role in educational systems providing administrators, educators, parents, and students the data and information needed to continuously improve teaching and learning.

To fully meet the twin needs of accountability and instructional improvement, however, States need assessment systems that are based on standards designed to prepare students for college and the workplace, and that more validly measure what students know and can do. Further, States need assessment systems that better reflect good instructional practice and support a culture of continuous improvement in education by providing information that can be used meaningfully and in a timely way to determine school and educator effectiveness, identify professional development and support needs, improve programs, and guide instruction.
As delineated in the U.S. Department of Education’s release of notice inviting applications (NIA) for the fiscal year 2010 Race to the Top Assessment Program competition, there are two categories of available grants: 1) High School Course Assessment and 2) Comprehensive Assessment System. The Comprehensive Assessment System, designed to support the Common Core mathematics and English language arts standards, is the focus of the CONSORTIUM. Additional information regarding the Comprehensive Assessment System is as outlined below:

Assessment systems developed with Comprehensive Assessment Systems Grant funds must:

- Include one or more summative assessment components in mathematics and English language arts that are administered at least once during grades 3-8 and at least once in high school;
- Produce student achievement and growth data that can be used to determine if students are on track to graduating college and career ready; and
- Identify best practices to support a culture of continuous learning and improvement in education by providing timely and meaningfully data to improve programs and instruction.

Eligibility Requirements. Grant eligibility requires each state in the consortium to submit a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) agreeing to the consortiums conditions of membership, outlines the potential state barriers and how the state will address them, and commits to implementing the assessment system no later than the 2014-15 school year. The MOU must be signed by the state’s Governor, Superintendent, State Board and Procurement Officer.

- Eligible consortia must include at least 15 states, of which at least five states are governing states.
- An eligible application must identify a project management partner and provide an assurance that the project manager partner is not partnering with any other applicants under the Comprehensive Assessment category.
- An eligible application must be able to ensure that the summative assessments will be fully implemented in each participating state no later than the 2014-2015 school year.
- An eligible application must address all absolute priorities (as listed below).

Absolute Priority: Comprehensive Assessment Systems Measuring Student Achievement Against Common College and Career-Ready Standards

- Measures student knowledge and skills against a common set of college-and career-ready standards.
- Consists of assessment components in mathematics and in English language arts that include one or more summative assessment components.
- Produces student achievement data and student growth data.
- Assesses all students, including English Language Learners and students with disabilities.
• Produces data that can be used to determine school, principal, and teacher effectiveness, determine principal and teacher professional development needs, and teaching, learning, and program improvement.

Competitive Priority: Collaboration and Alignment with Higher Education
• Commitment that the Institute of Higher Education (IHE) system will participate in the design and development of high school summative assessments for mathematics and English language arts in order to ensure that assessments measure college readiness.
• Commitment that the IHE system will implement policies that exempt students from remedial courses if they have met necessary achievement standards for each assessment.
• Applications must be signed by Higher Education executive officer and the president or head of each participating IHE.
• Applications must provide the total number of direct matriculating students in the 2008-09 year and total number of matriculating students in the consortia’s member states.

1.3 OBJECTIVE

Consultant will work with the CONSORTIUM’s Governing Committee and serve as the CONSORTIUM’s required “Project Management Partner” to provide project management services necessary to fully implement a common assessment grant pending award by the U.S. Department of Education.

1.4 SCOPE OF WORK

A. OVERVIEW
• As a project management partner, Consultant would be responsible for facilitating and organizing the planning, discussing, decision-making, task assigning and completing of activities of the executive and coordinating committees.
• The CONSORTIUM recognizes the importance of having a strong management plan in place in order to conduct the duties required for development of the Common Assessment System. As the development of the Common Assessment Program has many tasks, activities, and other aspects that require coordinating the CONSORTIUM seeks a partner with demonstrated program management skills.

B. PROJECT PLANNING
• Provide a detailed, comprehensive management strategy and project timeline that displays for CONSORTIUM’s members how Consultant will ensure successful completion of each product deliverable on time, within budget, and in a manner that is financially sustainable over time. The management strategy and timeline shall detail project deliverables and the means of tracking assigned tasks. The work plan and timeline shall include, for each key deliverable (e.g., assessment component, scoring and moderation system, professional development activities), the major
milestones, deadlines, and entities responsible for execution, plus the approach to identify, manage, and mitigate risks associated with the project.

- Create and maintain detailed project plans that describe the full scope of work in which the CONSORTIUM is engaged. Project planning should include multi-state and within-state activities. Plans should be amended over time to include any unique within-state activities necessary to implement CONSORTIUM deliverables.

- Based on notification of intent to renew contract term, apparent successful Contractor shall establish project plans in advance of each contract year. Year 1 final plans shall be provided by October 15, 2010.

- Create and maintain a list of all Contractors and subcontractors including at a minimum, description of the work for which they are contracted to complete, the source of funding used to pay for their work and the method by which they were hired.

- Maintain and update project plans from Contractors with a frequency appropriate to the duration and urgency of the work in which the Contractor is engaged.

- Create and maintain a list of all human resources that will be working on the project at the multi-state and within-state levels. Collaborate with CONSORTIUM to create a charter for any workgroup created that includes the description of the purpose for the group, members roles and responsibilities, key deliverables, milestones, anticipated budget and a high level timeline.

- Establish a systems life-cycle and development approach that can be used as basis for the planning application development.

C. PROJECT DOCUMENTATION

- Establish a document inventory and catalog of existing documentation. Purpose shall be to determine which documents are accounted for and available as well as which documents are missing.

- Perform a quarterly evaluation of the comprehensiveness of documentation and follow-up with leaders to ensure that gaps are filled.

- Design and implement a comprehensive strategy to maintain an official record of CONSORTIUM documentation, materials and information (e.g. design documents, minutes from meetings, legal documents, technical specifications etc.). Documentation shall be accessible by all CONSORTIUM members through secure web-based and file transfer protocol (SFTP) formats, with access permissions based on roles and responsibilities associated with maintenance of the repository and associated contents. All web-based and SFTP materials should easily transferable to another organization either during or at the conclusion of the contract period.

- Provide weekly, monthly and quarterly evaluations of progress. Progress reports should clearly identify any tasks or deliverables that appear to be at risk, including a clear identification of any resource (human, time or money) that as allocated may pose a risk to the project.
• Facilitate the development of CONSORTIUM document format and style guidelines. Review CONSORTIUM documents to ensure they are formatted according to CONSORTIUM style guidelines.

D. GOVERNANCE SUPPORT
• Communicate via a defined and systematic plan to the Governing Committee any tasks or deliverables that appear to be at risk.
• Participate in all CONSORTIUM meetings, whether in person, by conference call, or via Webex format.
• Create and maintain organizational charts that describe the governance structure and member roles and responsibilities.
• Create, as directed by the Governing Committee, requests for proposals and statements of work necessary to procure required services and/or resources.
• Facilitate the review of issues for the Governing Committee and work closely with the coordinating group to prepare for larger group conversations and meetings.
• Provide suggestions for improvement and solutions in regard to internal processes.
• Comply with and help enforce governance by-laws.
• Provide support and materials to states regarding entering, exiting, and/or changing their level of CONSORTIUM membership.
• Track the membership of each state in the CONSORTIUM. At a minimum, key contacts, dates of membership, and any legal documents associated with each state’s membership shall be recorded.

E. IMPLEMENTATION MANAGEMENT
• Consultant shall maintain and distribute a schedule/timeline to OSPI and the other project stakeholders on a periodic basis, typically weekly. If awarded a contract, Consultant shall attend a planning meeting with OSPI and other party staff members to establish the initial schedule.
• Schedule weekly meetings (at a minimum) for the governance committees and workgroups and ensure support materials are provided in advance. Weekly summaries of project status should provide enough information for coordinating committees to initiate appropriate responses. Summaries should include a recap of recent activities, impending deadlines and milestones, and risk and mitigation strategies.
• Translate discussions and vision into documented decisions and create a plan of action for decision items. Frame discussions around critical design issues.
• Collaborate with committee co-chairs to provide agendas for CONSORTIUM meeting.
• Record detailed minutes of all CONSORTIUM meetings and ensure minutes are available for review to ensure committees are sufficiently supported in their decision making processes and that decisions are documented.

• Conduct "Lessons Learned" sessions, on a regular basis, to identify follow-up actions to improve system processes.

• Arrange any meetings required by workgroups or CONSORTIUM. Provide logistics support for members’ travel and accommodations as necessary to complete the work of the CONSORTIUM.

• Serve as liaison between CONSORTIUM members and groups or individuals, such as: Council of Chief State School Officers, CONSORTIUM grant writers, technical advisors, etc.

• Coordinate technical advisory meetings and external reviews as necessary to ensure the CONSORTIUM receive sufficient evaluation of designs and deliverables prior to evaluation by the U.S. Department of Education.

F. BUDGET MONITORING
• Track and report CONSORTIUM staff hours on a monthly basis.

• Annually forecast CONSORTIUM revenue and expenditures.

• Provide specific information to states in regard to the financial support required for operational testing. This is necessary to ensure that after the grant period ends, states include Comprehensive Assessment System grant obligations in their budgets and plan accordingly.

• Ensure timely and accurate disposition of CONSORTIUM invoices. Ensure payments are disbursed within thirty (30) business days of approval. Ensure deliverables are received prior to payment delivery. Follow up with CONSORTIUM sub-contractors when necessary and ensure that they are meeting the deadlines as indicated in the projected calendar.

• Provide, on a quarterly basis, a detailed cost breakdown to the CONSORTIUM regarding actual and anticipated expenditures for each contracted year.

• Inform the CONSORTIUM of costs due to proposed program modifications or adjustments, and obtain approval of the Governing Committee prior to initiation of actual work.

G. COMPLIANCE MONITORING AND COMMUNICATION
• Provide all materials and documentation required and/or requested by the U.S. Department of Education or private foundations in relation to the grant’s progress. This includes responding to any ad-hoc questions and/or other established periodic reviews.

• Coordinate CONSORTIUM’s active participation in applicable technical assistance activities provided by the U.S. Department of Education, as specified in the NIA.
• Coordinate, manage and track questions from the public to ensure each question is addressed within three (3) business days in a manner consistent with the process established in collaboration with the Governing Committee.

• Ensure each Contractor on the project has sufficient and timely information such that they can complete their required deliverables. Mediate conflicts among Contractors and/or states as necessary.

• Coordinate and track communication and facilitate decision making among CONSORTIUM members.

• Coordinate the development and submission of any CONSORTIUM materials for U.S. Department of Education’s “peer review”.

• Document and make Governing Committee aware of technical/practical defensibility constraints.

• Create and maintain a web site that provides public and secure access, respectively, to project resources. Rights to secure access will be defined and approved by CONSORTIUM.

H. COMPLIANCE WITH NIA “OPEN SOURCE” REQUIREMENTS
• As required by the U.S. Department of Education, serve as the point of contact regarding any “open source” requests. Address requests within ten (10) business days in manner consistent with policies established by the CONSORTIUM.

• Track, in detail, the dispensation of open source requests and ensure any legal, intellectual property, waiver, security arrangements, etc. are archived with appropriate and sufficient signatures.

• Provide monthly reports regarding the dispensation of open source requests.

• Serve as the logistics liaison with other consortia and/or professional organizations.

1.5 STATE’S ROLE

As fiscal agent for the CONSORTIUM, OSPI will assume lead responsibility for the management of all contracting activities with the apparent successful Contractor. All work direction and expenditure decisions will come from the CONSORTIUM’s Governing Committee or delegated work group, but all matters relating to contract and payment processing will be coordinated through OSPI.

1.6 CONSULTANT QUALIFICATIONS

Minimum:
• Licensed to do business in the United States.
• Ability to work in a fast-paced environment with multiple deadlines.
• Ability to keep CONSORTIUM members on task and to meet deadlines through the use of strong facilitation, mediation and consensus building.
• Five (5) years of demonstrated knowledge and experience with education and the field of large scale assessment/test measurement.
• Demonstrated experience working with large stakeholder groups from various different agencies/divisions.
• Demonstrated project planning and project management skills on a large scale project that incorporates resources spread out over large distances.
• Ability to remain neutral and work with thirty (30) plus state stakeholders to best meet individual states needs and concerns.

Preferred:
• Experience facilitating substantial grant submissions.

1.7 FUNDING

Maximum available funding for the services outlined herein is estimated at an annual not to exceed amount of two million dollars ($2,000,000).

The initiation of a contract is subject to a successful award received by the U.S. Department of Education. Any contract awarded as a result of this procurement is contingent upon the availability of funding.

The Consultant shall provide their most favorable and competitive cost estimate to perform the work.

1.8 PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE

The period of performance of any contract resulting from this RFP is tentatively scheduled to begin on or about October 1, 2010 and end on or about September 30, 2011. The option to extend any contract resulting from this procurement shall be at the sole discretion of the CONSORTIUM, and will be implemented via contract amendment by OSPI, acting on behalf of the CONSORTIUM. As such, OSPI reserves the right to amend to extend the contract for three additional contract years through September 30, 2014. Decision to renew via amendment shall be based on sustained satisfactory performance as decided by the CONSORTIUM’s Governing Committee, successful completion of yearly project objectives, and availability of funding.

1.9 DEFINITIONS /ACRONYMS

Consultant: Individual or company submitting a proposal in order to attain a contract with OSPI.
Contractor: Individual or company whose proposal has been accepted by OSPI and is awarded a fully executed, written contract.
IHE: Institutions of Higher Education
MOU: Memorandum of Understanding
NIA: Notice Inviting Applications

OSPI: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction is the agency of the State of Washington that is issuing this RFP.

Proposal: A formal offer submitted in response to this solicitation.

Request for Proposals (RFP): Formal procurement document in which a service or need is identified but no specific method to achieve it has been chosen. The purpose of an RFP is to permit the consultant community to suggest various approaches to meet the need at a given price.

SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium: The member-state arrangement collaborating on development of a comprehensive assessment program aligned to the Common Core standards sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education.

1.10 ADA

OSPI complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Consultants may contact the RFP Coordinator to receive this Request for Proposals in Braille or on tape.

2 GENERAL INFORMATION FOR CONSULTANTS

2.1 RFP COORDINATOR

The RFP Coordinator is the sole point of contact in OSPI for this procurement. All communication between the Consultant and OSPI upon receipt of this RFP shall be with the RFP Coordinator, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Michael Middleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Address</td>
<td>600 Washington Street South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td>PO Box 47200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, State, Zip Code</td>
<td>Olympia WA 98504-7200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number</td>
<td>360.725.6434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax Number</td>
<td>360.725.0424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Michael.Middleton@k12.wa.us">Michael.Middleton@k12.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communication with parties other than the RFP Coordinator, regarding the services outlined herein, will be considered unofficial and non-binding on OSPI and the CONSORTIUM. Consultants are to rely on written statements issued by the RFP Coordinator. Communication directed to parties other than the RFP Coordinator may result in disqualification of the Consultant.

2.2 ESTIMATED SCHEDULE OF PROCUREMENT ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Request for Proposal</th>
<th>June 4, 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letter of Intent to Propose Due</td>
<td>June 18, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question and Answer Period</td>
<td>June 7 – July 2, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-proposal Video Conference</td>
<td>June 29, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Date(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Date for Questions Regarding RFP</td>
<td>July 2, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release Q&amp;A plus RFP Addendum (as needed)</td>
<td>July 9, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals Due</td>
<td>July 30, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate written proposals</td>
<td>August 2 – August 13, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announce “Apparent Successful Contractor”</td>
<td>August 16, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold Debriefings (if requested)</td>
<td>August 17– August 19, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiate Contract</td>
<td>August 30 – September 10, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Contract with OFM</td>
<td>September 16, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin Contract Work</td>
<td>October 1, 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*OSPI reserves the right to revise the above schedule

### 2.3 LETTER OF INTENT

Consultants intending on submitting a proposal must notify the RFP Coordinator via Letter of Intent to Bid by no later than 4:30 p.m. PDT June 18, 2010. This letter may be provided via fax, email attachment, or postal or express courier service. Timely submission of this letter will assure the Consultant that they will receive, via e-mail, notification of any addendum or amendments to the RFP amendments, a copy of all RFP-related questions and answers, and any other correspondence pertinent to this procurement.

### 2.4 PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE

A pre-proposal conference is scheduled to be held on June 29, 2010 from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m., PDT. OSPI will conduct the video/teleconference from its offices at 600 Washington Street SE, Olympia, WA 98501. All prospective Consultants should participate; however, participation is not mandatory. Instructions on how to participate in the video conference will be forwarded to the points of contact of each Consultant that submits a Letter of Intent.

### 2.5 CONSULTANT QUESTIONS

Written questions may be submitted in advance via email to the RFP Coordinator. OSPI shall be bound only to written answers to questions. Any oral responses given at the pre-proposal conference shall be considered unofficial. Questions arising at the pre-proposal conference or in subsequent communication with the RFP Coordinator will be documented and answered in written form. On July 9, 2010 OSPI will post a copy of all questions and answers, from the pre-proposal conference and written submissions, on the OSPI website. The questions and answers will also be released on WEBS to Consultants registered under the applicable commodity code.

### 2.6 REVISIONS TO THE RFP

In the event it becomes necessary to revise any part of this RFP, addenda will be provided via e-mail to all who submitted a Letter of Intent. In addition, the addenda shall
be published on the OSPI web site, at http://www.k12.wa.us/RFP/, and posted on WEBS for all Consultants who are registered.

2.7 COSTS TO PROPOSE

OSPI will not be liable for any costs incurred by the Consultant in preparation of a proposal submitted in response to this RFP, in conduct of a presentation, or any other activities related to responding to this RFP.

2.8 NO OBLIGATION TO CONTRACT

This RFP does not obligate the State of Washington or OSPI, acting on behalf of the CONSORTIUM, to contract for services specified herein.

Additionally, although any contract would be held by Washington (OSPI), when appropriate, the CONSORTIUM reserves the right to transfer fiscal authority to a new, independent non-profit organization to be created pending grant award.

2.9 REJECTION OF PROPOSALS

OSPI, acting on behalf of the CONSORTIUM, reserves the right at its sole discretion to reject any and all proposals received without penalty and not to issue a contract as a result of this RFP.

2.10 MOST FAVORABLE TERMS

OSPI reserves the right to make an award without further discussion of the proposal submitted. Therefore, the proposal should be submitted initially on the most favorable terms which the Consultant can propose. There will be no best and final offer procedure. OSPI does reserve the right to contact a Consultant for clarification of its proposal.

The Consultant should be prepared to accept this RFP, including Exhibits to the RFP, for incorporation into a contract resulting from this RFP. Contract negotiations may incorporate some, or all, of the Consultant’s proposal. It is understood that the proposal will become a part of the official procurement file on this matter without obligation to OSPI.

2.11 RESPONSIVENESS

All proposals will be reviewed by the RFP Coordinator to determine compliance with administrative requirements and instructions specified in this RFP. The Consultant is specifically notified that failure to comply with any part of the RFP may result in rejection of the proposal as non-responsive.

OSPI also reserves the right, however, at its sole discretion to waive minor administrative irregularities.
2.12 ACCEPTANCE PERIOD

The associated terms submitted with the proposal must provide ninety (90) days for acceptance by OSPI from the due date for receipt of the proposals.

2.13 PROPRIETARY INFORMATION/PUBLIC DISCLOSURE

All proposals received shall remain confidential until the contract, if any, resulting from this RFP is signed by the OSPI Contracts Administrator and the apparent successful Contractor; thereafter, the proposals shall be deemed public records as defined in RCW 42.56.

Any information in the proposal that the Consultant desires to claim as proprietary and exempt from disclosure under the provisions of RCW 42.56 must be clearly designated. The page must be identified and the particular exception from disclosure upon which the Consultant is making the claim. Each page claimed to be exempt from disclosure must be clearly identified by the word “Confidential” printed on the lower right hand corner of the page.

OSPI will consider a Consultant’s request for exemption from disclosure; however, OSPI will make a decision predicated upon RCW 42.56. Marking the entire proposal exempt from disclosure will not be honored. The Consultant must be reasonable in designating information as confidential. If any information is marked as proprietary in the proposal, such information will not be made available until the affected proposer has been given an opportunity to seek a court injunction against the requested disclosure.

A charge will be made for copying and shipping, as outlined in RCW 42.56. No fee shall be charged for inspection of contract files, but twenty-four (24) hours’ notice to the RFP Coordinator is required. All requests for information should be directed to the RFP Coordinator.

2.14 MINORITY & WOMEN-OWNED BUSINESS PARTICIPATION

In accordance with the legislative findings and policies set forth in chapter 39.19 RCW, the state of Washington encourages participation in all of its contracts by firms certified by the Office of Minority and Women’s Business Enterprises (OMWBE). Participation may be either on a direct basis in response to this solicitation or on a subcontractor basis. However, no preference will be included in the evaluation of proposals, no minimum level of MWBE participation shall be required as a condition for receiving an award, and proposals will not be rejected or considered non-responsive on that basis. Any affirmative action requirements set forth in federal regulations or statutes included or referenced in the contract documents will apply.

The established annual procurement participation goals for MBE is 8 percent and, for WBE, 4 percent, for this type of project. These goals are voluntary. Consultant s may contact OMWBE at 360/753-9693 to obtain information on certified firms.
2.15 CONTRACT AND GENERAL TERMS & CONDITIONS

The apparent successful Contractor will be expected to enter into a contract which is substantially the same as the sample contract and its general terms and conditions attached as Exhibit E. In no event is a Consultant to submit their own standard contract terms and conditions in response to this solicitation. However, the Consultant may submit exceptions as allowed in the Certifications and Assurances section, Exhibit F to this solicitation. OSPI will review requested exceptions and accept or reject the same at its sole discretion.

Additionally, the budget, scope of work and/or timeline may need to be amended based on negotiations with the U.S. Department of Education upon finalization of the grant award. That being the case, the CONSORTIUM cannot anticipate such amended elements impacting the scope of work delineated by this RFP, thus with submission of bid, Consultant is committing to complete the scope of work as detailed. Any action on the part of Consultant to modify the scope of work and associated budget due to grant award amendment will be construed as a breach of contract.

2.16 COMMITMENT OF FUNDS

The Contracts Administrator is the only individual who may legally commit OSPI to the expenditures of funds for a contract resulting from this RFP. No cost chargeable to the proposed contract may be incurred before receipt of a fully executed contract.

2.17 STATEWIDE VENDOR PAYMENT REGISTRATION

Consultants awarded contracts as a result of this RFP will be required to register as a Statewide Vendor (SWV). The SWV file is a central Vendor file maintained by the Office of Financial Management for use by Washington State agencies in processing Consultant payments. This allows you, as a Consultant, to receive payments from all participating state agencies by direct deposit, the State’s preferred method of payment. While registration in the SWV is mandatory, the Consultant is NOT required to participate in the direct deposit program and therefore is not required to submit banking information. Please go to http://www.ofm.wa.gov/accounting/Vendor.asp for online registration.

2.18 INSURANCE COVERAGE

The Contractor is to furnish OSPI with a certificate(s) of insurance executed by a duly authorized representative of each insurer, showing compliance with the insurance requirements as set forth in the General Terms and Conditions of Exhibit E.

The Contractor shall, at its own expense, obtain and keep in force insurance coverage which shall be maintained in full force and effect during the term of the contract. The Contractor shall furnish evidence in the form of a Certificate of Insurance that insurance shall be provided, and a copy shall be forwarded to OSPI within fifteen (15) days of the
contract effective date. For administrative filing purposes, all policies sent to OSPI as proof of insurance must reference the State's contract number.

3 PROPOSAL CONTENTS

3.1 PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL

Consultants are required to submit fifteen hard (15) copies of their proposal. One (1) copy must have original signatures, while the remaining fourteen (14) copies may have photocopied signatures. Additionally, the Consultant must provide one copy of the proposal electronically via a compact disc (CD).

Whether mailed or hand delivered, the proposal package as requested above must be received by OSPI no later than 4:30 p.m. PDT in Olympia, Washington, on July 30, 2010. Proposals should be mailed to the address indicated herein and clearly marked to the attention of the RFP Coordinator, Michael Middleton.

Consultants mailing proposals should allow normal mail delivery time to ensure timely receipt of their proposals by the RFP Coordinator. Consultants who hand delivering proposals should allow time for traffic congestion. Consultants assume the risk for the method of delivery chosen. OSPI assumes no responsibility for delays caused by any delivery service.

Late proposals will not be accepted and will be automatically disqualified from further consideration. The proposals must respond to the procurement requirements. Do not respond by referring to material presented elsewhere. The proposal must be complete and must stand on its own merits.

Failure to respond to any portion of the procurement document may result in rejection of the proposal as non-responsive. Once submitted, all proposals and any accompanying documentation become the property of OSPI and will not be returned.

3.2 PROPOSAL FORMAT

Proposals must be submitted on eight and one-half by eleven (8 1/2 x 11) inch paper with tabs separating the major sections of the proposal. The four major sections of the proposal are to be submitted in the order noted below:

- Letter of Submittal, including signed Certifications and Assurances Form (Exhibit F)
- Technical Requirements
- Management Proposal
- Cost Proposal

Proposals must provide information in the same order as presented in this document with the same headings. This will not only be helpful to the evaluators of the proposal, but should assist the Consultant in preparing a thorough response.
Items in this section marked “mandatory” must be included as part of the proposal for the proposal to be considered responsive; however, these items are not scored. Items marked “scored” are those that are awarded points as part of the evaluation conducted by the evaluation team.

3.3 LETTER OF SUBMITTAL (MANDATORY)

The Letter of Submittal and the attached Certifications and Assurances Form (Exhibit F) must be signed and dated by a person authorized to legally bind the Consultant to a contractual relationship, e.g., the President or Executive Director if a corporation, the managing partner if a partnership, or the proprietor if a sole proprietorship. Along with introductory remarks, the Letter of Submittal is to include by attachment the following information about the Consultant and any proposed subcontractors:

- Name, address, principal place of business, telephone number, fax number and e-mail address of legal entity or individual with whom contract would be written.
- Name, address, and telephone number of each principal officer (President, Vice President, Treasurer, Chairperson of the Board of Directors, etc.).
- Legal status of the Consultant (sole proprietorship, partnership, corporation, etc.) and the year the entity was organized to do business as the entity now substantially exists.
- Federal Employer Tax Identification number or Social Security number and the Washington Uniform Business Identification (UBI) number issued by the State of Washington Department of Revenue.
- Address of the facility from which the Consultant would operate.
- Whether any current Washington State employees or former Washington State employees employed or on the firm’s governing board as of the date of the proposal. Include their position and responsibilities within the Consultant’s organization. If following a review of this information, it is determined by OSPI that a conflict of interest exists, the Consultant may be disqualified from further contract award consideration.

3.4 TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS (SCORED)

The Technical Proposal must contain a comprehensive description of services, incorporating the duties outlined in the Scope of Work indicated above in Section 1.4. Please Note: Mere repetition of the Scope of Work identified in Section 1.4 will not be considered responsive.

A. PROJECT APPROACH/METHODOLOGY

- Include a complete description of the Consultant’s proposed approach and methodology for the project. This section should convey Consultant’s understanding of the proposed project, a description of how each minimum qualification is met (samples of work added as appendices are appropriate), and a detailed narrative regarding how the Consultant would incorporate the expectations into completion of each of the required deliverables.
B. WORK PLAN
- Include all project requirements and the proposed tasks, services, activities, etc. necessary to accomplish the scope of the project defined in this RFP. This section of the technical proposal must contain sufficient detail to convey to members of the evaluation team the Consultant's knowledge of the subjects and skills necessary to successfully complete the project. Include any required involvement of OSPI and/or CONSORTIUM. The Consultant may also present any creative approaches that might be appropriate and may provide any pertinent supporting documentation.

C. PROJECT SCHEDULE
- Include a project schedule indicating when the elements of the work will be completed and when deliverables, if any, will be provided.

D. DELIVERABLES
- Fully describe deliverables to be submitted under the proposed contract.

E. OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT
- Describe the impacts/outcomes the Consultant propose to achieve as a result of the delivery of these services including how these outcomes would be monitored, measured and reported to the OSPI, acting as fiscal agent, and to the CONSORTIUM.

F. RISKS
- Define risks you identify as being significant to the success of the project. Include how you would propose to effectively monitor and manage these risks, including reporting of risks to the OSPI, acting as fiscal agent, and to the CONSORTIUM.

3.5 MANAGEMENT PROPOSAL (SCORED)
Consultant shall provide detailed information on the management design, roles and responsibilities of proposed staff, staff qualifications and additional mandatory information as indicated below.

A. MANAGEMENT DESIGN
- To understand the day-to-day functionaries engaged in the firm beyond the proposed project staff, Consultant shall detail the overall structure associated with executing and fulfilling projects. Consultant shall provide an organizational chart (or charts) of the: reporting structure by role, reporting structure by task (which department takes direction from who on the associated task), and reporting and decision-making structure associated with problem resolution.

B. PROJECT TEAM STRUCTURE
- Provide a description of the proposed project team structure and internal controls to be used during the course of the project. Include information as to the use of subcontractors and address the possibility of staff substitutions. Provide a chart indicating lines of authority for personnel involved in performance of this potential
contract and relationships of this staff to other programs or functions of the firm. This chart must also show lines of authority to the next senior level of management. Include who within the firm will have prime responsibility and final authority for the project work.

C. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES
- Consultant shall detail the specific roles required to fulfill the project objectives and the responsibilities associated with the various project tasks. Details shall encompass not only direct work responsibilities but also the interfaces with other defined roles and parties in moving the project through a given task or from one task to the next. Additionally, client interfaces shall be identified where the Consultant expects OSPI or other parties to be involved or assume responsibility in a given task. Intent is to understand the “chain of custody” for a task and identify where communication is critical to ensure smooth transitions across work groups, contractors, and OSPI.

D. TIME COMMITMENTS BY TASK AND INDIVIDUAL
- To be documented in terms of actual hours required and associated dates that delineate the project work. The intent is for OSPI and other project team members to understand the expectation of each individual’s time commitment to the project and the Consultant’s interpretation of the personnel resource commitment anticipated to support the scope of work for the project. Exhibit C is provided as the format for submittal of this information.

E. STAFF QUALIFICATIONS/EXPERIENCE
- Provide resumes and additional information as requested below for all individuals identified in Exhibit C. Additionally, Consultant’s proposal will make available all similar information for proposed alternate staff and anticipated subcontractors intended to participate in the project efforts. Resumes can either be embedded or attached as an appendix to the proposal.
- Proposed staff members, alternates, and/or sub-contractors must have demonstrable skills and experience appropriate for the project. As such, please provide the following information for each individual:
  - A resume to include applicable skills, qualification, and previous work experience on projects similar in nature to the work requested in this RFP.
  - Level of expertise in various aspects of performance-based assessment relevant to the work area assigned.
  - Level of understanding of standards-based assessments.
  - Skills in translating and/or implementing current national or industry standards for classroom consumption.

F. STAFFING SUBSTITUTIONS
- The Consultant must commit that staff identified in the proposal will actually perform the assigned work. Consultant should be prepared to offer alternative candidates for key positions for purposes of identifying potential back-ups for primary staff and possible replacement should the CONSORTIUM or other project team members object to specific personnel participation. For any alternate, proposed, a resume must also be provided. Any
staff substitution must have the prior approval of OSP, acting on behalf of the CONSORTIUM. Should a primary candidate not exist for a specific role, Consultant is expected to acknowledge the situation and provide a plan to meet the objectives of the project. The plan should detail both the criteria for recruitment of qualified candidates and requisite training needed to adequately meet the CONSORTIUM’s needs. The plan should be detailed in both the chart provided as Exhibit C and in the resume portion of associated with this section.

- At the time of contract execution, if the CONSORTIUM’s Governing Committee is not satisfied with proposed personnel assignments of the Consultant, the CONSORTIUM, through OSPI as fiscal agent, shall be allowed to retain the services of qualified service providers at the Consultant’s expense. At any time during the contracted period, if it becomes necessary for the Contractor to add or replace professional staff, the consortium shall have the right to participate in the interview process, and the CONSORTIUM’s Governing Committee shall have approval authority regarding the selection or appointment of a candidate for the vacancy. If the CONSORTIUM believes a Contractor’s proposed staff member needs to be removed from the project, as fiscal agent, OSPI shall provide a thirty (30) day written notice of the request to allow the Contractor the opportunity to propose a suitable alternative. Corrective action shall be implemented within thirty (30) days of agreement on a plan.

G. STAFFING REQUIREMENTS

- Consultant must specify the person (or persons) who will be named the Program Manager/Project Director and primary contact for the project. OSPI, acting on behalf of the CONSORTIUM, shall have final approval of the Program Manager/Project Director. A Program Manager/Project Director shall have authority and responsibility for overall quality control of the Consultant’s project including follow-through on all tasks, whether assigned to other managers, sub-contractors, and consultants. A Program Manager/Project Director will assume responsibilities for all oral or written correspondence to task managers, subcontractors, and consultants as well as timely completion of all activities for which Contractor is responsible. The Program Manager/Project Director must be readily available to respond to questions or issues as they arise, whether by phone, pager or email.

- Stability in the Program Manager/Project Director’s role is essential, but OSPI, acting on behalf of the CONSORTIUM, reserves the right to request a change in Program Manager/Project Director in the event of substantial unsatisfactory performance. Any subsequent changes in Program Manager/Project Director contemplated by Contractor must be reviewed and approved in consultation with the OSPI.

- At least four (4) senior staff FTE’s with project management certification must be proposed for work on the project.

- The Consultant must propose to utilize at least one senior network engineer staff member with at least three (3) years experience in routing and with Tier 1 and Tier 2 internet service providers; and at least one application developer staff member with at least seven (7) years application development experience with internet based applications.
H. EXPERIENCE OF THE CONSULTANT

- Evidence would include, but not be limited to Consultant's mission, date of founding, size, experience (including past success in implementing similar projects). Consultant shall further provide statistical information detailing elements of the organization's history of staff turnover, average employee tenure, average project tenure, average years of experience; and level of experience employees have in the education field.

- Include a list of contracts the Consultant has had during the last five years that relate to the Consultant's ability to perform the services needed under this RFP. List contract reference numbers, contract period of performance, contact persons, telephone numbers, and fax numbers/e-mail addresses.

I. REFERENCES

- List names, addresses, telephone numbers, and fax numbers/e-mail addresses of four business references for which work has been accomplished and briefly describe the type of service provided. The Consultant must grant permission to OSPI to contact the references. Do not include current OSPI staff as references. References will be contacted for the top-scoring proposal(s) only.

J. RELATED INFORMATION (MANDATORY)

- Consultant must identify any potential conflicts of interest it may have in conducting this work including, but not limited to, existing contracts, possible bids it may submit for work with other consortia, government agencies or other organizations.

- Consultant must identify whether it anticipates using the source of funding other than those identified in this request to pay for the services described in this request.

- Consultant must indicate whether or not it has submitted (or anticipates submitting) a proposal to be a project management partner for a different consortium funded under the same U.S. Department of Education grant program.

- If the Consultant or any subcontractor contracted with the State of Washington during the past twenty-four (24) months, indicate the name of the agency, the contract number and project description and/or other information available to identify the contract.

- If the Consultant's staff or subcontractor's staff was an employee of the State of Washington during the past twenty-four (24) months, or is currently a Washington state employee, identify the individual by name, the agency previously or currently employed by, job title or position held and separation date.

- If the Consultant has had a contract terminated for default in the last five years, describe such incident. Termination for default is defined as notice to stop performance due to the Consultant's non-performance or poor performance and the issue of performance was either: (a) not litigated due to inaction on the part of the Proposer, or (b) litigated and such litigation determined that the Proposer was in default.
• Submit full details of the terms for default including the other party's name, address, and phone number. Present the Consultant’s position on the matter. OSPI will evaluate the facts and may, at its sole discretion, reject the proposal on the grounds of the past experience. If no such termination for default has been experienced by the Consultant in the past five (5) years, so indicate.

3.6 COST PROPOSAL

A. COST PROPOSAL SPECIFICATIONS

• In order to better compare proposals, we are requesting that budgets be presented in accordance with the table presented in Exhibit D. Evaluation of proposals and the award of any contract will be based upon the reasonableness of costs to be incurred and charged to OSPI. OSPI will only make payments upon satisfactory performance and/or provided deliverables. In addition, penalties for non-performance, as indicated in Exhibit H, may affect Contractor payment. In the event of termination of any contract, the amount due and payable to the Consultant for any partial performance must be ascertainable.

• OSPI is particularly interested in proposals that, in responding to the specifications set forth in this RFP, make optimum use of available resources in a cost-effective manner. Although cost is a consideration, OSPI is not bound to select a Consultant solely on the basis of low bid. To assist OSPI in selecting the proposal that will best accomplish the objectives of the program within the resources available, Consultant shall identify and estimate all costs for performing the tasks necessary to accomplish the deliverables of the RFP and subsequent contract. The costs associated with each major component or significant work product must be clearly and separately identified. The cost proposal must detail all expenses that will be billed to OSPI in the event of a contract award. Consultant should include a suggested payment schedule based on monthly invoicing.

• Contractor shall be responsible for payment of all applicable taxes due for services rendered under any contract resulting from this RFP and should be accounted for in the cost proposal.

B. IDENTIFICATION OF COSTS (SCORED)

• Identify all costs including expenses to be charged for performing the services necessary to accomplish the objectives of the contract. In accordance with Exhibit D, Consultant is to submit a fully detailed budget including staff costs, administrative costs, travel costs, and any other expenses necessary to accomplish the tasks and to produce the deliverables under the contract. Consultants are required to collect and pay Washington State sales tax, if applicable.

• Costs for subcontractors are to be broken out separately. Please note if any subcontractors are certified by the Office of Minority and Women’s Business Enterprises.
C. COMPUTATION

- The score for the cost proposal will be computed by dividing the lowest cost bid received by the Consultant's total cost. Then the resultant number will be multiplied by the maximum possible points for the cost section.

4 EVALUATION AND CONTRACT AWARD

4.1 EVALUATION PROCEDURE

Responsive proposals will be evaluated strictly in accordance with the requirements stated in this solicitation and any addenda issued. The evaluation of proposals shall be accomplished by an evaluation team, to be designated by OSPI, acting on behalf of the CONSORTIUM. The evaluation team shall be responsible for the ranking of the proposals.

OSPI, acting on behalf of the CONSORTIUM, may elect to select the top-scoring firms as finalists for an oral presentation.

4.2 EVALUATION WEIGHTING AND SCORING

The following points will be assigned to the proposals for evaluation purposes (refer to Exhibit G for additional details):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Proposal – 50%</th>
<th>180 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Approach/Methodology</td>
<td>10 points (max.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Work Plan</td>
<td>130 points (max.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Schedule</td>
<td>10 points (max.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Deliverables</td>
<td>10 points (max.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes/Impacts</td>
<td>10 points (max.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks</td>
<td>10 points (max.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Proposal – 25%</th>
<th>90 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Team Structure/Internal Controls</td>
<td>50 points (max.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Qualifications/Experience</td>
<td>20 points (max.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of the Consultant</td>
<td>10 points (max.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addenda to Management Proposal</td>
<td>10 points (max.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Proposal – 25%</th>
<th>90 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FOR PROPOSAL</td>
<td>360 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References (Top 3 Candidates only)</th>
<th>10 points (max.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>370 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.3 NOTIFICATION TO CONSULTANTS

Consultants whose proposals have not been selected for further consideration, negotiation or award will be notified via e-mail.

4.4 DEBRIEFING OF UNSUCCESSFUL CONSULTANTS

Upon request, an individual debriefing conference will be scheduled with an unsuccessful Consultant. The request for a debriefing conference must be received by the RFP Coordinator within three (3) business days after the Notification of Unsuccessful Consultant letter is e-mailed to the Consultant. The debriefing will be held within the prescribed dates listed in the Schedule of Procurement Activities, unless a modification for the convenience of OSPI, or a request by the Consultant in question is approved by OSPI.

Debriefing will be limited to a critique of the requesting Consultant’s proposal. Comparisons between proposals or evaluations of the other proposals will not be allowed. Debriefing conferences may be conducted in person or on the telephone and will be scheduled for a maximum of one hour.

4.5 PROTEST PROCEDURE

This procedure is available to Consultants who submitted a response to this solicitation document and who have participated in a debriefing conference. Upon completing the debriefing conference, the Consultant is allowed three (3) business days to file a protest of the acquisition with the RFP Coordinator. Protests may be submitted by e-mail, but must be followed by the original document.

Consultants protesting this procurement shall follow the procedures described below. Protests that do not follow these procedures shall not be considered. This protest procedure constitutes the sole administrative remedy available to Consultants under this procurement.

All protests must be in writing and signed by the protesting party or an authorized Agent. The protest must state the grounds for the protest with specific facts and complete statements of the action(s) being protested. A description of the relief or corrective action being requested should also be included. All protests shall be addressed to the RFP Coordinator.

Only protests stipulating an issue of fact concerning the following subjects shall be considered:

- A matter of bias, discrimination or conflict of interest on the part of the evaluator.
- Errors in computing the score.
- Non-compliance with procedures described in the procurement document or OSPI policy.
Protests not based on procedural matters will not be considered. Protests will be rejected as without merit if they address issues such as: 1) an evaluator's professional judgment on the quality of a proposal, or 2) OSPI'S assessment of its own and/or other agencies needs or requirements.

Upon receipt of a protest, a protest review will be held by OSPI. The OSPI Contracts Administrator or an employee delegated by the Contracts Administrator who was not involved in the procurement will consider the record and all available facts and issue a decision within five business days of receipt of the protest. If additional time is required, the protesting party will be notified of the delay.

In the event a protest may affect the interest of another Consultant that submitted a proposal, such Consultant will be given an opportunity to submit its views and any relevant information on the protest to the RFP Coordinator.

The final determination of the protest shall:

- Find the protest lacking in merit and uphold OSPI's action; or
- Find only technical or harmless errors in OSPI's acquisition process and determine OSPI to be in substantial compliance and reject the protest; or
- Find merit in the protest and provide OSPI options which may include:
  - Correct the errors and re-evaluate all proposals, and/or
  - Reissue the solicitation document and begin a new process, or
  - Make other findings and determine other courses of action as appropriate.

If OSPI determines that the protest is without merit, OSPI will enter into a contract with the apparently successful Contractor. If the protest is determined to have merit, one of the alternatives noted in the preceding paragraph will be taken.

5 RFP EXHIBITS

Exhibit A  Race To The Top NIA – Comprehensive Assessment Program
Exhibit B  Common Core Standards
Exhibit C  Staffing & Responsibilities Table
Exhibit D  Budget Submission Form
Exhibit E  Personal Service Contract Format including General Terms and Conditions
Exhibit F  Certifications and Assurances
Exhibit G  Evaluation Criteria
Exhibit H  Service Level Expectations and Remedies
### Appendix A8-3: WestEd State Assessment Experience: Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Standards Review and Development</th>
<th>Test Development</th>
<th>Alignment Studies</th>
<th>Special Populations</th>
<th>Technical Advice</th>
<th>Policy Consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>2005–06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>2008, ongoing</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>2004–04</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>2008–06, 2009</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>2002–03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2002–03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>2003–04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>2000–02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>2003–04</td>
<td>2003–04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>2007–08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Updated: April 2010*
Appendix A8-4: Summary of Corporate Capacity of Interim Project Management Partner

WestEd’s mission—to work with educational and other communities to promote excellence, achieve equity, and improve learning for children, youth, and adults—is addressed through a full range of projects. To carry out this mission, WestEd project staff are organized into a dozen formal program areas, some addressing educational content or level and some in areas of high risk and high need that cut across content. Areas of work include Assessment and Accountability; Mathematics and Science; Curriculum and Instruction; Literacy; Culture, Diversity, a Secondary and Postsecondary Education; Evaluation; Special Education; Leadership and Teacher Professional Development; Healthy Kids, Schools, and Communities; Early Childhood; Web, Database, and Interactive Services; and Policy. Across programs, WestEd boasts expertise in student assessment, data-driven planning, curriculum development, training, school coaching, community partnership building, research and evaluation methods, and policy analysis. Collaboration among staff is institutionally promoted through regular meetings of management, program, and administrative councils.

WestEd integrates the use of communications, information technology, and multimedia resources into its programs and projects to improve and extend staff’s ability to communicate with and educate students, teachers, and other clients. The integration of media technology includes the use of on-demand and high-volume printing, the World Wide Web, email, video-based documentaries, and online professional development.

- **Communications.** WestEd’s Communications program works with program staff to ensure that the latest research and best practices are accessible to clients as well as to educators, parents, state and local education agencies, policymakers, and the media. The Communications team includes accomplished writers, editors, video producers, and web developers.

- **Information Management and Activity Tracking.** WestEd has developed a web-based activity tracking application that interfaces with an SQL database. This system enables staff to gather, store, share, and disseminate project-based information. WestEd staff use the activity-tracking component of the intranet to enter and share data about program and project activities, staff, and publications. This system facilitates project management, report writing, collaboration, and coordination within and across projects. In addition, the system allows management to review data about projects linked to performance and other indicators.

- **Multimedia Equipment, Facilities, and Resources.** Many agency projects and programs provide services directly to practitioners. The use of multimedia presentations facilitates information dissemination to clients in different locations and increases the accessibility of services that can be provided economically and efficiently. The agency has invested in multimedia equipment both for delivering services and for developing products. Currently, to foster connections between staff and clients, WestEd has videoconferencing facilities in its San Francisco, Los Alamitos, Oakland, Phoenix, Redwood City, and Sacramento offices. WestEd staff also rely on extensive telecommunications facilities,
including an integrated voice messaging system and data links that connect the ten WestEd offices nationwide. WestEd maintains an avid video production suite and a second digital video production suite using a variety of equipment. A primary WestEd objective is to selectively apply effective technologies in ways that will significantly extend the work of staff and clients to meet the increasing needs of students in America’s knowledge-based economy.

WestEd currently houses a number of centers that conduct R&D and provide technical assistance and support to regions, State Educational Agencies (SEAs), and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs). These are described below.

- Since 1966, WestEd has served as the leader for the Regional Educational Laboratory West (REL–West), one of ten RELs funded by the U.S. Department of Education’s Institute of Education Sciences (IES). REL–West serves the states of Arizona, California, Nevada, and Utah. Under the current contract, REL–West is carrying out a number of ongoing projects that include conducting regional needs analyses with education stakeholders and policymakers; initiating and completing Fast Response R&D projects in response to emerging needs; ensuring stakeholders at the regional level have access to the best research-based evidence available; and assisting states in the REL–West in designing and conducting local evaluations. WestEd is the lead agency for the California Comprehensive Center (CC) and the Southwest Region CC, the lead for the Assessment and Accountability CC, and a subcontractor for the New England Region CC, New York CC, and the High School Content Center. These centers are part of a network of 21 centers funded nationwide by the U.S. Department of Education’s (ED) Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE). Each is charged with supporting states in successful implementation of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) expectations. In collaboration with state departments of education and other regional and professional organizations, the CCs provide technical assistance and access to resources to help states establish standards-based assessment and accountability systems that include and support special needs students (students with disabilities and English learners).

- The Northeast Regional Resource Center (NERRC), funded by USED’s Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), is one of six Regional Resource Centers for special education in the United States. NERRC serves the eight Northeastern states, helping state education agencies improve their systems of early intervention, special education, and transition services through the development and implementation of policies, programs, and practices that enhance educational results for children and youth with disabilities.
SUMMARY OF RELATED EXPERIENCE

Dr. Stanley Rabinowitz is Director of WestEd’s Assessment and Standards Development Services (ASDS) program and is Director of the national Assessment and Accountability Comprehensive Center (AACC). In these roles, Dr. Rabinowitz has consulted extensively on academic standards, assessment, and accountability issues with policymakers and assessment staff at national, regional, and state levels. Through his involvement in state system Technical Advisory Committees and the role he serves in the AACC, Dr. Rabinowitz regularly advises states preparing for and undergoing peer review; he is thus intimately familiar with the standards and assessment system challenges and constraints faced by states. He also works regularly with states as they consider transitions from norm-referenced to criterion-referenced assessments and supports states as they design new assessment systems. In addition, Dr. Rabinowitz is currently serving as reviewer for the Common Core Standards, a role that uniquely positions him as an asset to states both as they think through the implications of adopting the Common Core Standards and as they design models for standards implementation.

Prior to joining WestEd, Dr. Rabinowitz served as state assessment director for the New Jersey Department of Education. His areas of expertise include No Child Left Behind Development and Implementation, High Stakes Student Assessment; School Accountability; Assessment of Students with Disabilities and English-Language Learners; Applied Statistics and Psychometrics; and Program Evaluation. Dr. Rabinowitz holds an M.S. and Ph.D. in educational psychology and statistics.

EDUCATION

1990    Ph.D., Educational Psychology and Statistics, State University of New York at Albany, Albany, NY
1977    M.S., Educational Psychology and Statistics, State University of New York at Albany, Albany, NY
1975    B.A., Magna Cum Laude; Major: Psychology; Minor: English, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, NY

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

1991– Present    Senior Program Director, Assessment and Standards Development Services (ASDS) WestEd, San Francisco, CA
                      Project Director, Assessment and Accountability Comprehensive Center (AACC) Assessment and Accountability Specialty Laboratory
1988–1990 Director of Statewide Assessment, Bureau of Cognitive Skills
New Jersey Department of Education, Trenton, NJ

New Jersey Department of Education, Trenton, NJ

1988–1990 Director of Statewide Assessment, Bureau of Cognitive Skills
New Jersey Department of Education, Trenton, NJ

New Jersey Department of Education, Trenton, NJ

1982–1983 Evaluator, Remedial English and Mathematics Programs
New York City Technical College, Brooklyn, NY

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS


Rabinowitz, S. N. (2003, October). Design considerations for building out NCLB state assessment systems. Presentation at the 2003 Edward F. Reidy, Jr., Interactive Lecture Series, Nashua, NH.

Rabinowitz, S. N. (2003). Pseudo-vertical scales: Can we have a little cake (and eat it too)? Paper presented at the CCSSO annual conference on Large-Scale Assessment, San Antonio, TX.


PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

- American Educational Research Association
- National Council on Measurement in Education
SUMMARY OF RELATED EXPERIENCE

Joanne Jensen has extensive experience in the development of performance-based student assessment tasks and systems and criterion-referenced assessments involving both selected- and constructed-response items. As the director of Assessment Client Relations, she is responsible for coordinating project management for WestEd’s assessment development contracts. Previously she served as Director of Test Development for WestEd’s Assessment and Standards Development Services Program. She directs the development of assessments for Nevada’s Proficiency Examination Program, which includes a high school exit examination in reading, mathematics, and science; criterion-referenced assessments at grades 3 through 8 for reading and mathematics; and science assessments at grades 5 and 8. As the Project Director at WestEd for Kentucky’s Commonwealth Accountability Testing System (CATS), she supervises the development of constructed-response and selected-response items for the areas of reading, mathematics, science, social studies, arts and humanities, and practical living and vocational studies. She also directs the development of the End-of-Semester Assessment Program for the Cincinnati Public Schools for Grades 9, 10, 11 and 12 in the content areas of English, mathematics, science, and social studies. She supervised the test development for science and history/social sciences for the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System. Dr. Jensen also directed the development of high school assessments for West Virginia’s WESTEST Statewide Assessment Program for English/language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. She also has contributed to the development of a performance-based assessment model for California’s secondary vocational students. This model included portfolios, student projects, and written scenarios (on-demand problem-solving writing prompts). As part of this work, Dr. Jensen has worked extensively with teachers in the development of a range of assessment tasks using a standards-based approach. She is experienced in training teachers in the use of holistic scoring techniques. Her other areas of expertise include research design, survey research, and program evaluation.

EDUCATION

1994  Ph.D., Educational Psychology, University of California, Berkeley. Areas: Research Methods, Educational Measurement, Learning Theory

1984  M.A., Education, University of California, Berkeley

1980  B.A. (Summa Cum Laude), Psychology, California State University, Fresno
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007–</td>
<td>Director of Assessment Client Relations</td>
<td>Assessment and Standards Development Services (ASDS), WestEd, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>Provides program management support to assessment development contracts across ASDS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Director of Test Development</td>
<td>ASDS, WestEd, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinated item development and forms construction across the balance of ASDS contracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006–</td>
<td>Project Director, Kentucky Instructional Results and Information Systems (KIRIS)/(CATS)</td>
<td>WestEd, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervises the development of standards-based assessments for six curriculum areas at the elementary, middle school, and high school levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004–</td>
<td>Director of Test Development</td>
<td>Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System, WestEd, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>Supervises the development of standards-based assessments for elementary and middle school science and elementary, middle school, and high school history and social sciences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998–</td>
<td>Director of Test Development</td>
<td>Nevada Proficiency Examination Program, WestEd, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>Supervises the development and production of standards-based assessments for three subject areas for Nevada’s Proficiency Examination Program, which includes high school proficiency examinations and criterion-referenced assessments at grades 3 through 8 for Reading, Math, and Science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994–</td>
<td>Associate Project Director</td>
<td>(KIRIS)/(CATS), WestEd, San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>Supervised the development of criterion-referenced and performance-based assessments for six curriculum areas. Managed the data collection for non-cognitive indicators of school success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990–</td>
<td>Supervisor/Trainer, —Learning from Text” Staff</td>
<td>University of California, Berkeley, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consulted in the development of summative criterion-referenced tests in Mathematics, Language Arts, and Business Departments of the Liberty Union High School District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990–</td>
<td>Instructor, —Academic Enhancement Series”; Student Learning Center</td>
<td>University of California, Berkeley, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performed psychometric and statistical analyses on the achievement data.

1986–1988
Instructor, “Learning from Text”; School of Education
University of California, Berkeley, CA

1984–1986
Field Coordinator, Autonomous Learning Project
Far West Laboratory, San Francisco, CA
Negotiated, coordinated, and developed testing and observation procedures for large-scale data collection involving twelve schools at three grade levels.

1984–1986
Teaching Assistant, “Data Analysis for Educational Research and Program Evaluation”; Graduate School of Education, University of California, Berkeley, CA

1983–1984
Research Assistant, Office of Student Research
University of California, Berkeley, CA
Data analyst and statistician for office serving the research and analysis requests based on student application and admissions databases.

1984–1984
Teaching Assistant, “Data Analysis for Educational Research and Program Evaluation”;

1983
Research Assistant, Language Learning Project
University of California, Berkeley, CA
Data analyst and research liaison with research department of Oakland Public Schools.

1983–1981
Teaching Assistant, “Introduction to Statistics”; Department of Psychology
California State University, Fresno, CA

Teaching Assistant, “Introduction to Psychology”;

Teaching Assistant, “Introduction to Psychology”;

1980
Teaching Assistant, “Introduction to Psychology”;

1980
Graduate School of Education, University of California, Berkeley, CA

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS


Jensen, J.L. (1997). *Reflecting on Assessment*. Invited address to the Faculty of the School of Education, University of the Pacific, Stockton, CA.


SELECTED PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

• Referee for Educational Researcher
• Referee for Curriculum and Instruction
• Referee for American Educational Research Association Division H: School Evaluation and Program Development

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

• American Educational Research Association
• Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
• National Council on Measurement in Education
SUMMARY OF RELATED EXPERIENCE

Carole Gallagher is Senior Research Associate in WestEd’s Assessment and Standards Development Services (ASDS) program. In that role she supports institutional growth via proposal development and outreach to states. She has directed key projects related to standards development, revision, integration, and evaluation; alternate assessment development; and formative assessment implementation. She serves as the external evaluator for a federally funded assessment grant and supports technical assistance services provided to regions and states through the Assessment and Accountability Comprehensive Center (AACC) at WestEd. Dr. Gallagher conducts research on postsecondary readiness for education, the workplace, and citizenship and on emerging issues in assessment and accountability (e.g., technical adequacy considerations, balanced assessment systems, and assessing special student populations). She studies state and federal accountability models and recently completed case study reports on the growth models in two states. Her ongoing work includes promoting effective data use in schools, studying research-based best practices in formative assessment, facilitating state efforts to integrate academic and career/technical education standards, and guiding states in the collection and documentation of appropriate evidence of alignment among standards, curriculum, instruction, and assessment. She also conducts hierarchical analyses of longitudinal data to examine performance gaps and monitor changes in student test performance over time.

Dr. Gallagher is a career educator with teaching, counseling, and administrative experience at the secondary and college levels. Prior to joining WestEd, Dr. Gallagher served as the NAEP Coordinator for the state of Indiana, overseeing sampling, administration, and reporting activities associated with the National Assessment of Educational Progress. During her time at the Indiana Department of Education, she also worked on development, scoring, and reporting activities associated with the state’s K–12 English/Language Arts assessments.

EDUCATION

2004    Ph.D., Educational Psychology, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN
2004    Certification, Large-Scale Assessment, University of Maryland, College Park, MD
1977    M.A., Guidance and Counseling, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI
1974    B.A., English, Secondary Education, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI
PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2005–Present  Senior Research Associate, Assessment Standards and Development Services (ASDS)
               WestEd, San Francisco, CA

Responsibilities include directing standards and assessment development projects; overseeing research studies related to assessment; supporting technical assistance outreach efforts to states, regional centers, and districts regarding NCLB compliance issues; conducting research on existing and emerging assessment and accountability issues; and collaborating on special projects associated with the AACC. She currently directs a multi-phase state content standards revision project that includes the development of crosswalks between the new state standards and the K–12 Common Core State Standards, serves as the external evaluator for a federally-funded assessment grant, is an author on an in-review REL-West research report on assessment accommodations for English language learners, and is developing training materials for a state’s examination of the alignment between state standards and district curricula.

2002–2005  State NAEP Coordinator
2005      Indiana Department of Education, Indianapolis, IN

Responsibilities included overseeing administration of national and international assessments in schools; coordinating recruitment, test administration, and reporting activities; serving as state liaison with NCES; supporting state test development work in English/Language Arts; and conducting independent research using hierarchical modeling of student performance data.

2000–2002  Associate Instructor
2002      Indiana University, Bloomington, IN

Responsibilities included teaching courses in educational psychology and measurement to undergraduates and in critical reading to at-risk minority and first generation college freshmen; also supervised students’ pre-student teaching field experience and collaborated in the development of a virtual field experience for pre-service teachers.

1994–2000  Dean of Students
2000      Columbus East High School, Columbus, IN

Responsibilities included monitoring student behavior in a comprehensive high school; monitored attendance, administered discipline (suspension and expulsions); counseled and managed interventions for general and special education students.

1991–1994  Guidance Counselor
1994      Central Middle School, Columbus, IN

Responsibilities included providing academic, career, and personal counseling for students in grades 7 and 8.
1988–1990  *Evaluator*, LOGOS Program for Gifted and Talented
Richmond, IN
Responsibilities included administering and scoring entrance examination for district’s Gifted and Talented program, grades K–10.

Huron Valley Women’s Facility, Ypsilanti, MI
Responsibilities included teaching reading courses to incarcerated felons to facilitate high school completion efforts.

1977–1974  *High School English Teacher*
LaGrange Township High School, LaGrange, IL
Responsibilities included teaching required English classes at the freshman and sophomore levels and developing and teaching electives in literature and creative writing.

**SELECTED PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS**


**PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS**

- American Educational Research Association
- National Council on Measurement in Education
SUMMARY OF RELATED EXPERIENCE

Carol Whang manages state- and district-level projects for the Assessment and Standards Development Services (ASDS) program at WestEd. As a project manager, she has provided oversight of both assessment and research projects within ASDS. Her assessment management experience includes coordinating the development of test forms for the Kentucky Core Content Test—a high-stakes statewide assessment that included eight grades and six content areas. In this role, she produced detailed documentation and procedure manuals for various processes related to test form development, collaborated with and provided oversight of internal and external project staff, and communicated with internal and external staff at all levels. In addition to having successfully coordinated several simultaneous processes involving multiple grades and content areas, she also provided oversight of quality control of test forms, resulting in consecutive years of error-free test forms. In addition to management of large complex projects, her test development experience includes writing technical reports; effectively and efficiently communicating with key stakeholders at the school, district, and state levels; drafting and revising assessment items and scoring guides; training support staff; and facilitating item-review meetings.

She also has extensive experience managing a diverse range of research projects. At the state level, she has managed WestEd’s contract to support the California Department of Education in the state’s Alternative Schools Accountability Model. For this project, she has successfully managed the contract and budget, coordinated meetings of the technical design group, drafted minutes for the Public School Accountability Act Subcommittee meetings, provided oversight over schedules and all deliverables. At the district level, she has managed WestEd’s development of quarterly learning targets for Chicago Public Schools. For this project, she developed and documented protocols for content staff; facilitated the work of all content staff, from creating schedules to providing materials and conducting training; tracked budgets; adapted plans and processes quickly in response to changing priorities; and kept internal and external staff informed of progress and issues requiring resolution.

Additionally, she has managed the data collection for a Regional Educational Laboratory West project. This involved developing data collection processes; providing oversight of database creation, data collection, and reconciliation; and maintaining detailed records and thorough documentation of schools, classes, and participants in the study with proper attention to maintaining data security.

EDUCATION

2004 Ph.D., Musicology, University of Pennsylvania, Area: Music History
1995 B.M., Highest Honors, Music, University of California, Santa Barbara
PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2009– Present  Program Associate
Present  WestEd, San Francisco, CA

2006– Present  Coordinator
2005– Present  Proofreader

2004  Marketing Assistant
San Francisco Opera, San Francisco, CA
Responsible for the general flow of marketing collateral for single tickets, including ad trafficking for both print and electronic deliverables.

2003  Instructor, History of Opera
Department of Music, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA

2002  Instructor, Introduction to Music Theory and Musicianship A
Department of Music, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA

1998–2001  Research Assistant, Eugene K. Wolf,
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA
Assisted with research on the origins and development of the classical symphony, including the preparation of musical transcriptions and archival research.

2000  Instructor, Introduction of a History of Music II (Classical, Romantic, Modern)
Department of Music, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA

1999  Instructor, Introduction to a History of Music I (Medieval, Renaissance, Baroque)
Department of Music, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA

1999  Assistant to the Executive Director
American Musicological Society, Philadelphia, PA

1998  Teaching Fellow, Introduction of a History of Music II (Classical, Romantic, Modern),
Department of Music, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA

1997  Teaching Fellow, Introduction to a History of Music I (Medieval, Renaissance, Baroque), Department of Music, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA

1997  Teaching Fellow, Introduction to a History of Music II (Classical, Romantic, Modern)
Department of Music, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA

1996  Teaching Fellow, Introduction to a History of Music I (Medieval, Renaissance, Baroque), Department of Music, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA
PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS


SUMMARY OF RELATED EXPERIENCE

Dr. Christyan P. Mitchell, Senior Research Associate at WestEd, serves as project lead overseeing the development of high-stakes state assessments for general and special student populations (i.e., English language learners, students with disabilities). In this capacity, Dr. Mitchell oversees the development of test designs, item specifications, item writer, and editor training, ancillary test materials, and provides item review training and facilitation. As project lead he ensures adherence to the principles of Universal Design and best practices for online assessment item development (when appropriate). Having experience in large-scale assessment as a senior program manager at Harcourt Assessment and former Chief Data Analyst at the Massachusetts Department of Education, Dr. Mitchell provides consultation to state departments of education on a variety of technical, policy, and implementation issues.

EDUCATION

2000  Ph.D., Educational Psychology, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
       Minneapolis, MN
1996  M.Ed., Educational Research, Northeastern University, Boston, MA
1993  B.S., Psychology, State University of New York at Binghamton, Binghamton, NY

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2006– Present  Senior Research Associate, Assessments and Standards Development Services
               (ASDS), WestEd, San Francisco, CA

Managing the item development for high-stakes state assessments for general and special populations. Providing technical assistance and guidance to state departments of education regarding a wide range of assessment issues.

2005– 2006  Senior Program Manager, Wyoming Department of Education Project

Managed Harcourt Assessment’s contract with the Wyoming Department of Education, budgeted annually at six million dollars. Wyoming’s state educational assessment system is a visionary and highly complex program consisting of five distinct assessments: high-stakes online assessment, alternate assessment, augmented catalog English proficiency assessment, formative assessment, and online writing assessment.

Coordinated efforts across functional groups to deliver Wyoming’s first-ever high-stakes online assessment. Oversaw the augmentation, standard setting, administration, and reporting of the Wyoming English proficiency assessment. Managed the development of a fully customized alternative assessment for Wyoming students with
severe cognitive disabilities. Managed the statewide implementation of Wyoming’s first-ever online formative assessment. Managed the statewide implementation of the Wyoming’s first-ever online writing assessment (subcontracted through Bookette Software). Coordinated test development team with Technical Advisory Committee lead Dr. James Popham to deliver instructionally supportive tests and score reports.

2002–2004
Chief Data Analyst, Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS)
Massachusetts Department of Education, Malden, MA

Oversaw all data analysis and reporting of Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS). Supervised four data analysts, provided technical direction on statistical analyses and software usage (e.g., SPSS, Excel, Access), delegated and supervised data analysis projects, built team approach, promoted and systematized data quality assurance procedures. Managed production of U.S. Department of Education compliant reports of adequate yearly progress. Managed production of and contributed to the MCAS technical reports (2002 and 2003). Co-authored and oversaw scoring and reporting specifications. Directly provided data analyses to the Commissioner of Education and Governor of Massachusetts. Oversaw the quality control analysis for all MCAS results. Oversaw web-based enrollment collection and data reporting. Designed student survey and analyzed and reported results.

2001–2002
Senior Data Analyst, MCAS
Massachusetts Department of Education, Malden, MA

Generated 2002 reports of MCAS results. Conducted analyses and prepared presentation material for public release of data, presented by the Commissioner of Education and Governor of Massachusetts. Conducted validity and reliability analysis of national reading assessment. Served as the lead analyst for the quality control analysis of all student results. Managed and maintained the database of student results (more than 500,000 records).

2000–2001
Principal Usability Engineer, Web Applications
Magnasource, Inc., Wakefield, MA

Designed usability testing methodology. Conducted user testing. Analyzed results (quantitative and qualitative). Designed and oversaw quality assurance testing. Authored user manuals. Wrote usability reports (internal and external).

1998–2000
Research Assistant, Character Education Grant
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN

Developed outcome measures for program evaluation. Supervised junior research team members. Conducted analysis, exploration, and documentation of current research pertaining to moral education strategies. Directed school principals, district superintendents, and teachers in the implementation of research-based didactic techniques. Co-developed a research-based, 700-plus-page, teacher guidebook for integrating character education into standards based curriculum.

1999
Instructor, Personality and Social Development
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN

1996–1999  
**Research Assistant**, Center for the Study of Ethical Development  
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN

Provided statistical and measurement support to researchers. Conducted workshops on statistical software usage, data analysis procedures, and research methodology techniques. Conducted research to establish construct validity for a new measure of moral cognition. Co-authored technical manual for research methodology and statistical analysis in moral cognition.

1997  
**Instructor**, Building a Learning Community  
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN

Taught course material. Designed outcome measures and assessed performance.

**SELECTED PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS**


**PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS**

- American Educational Research Association
- American Psychological Association
- Association for Moral Education
- Eastern Educational Research Association
- Phi Kappa Phi Academic Honorary
Appendix A8-6: Budget (PART I.J.)

SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium Budget Tables and Budget Narrative for Level 1 Summary and Detailed Budget Modules and Level 2 Detailed Budget Module

Part A: Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Module</th>
<th>Project Year 1</th>
<th>Project Year 2</th>
<th>Project Year 3</th>
<th>Project Year 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 1 Budget Modules</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Governance</td>
<td>$2,706,677</td>
<td>$2,595,483</td>
<td>$2,566,294</td>
<td>$2,567,468</td>
<td>$10,435,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. System Design</td>
<td>$357,450</td>
<td>$41,400</td>
<td>$14,716</td>
<td>$15,128</td>
<td>$428,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Research and Evaluation</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,002,850</td>
<td>$2,002,850</td>
<td>$2,002,850</td>
<td>$5,008,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Technology</td>
<td>$129,447</td>
<td>$10,744,471</td>
<td>$10,748,197</td>
<td>$5,452,028</td>
<td>$27,074,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Higher Ed Engagement</td>
<td>$368,957</td>
<td>$379,288</td>
<td>$389,908</td>
<td>$400,825</td>
<td>$1,538,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <strong>Total Funds Requested – Level 1 Budget Modules</strong> (lines 1-7)</td>
<td>$4,033,141</td>
<td>$24,240,803</td>
<td>$48,594,770</td>
<td>$73,119,105</td>
<td>$149,987,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2 Budget Modules</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Translations Priority 1</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$639,947</td>
<td>$2,969,972</td>
<td>$6,384,805</td>
<td>$9,994,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. <strong>Total Funds Requested – Level 2 Budget Modules</strong> (line 9)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$639,947</td>
<td>$2,969,972</td>
<td>$6,384,805</td>
<td>$9,994,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. <strong>Total Funds Requested for Comprehensive Assessment System</strong> (lines 8 plus 10)</td>
<td>$4,033,141</td>
<td>$24,880,750</td>
<td>$51,564,742</td>
<td>$79,503,910</td>
<td>$159,982,543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All calculations are done in fractional dollars and rounded to the nearest whole dollar for presentation in tables. As a result, small rounding differences may occur.

---

7 Full case detail available upon request.
## Part B: Level 1 Budget Modules – Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Categories</th>
<th>Project Year 1 (a)</th>
<th>Project Year 2 (b)</th>
<th>Project Year 3 (c)</th>
<th>Project Year 4 (d)</th>
<th>Total (e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personnel</td>
<td>$246,300</td>
<td>$253,196</td>
<td>$260,286</td>
<td>$267,574</td>
<td>$1,027,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>$73,890</td>
<td>$75,959</td>
<td>$78,086</td>
<td>$80,272</td>
<td>$308,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Travel</td>
<td>$256,300</td>
<td>$263,476</td>
<td>$317,669</td>
<td>$258,448</td>
<td>$1,095,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supplies</td>
<td>$28,800</td>
<td>$31,151</td>
<td>$30,435</td>
<td>$33,895</td>
<td>$124,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Contractual</td>
<td>$3,258,300</td>
<td>$23,395,532</td>
<td>$47,674,845</td>
<td>$72,262,535</td>
<td>$146,591,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Training Stipends</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)</td>
<td>$3,863,590</td>
<td>$24,019,315</td>
<td>$48,361,321</td>
<td>$72,902,724</td>
<td>$149,146,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Indirect Costs</td>
<td>$169,551</td>
<td>$221,488</td>
<td>$233,449</td>
<td>$216,381</td>
<td>$840,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Total Costs (add lines 9-10)</td>
<td>$4,033,141</td>
<td>$24,240,803</td>
<td>$48,594,770</td>
<td>$73,119,105</td>
<td>$149,987,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other Funds Allocated toward this Work</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Total Funds Requested (subtract line 12 from line 11)</td>
<td>$4,033,141</td>
<td>$24,240,803</td>
<td>$48,594,770</td>
<td>$73,119,105</td>
<td>$149,987,819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All calculations are done in fractional dollars and rounded to the nearest whole dollar for presentation in tables. As a result, small rounding differences may occur.
### Level 1 Budget Module – Detailed Table: Governance

**Budget Part B: Level 1 Budget Module – Detailed Table**

**Name: Governance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Categories</th>
<th>Project Year 1 (a)</th>
<th>Project Year 2 (b)</th>
<th>Project Year 3 (c)</th>
<th>Project Year 4 (d)</th>
<th>Total (e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personnel</td>
<td>$246,300</td>
<td>$253,196</td>
<td>$260,286</td>
<td>$267,574</td>
<td>$1,027,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>$73,890</td>
<td>$75,959</td>
<td>$78,086</td>
<td>$80,272</td>
<td>$308,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Travel</td>
<td>$75,900</td>
<td>$78,025</td>
<td>$60,765</td>
<td>$62,467</td>
<td>$277,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supplies</td>
<td>$28,800</td>
<td>$31,151</td>
<td>$30,435</td>
<td>$33,895</td>
<td>$124,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Contractual</td>
<td>$2,224,800</td>
<td>$2,092,931</td>
<td>$2,080,316</td>
<td>$2,066,921</td>
<td>$8,464,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Training Stipends</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)</td>
<td>$2,649,690</td>
<td>$2,531,263</td>
<td>$2,509,888</td>
<td>$2,511,128</td>
<td>$10,201,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Indirect Costs</td>
<td>$56,987</td>
<td>$64,220</td>
<td>$56,406</td>
<td>$56,340</td>
<td>$233,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Total Costs (add lines 9-10)</td>
<td>$2,706,677</td>
<td>$2,595,483</td>
<td>$2,566,294</td>
<td>$2,567,468</td>
<td>$10,435,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other Funds Allocated toward this Work</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Total Funds Requested (subtract line 12 from line 11)</td>
<td>$2,706,677</td>
<td>$2,595,483</td>
<td>$2,566,294</td>
<td>$2,567,468</td>
<td>$10,435,922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Based on its Indirect Cost Rate (ICR) agreement with USED, Washington can claim indirect costs against all expenditures per a set rate with the exception of contracts and sub-grants awarded within the grant. For contracts, Washington can claim indirect costs at the set rate against the first $25,000 of the contract value on a yearly basis. For sub-grants that might be awarded, Washington cannot claim any indirect costs. For purposes of the budget submission, indirect costs were calculated using Washington’s ICR agreement (Agreement No. 2010-040) rate of 11.4%.
2. All calculations are done in fractional dollars and rounded to the nearest whole dollar for presentation in tables. As a result, small rounding differences may occur.
Level 1 Budget Module – Detailed Narrative:

Name: Governance

Associated Work Plan:
- Adopt Common Core State Standards
- Select vendor(s) for item development services (including training)
- Select vendor(s) for assessment platform (development, delivery, scoring, and reporting)
- Select vendor(s) for formative materials development
- Develop assessment system requirements and specifications

Rationale: A fully enacted and robust governance structure is essential to successfully achieve each of the goals described in the competitive and absolute priorities. As described in section (A)(8), the Consortium will utilize the Lead Procurement State, Executive Committee, and Project Management Partner as part of a system of checks and balances to ensure that Consortium efforts are coordinated efficiently and effectively to realize the design, development, and implementation of the assessment system, consistent with the Consortium’s vision, goals, and Theory of Action. The governance committees will have access to sufficient legal advice to ensure that the risk of legal issues can be mitigated through prevention and good planning. The Consortium will meet regularly through teleconferences and periodically in person, as necessary, to effectively coordinate all of the member States and meet the established time lines. Although travel is budgeted for each set of meetings, the Consortium will attempt to save funds by strategically using online meetings instead. The volume and complexity of the topics will, in part, determine the viability of virtual meetings.

Expenses by Budget Category:

1) Personnel

2) Fringe Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project</th>
<th>Title of Position</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
<th>Fringe Rate</th>
<th>Percent of Time on Project</th>
<th>Total Salary</th>
<th>Total Fringe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington Project Director performs a compliance role to ensure that the deliverables are provided in a manner consistent with the agreement with USED.</td>
<td>FA Project Director</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$68,824</td>
<td>$20,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Fiscal Analyst assists the FA Project Director in reviewing expenditures to ensure that all are consistent with USED agreed-upon budget.</td>
<td>FA Fiscal Analyst</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$145,991</td>
<td>$43,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Project Manager writes, releases, and implements RFPs and contracts on behalf of the Consortium, and monitors the time lines and</td>
<td>FA Project Manager</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$187,702</td>
<td>$56,311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
project plans to ensure that the project will be completed within USED agreed-upon time line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Washington Administrative Support performs administration support as required by the FA.</th>
<th>FA Administrative Support</th>
<th>$24,000</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>$20,022</th>
<th>$6,006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington Contract Analyst assists the FA Project Director in reviewing and monitoring contracts to ensure that deliverables are consistent with contracted work and that contracts and amendments can be expedited through the system rather than using existing personnel exclusively.</td>
<td>FA Contract Analyst</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$145,991</td>
<td>$43,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium Executive Director performs a director role to manage the production of deliverables consistent with the agreement with USED and the direction of the Executive Committee.</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$458,827</td>
<td>$137,648</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. FA = Fiscal Agent
2. Fringe rate is that of the State of Washington, the Fiscal Agent for the Consortium.
3. Inflation has been applied to Salary and Fringe at a rate of 2.8% annually, beginning in year 2.

3) Travel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Type and Purpose of Meeting</th>
<th>Number of Persons per Trip</th>
<th>Number of Days of Trip</th>
<th>Number of Trips</th>
<th>Average Cost per Trip/Person</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Executive Committee consists of eight members and will meet quarterly for the first two years and twice a year for the second two years of the grant period. These meetings will be used to resolve complex issues, achieve consensus on high-level topics and to review complex deliverables. The meetings will also ensure that the Steering Committee is presented with concisely organized topics for their review.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$1,188</td>
<td>$114,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Steering Committee consists of 17 members and will meet every other quarter throughout the grant period. These meetings will be used to ensure that each member State is fully informed of the activities of the Consortium and has ample opportunities to raise and resolve any concerns. The meetings</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,199</td>
<td>$163,092</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
will be used to review complex deliverables and achieve consensus on issues allocated to the Committee by the Executive Committee.

Notes:
1. Travel costs include airfare, hotel, and per diem.
2. Inflation has been applied to travel costs at a rate of 2.8% annually, beginning in year 2.

5) Supplies – Supplies are purchased in association with the Executive and Steering Committee meetings. The assumptions are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplies Category</th>
<th>Enter Description of Supplies/Justification</th>
<th>Monthly Cost per Person</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General office supplies</td>
<td>Supplies needed to support monthly/quarterly meetings</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>$69,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>Paper needed to support monthly/quarterly meetings</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$46,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Office desk</td>
<td>$824 one-time cost</td>
<td>$824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>$721 one-time cost</td>
<td>$721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Standard desktop computer with monitor – 2 needed – Washington Fiscal Agent</td>
<td>$2,607 one-time cost</td>
<td>$2,607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) Contractual – The Consortium Project Management Partner will be provided under contract in the Governance Level 1 budget. Additionally, legal advice from the State of Washington Department of Justice and other outside counsel will be obtained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Services Required</th>
<th>Detailed Description of Services</th>
<th>Basis for Cost Estimates</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Management Partner</td>
<td>The Project Management Partner will assist the Consortium in directing the activities necessary to ensure that Consortium efforts are coordinated efficiently and effectively to realize the design, development, and implementation of the assessment system consistent with the Consortium’s vision, goals, and Theory of Action. The Project Management Partner will be procured by the State of Washington through an open procurement process as described in section (A)(8).</td>
<td>$2,000,000 per year</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Department of Justice</td>
<td>The Washington Department of Justice legal personnel will provide legal advice in the areas of Washington law, procurement and contract review, procurement and contract disputes, compliance reviews by USED, and transfer of authority to a 501(c)3 if appropriate.</td>
<td>$150/hr 480 hours</td>
<td>$73,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External legal consultation</td>
<td>External legal personnel will provide legal services in the areas of civil rights, inter-state and federal law regarding procurement, assessment and accountability, governance and personnel rules and associated State and Federal law, and establishment of an independent 501(c)3, if appropriate.</td>
<td>$350/hr 1,099 hours</td>
<td>$391,343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Washington State has followed the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40–74.48 and Part 80.36 and is consistent with Part II.F of this application. In addition, the Consortium’s plan for managing funds received under this grant category will be governed by the laws and rules of the State of Washington, as the Lead Procurement State, and in accordance with 34 CFR 80.36. Finally, Washington is prepared to follow the guidelines for grant management associated with the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) and will be legally responsible for the use of grant funds and for ensuring that the project is carried out by the Consortium in accordance with Federal requirements. Washington has already established an ARRA Quarterly reporting system (also referred to as 1512 Reporting).
## Level 1 Budget Module – Detailed Table: Assessment Design

### Budget Part B: Level 1 Budget Module – Detailed Table

**Name: Assessment Design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Categories</th>
<th>Project Year 1 (a)</th>
<th>Project Year 2 (b)</th>
<th>Project Year 3 (c)</th>
<th>Project Year 4 (d)</th>
<th>Total (e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personnel</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Travel</td>
<td>$57,000</td>
<td>$58,596</td>
<td>$126,497</td>
<td>$61,923</td>
<td>$304,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supplies</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Contractual</td>
<td>$372,000</td>
<td>$7,825,979</td>
<td>$29,628,922</td>
<td>$59,520,049</td>
<td>$97,346,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Training Stipends</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)</td>
<td>$429,000</td>
<td>$7,884,575</td>
<td>$29,755,419</td>
<td>$59,581,972</td>
<td>$97,650,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Indirect Costs</td>
<td>$41,610</td>
<td>$79,187</td>
<td>$98,837</td>
<td>$80,285</td>
<td>$299,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Total Costs (add lines 9-10)</td>
<td>$470,610</td>
<td>$7,963,761</td>
<td>$29,854,255</td>
<td>$59,662,257</td>
<td>$97,950,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other Funds Allocated toward this Work</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Total Funds Requested (subtract line 12 from line 11)</td>
<td>$470,610</td>
<td>$7,963,761</td>
<td>$29,854,255</td>
<td>$59,662,257</td>
<td>$97,950,884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Based on its Indirect Cost Rate (ICR) agreement with USED, Washington can claim indirect costs against all expenditures per a set rate with the exception of contracts and sub-grants awarded within the grant. For contracts, Washington can claim indirect costs at the set rate against the first $25,000 of the contract value on a yearly basis. For sub-grants that might be awarded, Washington cannot claim any indirect costs. For purposes of the budget submission, indirect costs were calculated using Washington’s ICR agreement (Agreement No. 2010-040) rate of 11.4%.
2. All calculations are done in fractional dollars and rounded to the nearest whole dollar for presentation in tables. As a result, small rounding differences may occur.
Level 1 Budget Module – Detailed Narrative:

Name: Assessment Design

Associated Work Plan:

- Produce test specifications, item-writing specifications, protocols, and training materials
- Field test items using existing online applications and/or stand-alone implementation of new online system as operational pilot
- Field test item performance review (Data Review)
- Summarize definitions of ELs, State policies, practices, and research on accommodations to inform educators, researchers, and other stakeholders across the States in the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium
- Produce a definition, inclusion policies, practices, and a set of accommodations appropriate for SWDs and 504 students that are commonly accepted by educators, researchers, and other stakeholders across the Consortium States
- Identify the characteristics of the accommodation needs of ELs, SWDs, and 504 students in a technology-based assessment environment that are commonly accepted by educators, researchers, and other stakeholders across the States in the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium
- Develop accommodations manual to monitor fidelity in application of inclusion and accommodations guidelines and/or policies by States to ensure consistent and streamlined inclusion and accommodation policies across the Consortium
- Systematically review accommodations for the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium
- Develop performance level descriptors
- Deliver Consortium summative assessment
- Deliver Consortium interim assessment

Rationale: The Consortium intends to create an online adaptive summative assessment that will be administered in grades 3–8 and at least once in high school. The design of the summative assessment is described in Section (A)(3). In addition, the Consortium will provide an online adaptive interim/benchmark assessment for grades 3–8 and high school that will provide for more in-depth assessment of what students know and can do based on smaller clusters of content and to describe incrementally the degree to which students are on track to be college- and career-ready. The design of the interim/benchmark assessment is also described in full in section (A)(3). Finally, as part of the Level 1 budget request, the Consortium will provide formative assessment tools and resources and professional development support for teachers in elementary, middle, and high school as part of the integrated system of teaching and learning described in the Theory of Action (section (A)(2) and in the assessment design section (A)(3)). These assessments will be administered based on a common understanding of the definitions of ELs and SWDs.
Expenses by Budget Category:

1) Personnel

Consortium labor associated with this working group budget will be composed of existing personnel. Therefore, the Consortium has not added any incremental labor costs to its Level 1 budget request.

3) Travel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Type and Purpose of Meeting</th>
<th>Number of Persons per Trip</th>
<th>Number of Days of Trip</th>
<th>Number of Trips</th>
<th>Average Cost per Trip/Person</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Technical Advisory Committee provides detailed technical review of progress regarding the assessment design, application development requirements, approach to psychometrics, design, and results of the research agenda. The advisors will be procured through Washington’s procurement process.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,486</td>
<td>$142,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and Technical Consultants provide support as needed for technical and policy issues that will arise as identified by the technical advisors, policy advisors, Executive Committee, and Steering Committee. The consultants will be procured through Washington's procurement process.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,486</td>
<td>$95,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Level Descriptors Consultant (mathematics) assists the Consortium in deriving common mathematics achievement level descriptors that will be the basis for the common achievement standards that will be used by the Consortium.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,506</td>
<td>$6,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Level Descriptors Consultant (ELA) assists the Consortium in deriving common ELA achievement level descriptors that will be the basis for the common achievement standards that will be used by the Consortium.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,506</td>
<td>$6,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Level Descriptors Committee includes 18 people across elementary, middle, high school, and higher education in each content area to convene for a three-day meeting. Stakeholders will make recommendations regarding the most appropriate achievement level descriptors that best describe a vertically articulated progression of student achievement leading up to college- and career-readiness.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,506</td>
<td>$54,213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Travel costs include airfare, hotel, and per diem.
2. Inflation has been applied to travel costs at a rate of 2.8% annually, beginning in year 2.
Travel requirement for the above advisors and consultants are as follows:
Technical Advisory Committee members and Policy and Technical Consultants will travel and be available for all Executive Committee meetings as required.

The performance level descriptor activities will commence with a three-day meeting of the various committees and consultants. Work will then be done offsite by the consultants with periodic meetings to share the results of work.

6) Contractual – Five major services will be provided under contract in the Level 1 Assessment Design budget. These services are site training, item alignment validation, external systems evaluation and quality control, an accommodations study, and the delivery of the summative and interim assessments. Additionally, an advisory committee, consultants, and outside labor to produce the assessment item performance level descriptors will be procured under contract within the Assessment Design Working Group budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Services Required</th>
<th>Detailed Description of Services</th>
<th>Basis for Cost Estimates</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State training/item alignment validation</td>
<td>Contract assumes 12,000 items validated (mix of summative and interim – $10/item, plus $280,000 for training States to conduct item writing and item review sessions).</td>
<td>Contract assumes 12,000 items validated (mix of summative and interim – $10/item, plus $280,000 for training States to conduct item writing and item review sessions)</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External evaluation and quality control</td>
<td>User acceptance and application testing necessary to ensure that the system meets the needs of the Consortium and provides high-quality assessments and reports to its stakeholders. The contractor(s) will be procured through Washington’s procurement process.</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation study</td>
<td>Build consensus and understanding among members regarding accommodations for ELs and SWDs through research of current approaches, best practices, and clear documentation of the new common system. The contractor(s) will be procured through Washington's procurement process if the associated Enhanced Assessment Grant is not awarded.</td>
<td>$1,500,000 Detailed budget developed</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Provide detailed technical advice regarding assessment design, development, administration, and reporting. Advisory Committee will include national experts who will contribute their knowledge and expertise regarding universal design and item writing, psychometrics, accommodations for ELs and SWDs, standard setting, etc.</td>
<td>12 people at $1,500 per day – 24 days</td>
<td>$450,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Cost Description</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and Technical Consultants</td>
<td>Advise Executive Committee and Steering Committee as required. These consultants will assist with small-scale research studies and targeted advice regarding policy questions, technical assessment issues, and information systems as required by the Consortium.</td>
<td>8 people at $1,500 per day – 106 days</td>
<td>$1,329,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Level Descriptors Consultant – Mathematics</td>
<td>Assist the Consortium in deriving common mathematics achievement level descriptors that will be the basis for the common achievement standards. The consultant will be procured through Washington’s procurement process.</td>
<td>$200/hr – 320 hours</td>
<td>$67,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Level Descriptors Consultant – ELA</td>
<td>Assist the Consortium in deriving common ELA achievement level descriptors that will be the basis for the common achievement standards. The consultant will be procured through Washington’s procurement process.</td>
<td>$200/hr – 320 hours</td>
<td>$67,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Level Descriptors Committee Members</td>
<td>Recommend the most appropriate achievement level descriptors that best describe a vertically articulated progression of student achievement leading up to college- and career-readiness. Members of these panels will include representative educators from the Governing States to be selected by the Executive Committee based on nominations.</td>
<td>18 people across elementary, middle, high school, and higher education in each content area – total of 36 people – $150/day – 9 days</td>
<td>$51,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative assessment</td>
<td>Cost is for delivery of the summative assessment and all components. Total cost encompasses item development, accommodations development, scoring, and psychometrics work, as well as costs that are needed to support all of these functions.</td>
<td>Costs were built up using the test design as the driver. ASG used its proprietary costing model to derive costs using per unit rates, labor and travel assumptions, etc.</td>
<td>$66,726,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim/Benchmark assessment</td>
<td>Cost is for delivery of the Interim/Benchmark Assessment and all components. Total cost encompasses item development, accommodations development, scoring, and psychometrics work, as well as costs that are needed to support all of these functions.</td>
<td>Costs were built up using the test design as the driver. ASG used its proprietary costing model to derive costs using per unit rates, labor, and travel assumptions, etc.</td>
<td>$25,953,940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State training/item alignment validation – An outside vendor will be hired to train educators on how to write items in accordance with the CCSS and the design of the SBAC assessment system. Once items have been written, the vendor will review the items to ensure that they do align to the standards developed as detailed in the CCSS, as well as the assessment system design.

External Evaluation and Quality Control – The external evaluation and quality control vendor will perform user acceptance testing of the assessment system. Numerous “use cases” will be created, and the vendor will test the application and GUI against these cases to ensure that the
system operates as intended. The vendor will run numerous tests to ensure that the system is user friendly and meets the specifications of the Consortium.

Accommodations Study – The study will produce a definition, inclusion policies, practices, and a set of accommodations appropriate for ELs, SWDs, and 504 students that are commonly accepted by educators, researchers, and other stakeholders across the Consortium States.

The Technical Advisory Committee will advise the Steering Committee, Project Management Partner, and Assessment Design Working Group on high-level technical and policy aspects of the assessment. Meetings of these individuals are designed to coincide with Steering Committee meetings.

The Consortium will employ the services of eight additional consultants to advise on a number of issues. These individuals will work more intensely with the Assessment Design Working Group and other working groups and will have deliverables related to the design and development of the actual assessment system. They will be available to attend the Steering committee and other meetings as required.

Once items have been field tested and the assessment system has been well defined, performance level descriptors for the items will be developed. The Consortium anticipates contracting with representatives from the elementary, middle, and high school and higher education and specific experts in mathematics and ELA to develop the descriptors.

Summative and Interim/Benchmark Assessment Contracts – Vendors will be hired to deliver both the summative and interim/benchmark assessments. A write-up of the assessments and cost assumptions follows:

A contractor or contractors will be hired to facilitate the design and development of the summative and interim/benchmark assessments for the Consortium. The estimated costs for development of the summative assessment are budgeted at $67 million, and the interim/benchmark assessment development costs are projected to be $26 million.

After the grant is completed, the per-student operational cost of the summative and interim/benchmark assessments are projected to be $19.81 and $7.50, respectively. These low operational costs reflect the innovative design of the assessment and the power of the Consortium to share the fixed and variable costs of assessment design and the fixed costs of implementation. A computerized adaptive test (CAT), while having high initial item development costs, affords low per-student costs in the operational years. The SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium assessment system will be very cost effective for its member States while at the same time delivering a much higher-quality assessment than is currently being delivered to students by the large majority of member States. Due to the strategic use of technology and systems that will increase efficiency for all States (such as use of a Web-based item development system, development of an online delivery platform for administering the assessments, and development and implementation of a centralized system for use in storing all test items and data, conducting psychometric analyses, and reporting assessment results), the Consortium’s per-student costs are projected to be lower under this high-quality assessment
system than the costs most member States incur today for their current assessment systems. Once the computer adaptive testing system is in place, costs for printing, shipping, scanning of test books, warehousing, and distribution are eliminated, and ongoing costs are sharply reduced versus those of paper-and-pencil tests.

These projected costs are based on a very specific set of unit-based costs and have been adjusted for inflation in anticipation of the true costs required for 2014–15, assuming an annual inflation rate of 2.8%.

**Assessment Development**

The Consortium contracted with the Assessment Solutions Group (ASG) to assist in the estimation of the price of its proposed new assessment system. ASG has developed a proprietary assessment cost model, based on real assessment data and the extensive testing-industry experience of the members of the group. The model was used to estimate both the development costs and the ongoing operational costs of the summative and interim/benchmark assessments developed by the Consortium. As required by the Consortium, ASG conducted specific independent research into the potential costs of new testing technologies and development of innovative item types. The Consortium supplied detailed information to ASG regarding the Consortium’s approach to governance, the proposed assessment design and administration, and methods of scoring to be used for each item type. All of the key variables required to provide the necessary inputs for the ASG cost model used in generating expected assessment development and operational costs were jointly developed by the Consortium and ASG. An extensive cost analysis was then conducted by ASG in order to maximize the educational benefits of the assessment while minimizing the overall costs of the entire program. This process of data modeling, analysis, cost projection, and review created the most effective design within the available budget. The calculated costs and key assumptions by major functional area are as follows:

**Content Development ($56M of assessment development costs)**

Item development costs and total items to be developed during the four-year project period are shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Development Costs</th>
<th>Summative Assessment</th>
<th>Interim/Benchmark Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Item Development</td>
<td>Operational Items Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selected Response</strong></td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>11,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constructed Response</strong></td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>2,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology Enabled</strong></td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>13,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Events</strong></td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>1,309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Performance events from the summative assessment are released and used on the interim/benchmark assessment.

Development Period – Because sufficiently sized item pools are needed for use of a CAT, a formula for the number of operational items required by grade and content area was derived based on the number of content strands in the content area/grade, the minimum number of score
points required per strand, the number of performance levels reported, a factor to take item randomness into account, and the number of opportunities for a student to take the assessment. The total number of items the Consortium anticipates including in the operational pool is sufficient to meet the test blueprint and to accurately measure the full range of student achievement, and is consistent with item pool requirements found in the literature on the design and use of CATs.\(^8\)

The difference in number between the total items developed and operational items developed is based on an assumption regarding the volume of items that are anticipated to “fall out” at various points of review (e.g., content, bias/sensitivity, universal design) and field testing during the life cycle of the items. The total number of items required for development is therefore based on the minimum operational item bank requirements as prescribed by the formula described above, plus additional items necessary to compensate for the anticipated fall-out rate. The assumptions used in the model include a 40% fall-out rate for selected-response, technology-enabled, and constructed-response items, and a 50% fall-out rate for performance events. The fall-out rate for the performance events is based on the experience of several advisors who have expertise in this area.

While the major expense item in this category is the cost of developing the items themselves ($40 million), there are additional expenditures that must be estimated to arrive at total content development costs. Additional content development costs calculated included ancillary development, art procurement, items received from existing State item banks, and the costs for permissions and preparation of a paper-based form. ASG’s proprietary cost model contains factors to arrive at these costs.

- Ancillary development includes development of ancillary materials and manipulatives that are required to assist the student in completion of the assessment. These items may include enhancements and tools to the online system including calculators, rulers, protractors, conversion tables, etc. These ancillaries are intended to be online, thus printing and shipping costs are not included. The costs for these items are estimated at $6 million and are based on vendor quoted information, as well as current industry standards. These costs may be incorporated directly into the test delivery application development.

- Typically a certain percentage of mathematics and English language arts items will contain graphic information/art that is procured from various available sources. Typical costs for this art are projected to be $3 million and are included in the content development calculations.

- The cost for States to prepare existing items in their item banks for electronic transfer to the Consortium and the permissions cost for those items are included in the calculations. An assumption was made that 25% of the selected-response items and 15% of the

---

constructed-response items required would be supplied from existing State item banks. All performance events and technology-enhanced items will be developed during the grant period and will not be supplemented by State item banks. The costs for this work are estimated at $3 million.

- Permissions costs for new items developed by the Consortium, in both the development period and the operational period, have been estimated at $4 million and have also been included.

- Finally, as a risk mitigation strategy and as part of the research design to ensure that all students are able to access the system, money is allocated for forms construction costs necessary to prepare a paper backup form for use in the rare circumstances of an online system failure where students would not have access to the CAT or for a small percentage of students that cannot otherwise access the CAT system. New items for this form are also part of the content development expense and are estimated at less than $1 million.

Content Development in the Operational Period – Although not included in the grant budget, estimated costs of the operational system are included in this proposal as evidence of ongoing sustainability. The elements comprising the cost estimate for item development during the operational period are the same as those included for the development period as described above. However, the operational cost estimate must include as additional factors, item release rates (the number of items taken out of the testing system and shared with the general public) and the number of items the Consortium would like to develop (in addition to those required for the operational test) for future use and have stored in an item bank. Consistent with other adaptive assessment systems, the Consortium will release 1% of its operational selected-response, technology-enhanced, and traditional constructed-response items. Beginning in 2014–15, released items from the summative assessment will be incorporated into the interim/benchmark assessment materials for use as resources to teachers for professional development. To replace those items that are released, roughly 10% more items than are required for the operational assessment will be developed in order to build the item bank. Unless research proves otherwise, it is assumed that the performance events will be more memorable and will be released at a rate of 100% each year. The Consortium will maintain a bank of secure operational performance events equal to approximately 30 events per content area per grade.

Item Development Cost Containment Measures – The model assumes standard per item development rates. However, the Consortium will implement strategies that have a strong potential to reduce costs. A proportion of the new items that are developed will be written by teachers from the participating States. These teachers will be trained by the Consortium and will use the item authoring system that will be created for this use. In addition, 25% of the selected-response items and 15% of the constructed-response items will be supplied from existing State item banks. Another important approach that will be used is separating contracts for key services, for example, item development for each of the content areas or for the technology-enabled items and performance events, which has the potential to reduce costs as multiple parties will be able to bid for a specialized large volume of work. Additionally, more than one vendor will be selected to develop items in order to enhance competition once the development contract(s) have been awarded.
Labor-Related Functions ($5M of assessment development costs)

Functions that are largely labor-related and relatively fixed in their nature have been included in the estimate of assessment costs for both the summative and interim/benchmark assessments. ASG maintains labor payroll information based on the U.S. Labor Department database, that includes labor rates for numerous job classifications and categories. Up-to-date labor rates by percentile and region of the country are maintained, allowing ASG to model costs based on anticipated labor rates and region of the country where the work will be performed. Labor costs have been modeled in both the assessment development and operational periods, and the calculation methods and models are virtually identical in both.

- Information Technology – The costs for fully integrating different scoring systems and developing consolidated reports and reporting formats are included in this category. It is anticipated that different scoring systems will be used for selected-response and technology-enhanced items as compared to the scoring systems required for traditional constructed-response items and performance events. To keep the costs affordable to States, artificial intelligence (AI) will be the primary method of scoring the constructed-response items and performance events. Consistent with the Theory of Action, teachers will play an important role in validating the AI scoring by participating in a “read-behind” role during the scoring process. In addition, the Consortium will leverage the read-behinds as a critical professional development opportunity for teachers. For performance events, the Consortium assumes that most of the traits upon which the students will be assessed will be scored via AI; however, the Consortium is budgeting for 1/3 of the performance events points to be rated by teachers in addition to the read-behinds described above to ensure reliable scoring of student work that may not be as effectively evaluated via AI technology. The cost for this labor is estimated at $1.5 million.

- Program Management – Program management labor is provided by the assessment vendor to help ensure that the program is delivered on schedule and with the quality required. Large programs of this nature will have many staff members assigned to the contract to manage the various aspects of the program. (The program management personnel assigned to the contract are exclusive of those in the governance, professional development, system design, etc., functions.) Costs for the program management function are included for the development and operational periods of both the summative and interim/benchmark assessments. The number of personnel required is calculated based on the number of students, States, and domains assessed. The cost of the labor is based on the labor rate tables described previously. The costs for the program management labor are estimated at $1 million.

- Psychometrics – The labor to evaluate the developed items and test results to ensure that the assessments are valid, reliable, and technically sound is included in the psychometrics function. Major activities to be performed by psychometricians assigned to the program include item analysis, Differential Item Functioning (DIF) analysis, computation of reliability indices, equating, scaling (both horizontal and vertical), standard setting, and dimensionality analysis, in addition to validity studies. Psychometricians will attend
critical meetings regarding item content, bias/sensitivity reviews, data reviews, and standard setting, as well as TAC meetings and management and planning sessions. The costs for the psychometric labor are estimated at $2 million and are exclusive of the research agenda and technical consultants.

- **Quality Assurance** – The labor to review item rendering, online adaptive selection algorithms, scoring systems, and other programs is provided by the vendor’s quality assurance/quality control function. The size of the QA team assigned to the contract is based on the number of procedural areas that the vendor and customer elect to closely monitor and the complexity of the data and/or processes to be checked. Typically, the equating/scaling and scoring functions receive the bulk of the quality control attention. The costs for the QA function are estimated at less than $1 million for the development period and are exclusive of the independent quality control that will be conducted by the Consortium.

**Online Delivery ($1.5M of assessment development costs)**

The costs for an online adaptive test delivery system including scoring of selected-response and computer-enabled items, hosting, maintenance, and other associated system costs have been estimated at $2–$3 per student per year depending on the number of assessments taken by a student. One-time per-test charges to prepare the system, generate the scoring programs, and render the items in the online environment are also included in the one-time online delivery system cost estimates. The data for these assumptions were gathered by ASG staff based on interviews with several online test vendors. A survey was also developed and sent to technology vendors to help estimate future costs for the various technology functions and inputs assumed in the cost projections. Based on the information that was collected, the vendor information was cross-validated, summarized, and presented to the Consortium in order to specify appropriate costs for setting up the online delivery system. This approach is helpful in determining a budget for a testing platform that will be cost effective for the States.

The same assumptions regarding online systems costs are used in both the development and operational assessment periods. Although the costs for the summative and interim/benchmark applications are estimated separately, there is a strong likelihood that the Consortium will be able to reduce costs by selecting a vendor, or otherwise developing a system on its own, that is able to supply a single system that will be scalable, flexible, and robust to meet the summative and interim/benchmark requirements as described in this proposal.

**Production, Manufacturing and Distribution ($4M of assessment development costs)**

Application support for item-based accommodations (e.g., audio and visual enhancements, refreshable Braille) is included in this part of the assessment cost model. ASG also modeled accommodations costs for the items that will be rendered by the online delivery system. Costs for all of these accommodations can be significant; typical rates quoted from vendors were used in the cost analysis. Over $4 million is budgeted for accommodations. This is in addition to the $1.5 million budgeted in the Assessment Design Working Group budget for an accommodations study to survey the various different accommodations provided to special populations and to develop an inclusive, effective, sustainable and efficient common accommodations policy for the Consortium.
The above assumptions are consistent for both the assessment development and operational periods.

**Scoring ($22M of assessment development costs)**

Scoring costs are a key component of total assessment costs and much care has been taken to estimate the projected scoring costs as accurately as possible. Several different types of scoring methods will be utilized by the Consortium. Selected-response and technology-enhanced items will be scored by the online test delivery system, constructed-response items and performance events will be scored by both AI and human (teacher) scoring systems. Ten percent of the constructed-response items and one-third of the points associated with performance events in the summative assessment will be doubled-scored by teachers to ensure accuracy of scores and provide teachers with valuable professional development.

The online system will be used to score the selected-response and technology-enhanced items, and those scoring costs are included in the per-student usage fee described above. The following table provides a summary of the scoring methodology for constructed-response items and performance events in the summative assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBAC Extended Response Scoring Methodology</th>
<th>Summative Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constructed Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Read</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human (Teacher)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Read behind</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human (Teacher)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Read</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human (Teacher)</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Read behind</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human (Teacher)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next table provides a summary of the scoring methodology for constructed-response items and performance events in the interim/benchmark assessment.
Artificial intelligence scoring system costs were estimated based on discussions with vendors. Scoring costs were calculated assuming both fixed-and variable-cost components. The fixed cost/system per-item training fee was estimated at $4,000. This figure represents the cost of gathering papers to cover responses at every score point in the rubric and training the system. Typically about 400 papers per item are required to be created and then input to the AI system. The AI system then scores the actual student responses based on the rubric developed and training papers fed into the system. Per score costs were estimated at $0.20 an item for English language arts and $0.50 for mathematics. The per score costs cover the vendor costs for servers, hosting, and bandwidth. Both of the estimates for the system training and per item fees are lower than current prices for AI systems and represent expectations, after discussions with vendors and results of the technology survey, of future prices and the impact that significant volumes of business will have on price. The estimated cost for AI scoring is $19 million. Calculation methods are the same for both the assessment development and operational periods. The assumption is that teachers will be paid a stipend of $150 per day to score items. Reader rates (the time it takes to read and score an item) for the constructed-response items were based on ASG proprietary data for these types of items. For the performance events, a conservative estimate was that it will take a teacher six minutes to score each one, on average. This estimate is based on the Consortium’s research of these types of items and will help ensure that the budget can support the richness of the performance tasks that are envisioned. These items will be scored on multiple rubrics, and teacher reader rates reflect the extra time necessary to score the performance event items according to the number of rubrics and scoring points associated with them. Training time for teachers has been included as have other related scoring costs. Finally,
an estimate of the ongoing costs for the use of a scoring moderation system to track teacher scores, monitor teacher-scored papers against pre-scored papers and otherwise ensure that the system and scoring quality are operating as planned has been added to the calculated teacher scoring costs. It is assumed that 25% of the teacher scoring cost is for the use of the scoring application. It is estimated that teacher scoring costs will be $3 million in the development period.

The SBAC assessment design allows all students to take the summative and interim/benchmark assessments twice. Scoring calculations have been modeled based on an assumption that 25% of students will take each assessment twice. However, the number of times that each student can access the system is likely limited more by the item bank than by contracts established with vendors. As the item bank grows, it is possible that student access to the assessment system will grow as well. This may be particularly important for the interim/benchmark assessment.

Interim/Benchmark Assessment Cost Containment Measures – A few cost containment measures were taken when designing the interim/benchmark assessment. The performance events used on the interim/benchmark assessment are to be taken from performance items that have been on previous summative assessments and have been released, thus saving AI system training costs. Also, only performance events that can be scored by AI systems will be used on the interim/benchmark assessment in the development period. The cost for teacher scoring of items is calculated the same way in both the assessment development and ongoing operational periods.

Travel ($4.5M of assessment development costs)
Travel costs for development, program management, and scoring are included in the costs of the assessment system. Development travel includes meetings for content, bias/sensitivity, accessibility, and data reviews as well as standard-setting meetings. ASG maintains an up-to-date database based on the GSA travel rate tables to calculate airfares, hotel rates, and per diem allowances. Program management travel has been included to account for trips that the managers of the assessment function require to ensure that the program is carried out as planned. Scoring travel represents the costs to travel for range finding, anchor pulling, and other meetings related to scoring constructed-response items and performance events.

Meeting costs are estimated by the number of people attending each type of meeting and the expected length of the meeting (number of days) for both the assessment development and operational periods.

Washington State has followed the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40–74.48 and Part 80.36, and is consistent with Part II.F of this application. In addition, the Consortium’s plan for managing funds received under this grant category will be governed by the laws and rules of the State of Washington, as the Lead Procurement State, and in accordance with 34 CFR 80.36. Finally, Washington is prepared to follow the guidelines for grant management associated with the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) and will be legally responsible for the use of grant funds and for ensuring that the project is carried out by the Consortium in accordance with Federal requirements. Washington has already established an ARRA Quarterly reporting system (also referred to as 1512 Reporting).
# Level 1 Budget Module – Detailed Table: System Design

## Budget Part B: Level 1 Budget Module – Detailed Table

**Name:** System Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Categories</th>
<th>Project Year 1 (a)</th>
<th>Project Year 2 (b)</th>
<th>Project Year 3 (c)</th>
<th>Project Year 4 (d)</th>
<th>Total (e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personnel</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Travel</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supplies</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Contractual</td>
<td>$337,500</td>
<td>$38,550</td>
<td>$13,210</td>
<td>$13,580</td>
<td>$402,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Training Stipends</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)</td>
<td>$337,500</td>
<td>$38,550</td>
<td>$13,210</td>
<td>$13,580</td>
<td>$402,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Indirect Costs</td>
<td>$19,950</td>
<td>$2,850</td>
<td>$1,506</td>
<td>$1,548</td>
<td>$25,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Total Costs (add lines 9-10)</td>
<td>$357,450</td>
<td>$41,400</td>
<td>$14,716</td>
<td>$15,128</td>
<td>$428,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other Funds Allocated toward this Work</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Total Funds Requested (subtract line 12 from line 11)</td>
<td>$357,450</td>
<td>$41,400</td>
<td>$14,716</td>
<td>$15,128</td>
<td>$428,693</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

1. Based on its Indirect Cost Rate (ICR) agreement with USED, Washington can claim indirect costs against all expenditures per a set rate with the exception of contracts and sub-grants awarded within the grant. For contracts, Washington can claim indirect costs at the set rate against the first $25,000 of the contract value on a yearly basis. For sub-grants that might be awarded, Washington cannot claim any indirect costs. For purposes of the budget submission, indirect costs were calculated using Washington’s ICR agreement (Agreement No. 2010-040) rate of 11.4%.

2. All calculations are done in fractional dollars and rounded to the nearest whole dollar for presentation in tables. As a result, small rounding differences may occur.
Level 1 Budget Module – Detailed Narrative:

Name: System Design

Associated Work Plan:

Development of the following scopes of services:
- Test delivery application
- Professional development and curriculum support application
- Item alignment and item writing training
- External evaluation/QC/user acceptance testing
- Web-based item authoring and item banking application
- Reporting and data storage central — HB’ application

Rationale: SBAC is committed to the development of a coherent system in which summative assessments, interim/benchmark assessments, formative tools, and curriculum resources work together to improve teaching and learning. Combining these system elements with the technology required to deliver them comprises the SBAC assessment system. Resources are provided in this area to ensure that any request for services or description of work is clear and comprehensive.

Expenses by Budget Category:

1) Personnel

Consortium labor associated with this working group budget will be composed of existing personnel. Therefore, the Consortium has not added any incremental labor costs to its Level 1 budget request.

6) Contractual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Services Required</th>
<th>Detailed Description of Services</th>
<th>Basis for Cost Estimates</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test delivery application</td>
<td>Contractor will write a detailed statement of work that addresses the full breadth of test delivery requirements as described in this application and based on consultation with the Executive and Steering Committees. The statement of work will be written consistent with the laws of the State of Washington.</td>
<td>$50,000 contract</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD curriculum support development</td>
<td>Contractor will write a detailed statement of work that addresses the full breadth of curriculum support and professional development as described in this application including resources to assist teachers in understanding the aspects of the assessment system. The statement of work will be written consistent with the laws of the State of Washington.</td>
<td>$50,000 contract</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item alignment</td>
<td>Contractor will write a detailed statement of work that ensures that there are sufficient resources to support the necessary item writing training, item writing, and item alignment work necessary to deliver the assessment. The statement of work will be written consistent with the laws of the State of Washington.</td>
<td>$50,000 contract</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External evaluation/audit/QC</td>
<td>Contractor will write a detailed statement of work that ensures that there are sufficient resources devoted to performing quality control and supporting user acceptance testing for the test delivery, “hub,” and item banking applications that will be developed and the associated documentation that will be produced in support of the application. The statement of work will be written consistent with the laws of the State of Washington.</td>
<td>$50,000 contract</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item banking application</td>
<td>Contractor will write a detailed statement of work that ensures that the item banking application supports the distributed item writing and item review required by the Consortium. The statement of work will be written consistent with the laws of the State of Washington.</td>
<td>$50,000 contract</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting application and central archive database application, professional development delivery application</td>
<td>Contractor will write a detailed statement of work that ensures that the “hub” is robust and is able to store all of the data that will be necessary to support the analysis and calibration of items and delivery of high-quality reports of student achievement and growth in student achievement. The “hub” will also deliver professional development information to educators. The statement of work will be written consistent with the laws of the State of Washington.</td>
<td>$50,000 contract</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost support</td>
<td>As necessary, consultant advice regarding the cost estimates included as the basis for the statement of work as well as reviews of the bids of contractors to ensure they are within the bounds of industry standards. May be included as part of the Project Management Partner duties.</td>
<td>$2,500/day 40 days</td>
<td>$102,839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Advisers – Support for various assessment design and delivery functions
Washington State has followed the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40 – 74.48 and Part 80.36, and is consistent with Part II.F of this application. In addition, the Consortium’s plan for managing funds received under this grant category will be governed by the laws and rules of the State of Washington, as the Lead Procurement State, and in accordance with 34 CFR 80.36. Finally, Washington is prepared to follow the guidelines for grant management associated with the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), and will be legally responsible for the use of grant funds and for ensuring that the project is carried out by the Consortium in accordance with Federal requirements. Washington has already established an ARRA Quarterly reporting system (also referred to as 1512 Reporting).
## Level 1 Budget Module – Detailed Table: Research and Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Categories</th>
<th>Project Year 1 (a)</th>
<th>Project Year 2 (b)</th>
<th>Project Year 3 (c)</th>
<th>Project Year 4 (d)</th>
<th>Total (e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personnel</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Travel</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supplies</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Contractual</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Training Stipends</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Indirect Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,850</td>
<td>$2,850</td>
<td>$2,850</td>
<td>$8,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Total Costs (add lines 9-10)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,002,850</td>
<td>$2,002,850</td>
<td>$2,002,850</td>
<td>$5,008,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other Funds Allocated toward this Work</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Total Funds Requested (subtract line 12 from line 11)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,002,850</td>
<td>$2,002,850</td>
<td>$2,002,850</td>
<td>$5,008,550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
1. Based on its Indirect Cost Rate (ICR) agreement with USED, Washington can claim indirect costs against all expenditures per a set rate with the exception of contracts and sub-grants awarded within the grant. For contracts, Washington can claim indirect costs at the set rate against the first $25,000 of the contract value on a yearly basis. For sub-grants that might be awarded, Washington cannot claim any indirect costs. For purposes of the budget submission, indirect costs were calculated using Washington’s ICR agreement (Agreement No. 2010-040) rate of 11.4%.
2. All calculations are done in fractional dollars and rounded to the nearest whole dollar for presentation in tables. As a result, small rounding differences may occur.
Level 1 Budget Module – Detailed Narrative:

Name: Research and Evaluation

Associated Work Plan:

- Collection of evidence of validity
- Research planning activities
- Assessment design and development research
- Pilot of operational assessment
- Operational psychometrics
  - Psychometric evaluation
  - Evaluation activities
  - Data collection strategies
  - Evaluation questions

See also Tables A5-2 and A5-3 for further information.

Rationale: The Consortium has a robust research plan that will be headed by the Research and Evaluation Working Group to ensure that the assessment system has integrity and is characterized by high technical quality, that the measurement components are trustworthy and fair, and that results are useful for the purposes intended.

Expenses by Budget Category:

1) Personnel
Consortium labor associated with this working group budget will be composed of existing personnel. Therefore, the Consortium has not added any incremental labor costs to its Level 1 budget request.

6) Contractual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Services Required</th>
<th>Detailed Description of Services</th>
<th>Basis for Cost Estimates</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research and Evaluation</td>
<td>The Consortium will procure contractors to engage in the Consortium’s extensive research agenda. This includes deriving recommendations on the best approach to measuring growth and investigations of the opportunities for flexibility as described in the proposal including the options for through-course assessments and greater flexibility in test administration conditions.</td>
<td>An independent psychometrician reviewed the Consortium research agenda to estimate the price of providing the research and studies described in Section (A)(5).</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A contract will be issued to a vendor(s) to perform the numerous research studies outlined in section (A)(5) of the document.
Washington State has followed the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40–74.48 and Part 80.36, and is consistent with Part II.F of this application. In addition, the Consortium’s plan for managing funds received under this grant category will be governed by the laws and rules of the State of Washington, as the Lead Procurement State, and in accordance with 34 CFR 80.36. Finally, Washington is prepared to follow the guidelines for grant management associated with the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), and will be legally responsible for the use of grant funds and for ensuring that the project is carried out by the Consortium in accordance with Federal requirements. Washington has already established an ARRA Quarterly reporting system (also referred to as 1512 Reporting).
## Level 1 Budget Module – Detailed Table: Professional Capacity and Outreach

**Budget Part B: Level 1 Budget Module – Detailed Table**

**Name: Professional Capacity and Outreach**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Categories</th>
<th>Project Year 1 (a)</th>
<th>Project Year 2 (b)</th>
<th>Project Year 3 (c)</th>
<th>Project Year 4 (d)</th>
<th>Total (e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personnel</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Travel</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supplies</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Contractual</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,505,000</td>
<td>$3,010,000</td>
<td>$3,010,000</td>
<td>$7,525,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Training Stipends</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,505,000</td>
<td>$3,010,000</td>
<td>$3,010,000</td>
<td>$7,525,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Indirect Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,550</td>
<td>$8,550</td>
<td>$8,550</td>
<td>$25,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Total Costs (add lines 9-10)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,513,550</td>
<td>$3,018,550</td>
<td>$3,018,550</td>
<td>$7,550,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other Funds Allocated toward this Work</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Total Funds Requested (subtract line 12 from line 11)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,513,550</td>
<td>$3,018,550</td>
<td>$3,018,550</td>
<td>$7,550,650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Based on its Indirect Cost Rate (ICR) agreement with USED, Washington can claim indirect costs against all expenditures per a set rate with the exception of contracts and sub-grants awarded within the grant. For contracts, Washington can claim indirect costs at the set rate against the first $25,000 of the contract value on a yearly basis. For sub-grants that might be awarded, Washington cannot claim any indirect costs. For purposes of the budget submission, indirect costs were calculated using Washington’s ICR agreement (Agreement No. 2010-040) rate of 11.4%.

2. All calculations are done in fractional dollars and rounded to the nearest whole dollar for presentation in tables. As a result, small rounding differences may occur.
Level 1 Budget Module – Detailed Narrative:

Name: Professional Capacity and Outreach

Associated Work Plan Items:

- Hire outside public relations firm
- Build teacher resources in development and scoring of summative, interim/benchmark, and formative assessments
- Build teacher resources in instructional/curriculum support
- Build outreach and communications plans for States
- Develop communications materials for States
- Develop SBAC website

Rationale: Building the professional capacity of teachers and administrators is central to our Theory of Action; therefore, SBAC has a comprehensive plan to involve them at all phases of development and implementation of our balanced assessment system and to provide them with the types of tools and supports that research has shown to be essential to change behaviors of teachers and students in the classroom. We also know that reform will not be successful without strong support outside of schools, so we are committed to implementing a comprehensive program for communicating with a broad set of stakeholders. Professional capacity building and outreach efforts will extend from Consortium member States to districts, schools, and classrooms to promote explicit and meaningful connections between the CCSS, instruction, assessment, and effective data use.

Expenses by Budget Category:

1) Personnel
Consortium labor associated with this working group budget will be composed of existing personnel. Therefore, the Consortium has not added any incremental labor costs to its Level 1 budget request.

6) Contractual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Services Required</th>
<th>Detailed Description of Services</th>
<th>Basis for Cost Estimates</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional development, curriculum, and instructional support vendor</td>
<td>Design the teacher professional development, curriculum, and instructional support materials.</td>
<td>Discussions with industry experts</td>
<td>$5,125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSSO contract</td>
<td>Support States through SCASS and train-the-trainer model. The Consortium will work through CCSSO via its SCASS model to support States in their training efforts around the new assessment system, uses of the system, and reasons for its use.</td>
<td>Current CCSSO SCASS model. The Consortium</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professional Development, Curriculum, and Instructional Support Vendor – A contract is estimated at $5.125 million to hire an outside vendor to design the teacher professional development, curriculum, and instructional support materials.

CCSSO Contract – The Consortium will work through CCSSO via its SCASS model to support States in their training efforts around the new assessment system, uses of the system, and reason for its implementation. The Consortium will fund two SCASS groups at $15,000 each for 15 States for two years.

Washington State has followed the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40–74.48 and Part 80.36, and is consistent with Part II.F of this application. In addition, the Consortium’s plan for managing funds received under this grant category will be governed by the laws and rules of the State of Washington, as the Lead Procurement State, and in accordance with 34 CFR 80.36. Finally, Washington is prepared to follow the guidelines for grant management associated with the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), and will be legally responsible for the use of grant funds and for ensuring that the project is carried out by the Consortium in accordance with Federal requirements. Washington has already established an ARRA Quarterly reporting system (also referred to as 1512 Reporting).
### Level 1 Budget Module – Detailed Table: Technology

**Budget Part B: Level 1 Budget Module – Detailed Table**

**Name: Technology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Categories</th>
<th>Project Year 1 (a)</th>
<th>Project Year 2 (b)</th>
<th>Project Year 3 (c)</th>
<th>Project Year 4 (d)</th>
<th>Total (e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personnel</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Travel</td>
<td>$32,200</td>
<td>$33,102</td>
<td>$34,028</td>
<td>$34,981</td>
<td>$134,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supplies</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Contractual</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
<td>$10,686,352</td>
<td>$10,688,770</td>
<td>$5,391,255</td>
<td>$26,850,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Training Stipends</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$116,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,719,454</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,722,798</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,426,237</strong></td>
<td><strong>$26,984,689</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Indirect Costs</td>
<td>$13,247</td>
<td>$25,018</td>
<td>$25,399</td>
<td>$25,791</td>
<td>$89,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. Total Costs (add lines 9-10)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$129,447</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,744,471</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,748,197</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,452,028</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,074,143</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other Funds Allocated Toward this Work</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13. Total Funds Requested (subtract line 12 from line 11)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$129,447</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,744,471</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,748,197</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,452,028</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,074,143</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Based on its Indirect Cost Rate (ICR) agreement with USED, Washington can claim indirect costs against all expenditures per a set rate with the exception of contracts and sub-grants awarded within the grant. For contracts, Washington can claim indirect costs at the set rate against the first $25,000 of the contract value on a yearly basis. For sub-grants that might be awarded, Washington cannot claim any indirect costs. For purposes of the budget submission, indirect costs were calculated using Washington’s ICR agreement (Agreement No. 2010-040) rate of 11.4%.

2. All calculations are done in fractional dollars and rounded to the nearest whole dollar for presentation in tables. As a result, small rounding differences may occur.
Level 1 Budget Module – Detailed Narrative:

Name: Technology

Associated Work Plan:
- Hire systems integrator to manage and tie together technology applications
- Develop database/hub, data archiving, reporting, and professional development delivery system
- Development of computerized assessment delivery platform
- Development of web-based item authoring, item metadata storage, and item banking application

Rationale: Innovative and efficient use of technology is the hallmark of the SBAC model and serves as the backbone of the proposed assessment system. SBAC asserts that the expanded use of technology will increase student access to and engagement in assessment, lead to more valid and timely assessment results, and lead to efficiencies and enhancements for professional development and resource tools. Specifically, SBAC will

1. Use technology to efficiently deliver training programs, resources, score reports, data, and interactive Web-based social networks designed for teacher use in the development and dissemination of effective curriculum and instructional practices, etc;
2. Create innovative and real-world item types that rely on technology platforms; and
3. Use adaptive item selection engines, drawing on a broad item pool, to ensure that accurate measures of student achievement are possible across a wide performance continuum without undue burden.

Expenses by Budget Category:

1) Personnel
Consortium labor associated with this working group budget will be composed of existing personnel. Therefore, the Consortium has not added any incremental labor costs to its Level 1 budget request.

3) Travel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Type and Purpose of Meeting</th>
<th>Number of Persons per Trip</th>
<th>Number of Days of Trip</th>
<th>Number of Trips</th>
<th>Average Cost per Trip/Person</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Implementation and IT Technical Committee meetings will be the basis for sharing best practices among States regarding large-scale implementation of assessment applications and to ensure successful project rollout through in-depth planning and problem solving.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$1,199</td>
<td>$134,311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes:
1. Travel costs include airfare, hotel and per diem.
2. Inflation has been applied to travel costs at a rate of 2.8% annually, beginning in year 2.

6) Contractual – Four major service agreements will be managed under contract in the Level 1 Technology budget. These contracts cover development of the three major systems listed in the following chart and a systems integrator to ensure that the systems work seamlessly together. Additionally, a State Implementation and IT Technical Committee will be formed and composed of outside individuals who will assist the States in systems implementation and provide advice and counsel to the Technology Working Group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Services Required</th>
<th>Detailed Description of Services</th>
<th>Basis for Cost Estimates</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Database hub/CPU; reporting application and central archive database application, professional development delivery application</td>
<td>Database hub/CPU; reporting application and central archive database application, professional development delivery application</td>
<td>Consultations with industry-knowledgeable technology consultants</td>
<td>$7,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field test delivery and test delivery application development vendor</td>
<td>Includes leases for servers as required during grant phase; central helpdesk and troubleshooting</td>
<td>Consultations with industry-knowledgeable technology consultants</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item writing/banking application</td>
<td>Item writing/banking application</td>
<td>Estimated cost to upgrade existing Michigan system</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT systems architecture and integration contractor</td>
<td>Ensure that the application development, organization, and scalability meet best practices and will work within the systems as they exist. Will also ensure that there is a coherent vision for future development and enhancements</td>
<td>Consultations with industry-knowledgeable technology consultants</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State implementation and IT Technical Committee</td>
<td>Composed of seven State information systems personnel who can provide advice regarding mitigation of technical barriers that States might encounter while attempting to implement the system.</td>
<td>7 people – $1,500/day 32 days</td>
<td>$350,377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Washington State has followed the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40–74.48 and Part 80.36, and is consistent with Part II.F of this application. In addition, the Consortium’s plan for managing funds received under this grant category will be governed by the laws and rules of the State of Washington, as the Lead Procurement State, and in accordance with 34 CFR 80.36. Finally, Washington is prepared to follow the guidelines for grant management associated with the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), and will be legally responsible for the use of grant funds and for ensuring that the project is carried out by the Consortium in accordance with Federal requirements. Washington has already established an ARRA Quarterly reporting system (also referred to as 1512 Reporting).
## Level 1 Budget Module – Detailed Table: Higher Education Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Categories</th>
<th>Project Year 1 (a)</th>
<th>Project Year 2 (b)</th>
<th>Project Year 3 (c)</th>
<th>Project Year 4 (d)</th>
<th>Total (e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personnel</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Travel</td>
<td>$91,200</td>
<td>$93,754</td>
<td>$96,379</td>
<td>$99,077</td>
<td>$380,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supplies</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Contractual</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$246,720</td>
<td>$253,628</td>
<td>$260,730</td>
<td>$1,001,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Training Stipends</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)</td>
<td>$331,200</td>
<td>$340,474</td>
<td>$350,007</td>
<td>$359,807</td>
<td>$1,381,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Indirect Costs</td>
<td>$37,757</td>
<td>$38,814</td>
<td>$39,901</td>
<td>$41,018</td>
<td>$157,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Total Costs (add lines 9-10)</td>
<td>$368,957</td>
<td>$379,288</td>
<td>$389,908</td>
<td>$400,825</td>
<td>$1,538,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other Funds Allocated toward this Work</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Total Funds Requested (subtract line 12 from line 11)</td>
<td>$368,957</td>
<td>$379,288</td>
<td>$389,908</td>
<td>$400,825</td>
<td>$1,538,977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Based on its Indirect Cost Rate (ICR) agreement with USED, Washington can claim indirect costs against all expenditures per a set rate with the exception of contracts and sub-grants awarded within the grant. For contracts, Washington can claim indirect costs at the set rate against the first $25,000 of the contract value on a yearly basis. For sub-grants that might be awarded, Washington cannot claim any indirect costs. For purposes of the budget submission, indirect costs were calculated using Washington’s ICR agreement (Agreement No. 2010-040) rate of 11.4%.
2. All calculations are done in fractional dollars and rounded to the nearest whole dollar for presentation in tables. As a result, small rounding differences may occur.
Level 1 Budget Module – Detailed Narrative:

Name: Higher Education Engagement

Associated Work Plan:
- Establish Higher Education Advisory Panel
- Establish Higher Education Consultant Group

Rationale: The SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium recognizes the importance of working collaboratively with higher education in order to achieve the goal of better preparing students for college. Achieving this goal will benefit higher education over time because students will enter IHE systems having met clear college-ready standards that are common across the Consortium States. The Consortium intends to collaborate with higher education in the creation of student achievement standards that will define “college-ready.” This collaboration will ensure that high school graduates will be able to track their readiness for college and careers throughout high school and will reduce the need for remediation within higher education. The Consortium expects that this collaboration will ultimately result in students being college- and career-ready or on track to being college- and career-ready.

Expenses by Budget Category:

1) Personnel
Consortium labor associated with this working group budget will be composed of existing personnel. Therefore, the Consortium has not added any incremental labor costs to its Level 1 budget request.

3) Travel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Type and Purpose of Meeting</th>
<th>Number of Persons per Trip</th>
<th>Number of Days of Trip</th>
<th>Number of Trips</th>
<th>Average Cost per Trip/Person</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Advisory Panel – Quarterly Meeting Travel – Travel will provide opportunities for higher education representatives to meet with K–12 partners and participate in the design and development of the system.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$1,486</td>
<td>$190,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Consultants – Quarterly Meeting Travel – These meetings will be used to resolve complex issues, achieve consensus on high-level topics, and present options for the governing committees to consider as they build the system.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$1,486</td>
<td>$190,205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Travel costs include airfare, hotel, and per diem.
2. Inflation has been applied to travel costs at a rate of 2.8% annually, beginning in year 2.
The Higher Education Advisory Panel and consultants will travel to meet with relevant constituents and the members of the Steering Committee on a quarterly basis.

6) Contractual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Services Required</th>
<th>Detailed Description of Services</th>
<th>Basis for Cost Estimates</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Advisory Panel</td>
<td>Higher education community will be blended with K–12 partners as participants in each of the working groups to ensure that the Consortium creates a seamless approach to college- and career-readiness.</td>
<td>$20,000 per day for the panel of 8</td>
<td>$500,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Consultants</td>
<td>Provide expertise regarding the use of the assessment as part of higher education’s placement process. Consultants will review available data and provide suggestions for assessment design, implementation, standard setting, and areas for additional research.</td>
<td>$20,000 per day for the consultants (8)</td>
<td>$500,539</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Higher Education Advisory Panel will focus mainly on defining Consortium policies around the high school assessment and other issues affecting preparing students for college and careers.

Washington State has followed the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40–74.48 and Part 80.36, and is consistent with Part II.F of this application. In addition, the Consortium’s plan for managing funds received under this grant category will be governed by the laws and rules of the State of Washington, as the Lead Procurement State, and in accordance with 34 CFR 80.36. Finally, Washington is prepared to follow the guidelines for grant management associated with the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), and will be legally responsible for the use of grant funds and for ensuring that the project is carried out by the Consortium in accordance with Federal requirements. Washington has already established an ARRA Quarterly reporting system (also referred to as 1512 Reporting).
## Part C: Level 2 Budget Module – Detailed Table

### Budget Part C: Level 2 Budget Module – Detailed Table

**Name:** Assessment Design – Translations  
**Priority:** 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Categories</th>
<th>Project Year 1 (a)</th>
<th>Project Year 2 (b)</th>
<th>Project Year 3 (c)</th>
<th>Project Year 4 (d)</th>
<th>Total (e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personnel</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Travel</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supplies</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Contractual</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$625,697</td>
<td>$2,955,722</td>
<td>$6,370,555</td>
<td>$9,951,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Training Stipends</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$625,697</td>
<td>$2,955,722</td>
<td>$6,370,555</td>
<td>$9,951,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Indirect Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$14,250</td>
<td>$14,250</td>
<td>$14,250</td>
<td>$42,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Total Costs (add lines 9-10)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$639,947</td>
<td>$2,969,972</td>
<td>$6,384,805</td>
<td>$9,994,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other Funds Allocated Toward this Work</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Total Funds Requested (subtract line 12 from line 11)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$639,947</td>
<td>$2,969,972</td>
<td>$6,384,805</td>
<td>$9,994,724</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Based on its Indirect Cost Rate (ICR) agreement with USED, Washington can claim indirect costs against all expenditures per a set rate with the exception of contracts and sub-grants awarded within the grant. For contracts, Washington can claim indirect costs at the set rate against the first $25,000 of the contract value on a yearly basis. For sub-grants that might be awarded, Washington cannot claim any indirect costs. For purposes of the budget submission, indirect costs were calculated using Washington’s ICR agreement (Agreement No. 2010-040) rate of 11.4%.
2. All calculations are done in fractional dollars and rounded to the nearest whole dollar for presentation in tables. As a result, small rounding differences may occur.
Level 2 Budget Module – Detailed Narrative:

Name: Translations

Associated Work Plan:
Develop five language translations, including sign language, of the Consortium’s mathematics summative and interim/benchmark assessments.

Priority: Several research-based accommodation strategies exist for States to increase access for EL students. These include modified language, use of dictionaries/glossaries, and for a growing number of states, translation into the student’s native language. The effectiveness of each of these strategies interacts with student background characteristics. For example, Sato et al., (2010) found that language modification works effectively for students at the upper end of the ELP continuum. Those at the lower end do not have sufficient English language skills to find value from even simplified text and will more likely benefit from being tested in their native language.

SBAC members are focusing on mathematics as the content area for translation. This is based on the belief that an “English” language arts test should be assessed in English. (Several of our States require that in statute or regulation.) Translating the mathematics assessments seems more appropriate to the extent that the test focuses on the “mathematics” knowledge and skills inherent in the CCSS. The Research and Evaluation Working Group will include as part of its work plan the development and implementation of comparability studies to ensure that student level and other accountability decisions made across the various language assessments are equally valid.

SBAC proposes to offer to member States the option to administer the summative and interim/benchmark assessments to a large majority of their non-English speaking students in their native languages. Additionally, some students with hearing or other disabilities will require the test to be administered via sign language. This Level 2 budget module provides the funds to translate the mathematics assessments into five different languages, including sign language. A survey of States indicates that selecting Spanish and up to four other languages will result in approximately 92% of ELs having the native language assessment opportunity. While 100% would be more desirable, the budget implications for translation beyond this first level greatly exceed the Level 2 budget limit.

In addition to Spanish, the next three languages and specific sign language will be determined by an examination of the required Home Language Survey for ELs across the member States. In addition to the summative and interim/benchmark assessment items and performance events, this request also includes all reports and ancillary materials.

Expenses by Budget Category:

1) Personnel – Consortium labor associated with this working group budget will be composed of existing personnel. Therefore, the Consortium has not added any incremental labor costs to its Level 2 budget request.

6) Contractual – It is anticipated that five different vendors may be required to perform this function—one for each of the language translations, as well as sign language.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Services Required</th>
<th>Detailed Description of Services</th>
<th>Basis for Cost Estimates</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics translation</td>
<td>Translation of mathematics summative and interim/benchmark assessments into four languages plus sign language.</td>
<td>Costs are based on per-word rates as well as re-composition costs for items as quoted by vendors. Costs also include a reporting capability ($125,000) and ancillary development.</td>
<td>$9,951,974</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Washington State has followed the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40–74.48 and Part 80.36, and is consistent with Part II.F of this application. In addition, the Consortium’s plan for managing funds received under this grant category will be governed by the laws and rules of the State of Washington, as the Lead Procurement State, and in accordance with 34 CFR 80.36. Additionally, Washington is prepared to follow the guidelines for grant management associated with the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), and will be legally responsible for the use of grant funds and for ensuring that the project is carried out by the Consortium in accordance with Federal requirements. Washington has already established an ARRA Quarterly reporting system (also referred to as 1512 Reporting).
### Appendix A8-7: Survey of Operational Costs for SBAC States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>General Funds</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>Grades 3-8</th>
<th>Grade 11</th>
<th>Are these funds used for formative and/or interim benchmark assessments?</th>
<th>Total $</th>
<th>Total Student Count</th>
<th>Per student Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$6,600,000</td>
<td>$4,200,000</td>
<td>350,152</td>
<td>50,199</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$10,800,000</td>
<td>400,351</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>$13,404,750</td>
<td>$1,095,250</td>
<td>366,895</td>
<td>57,834</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$14,500,000</td>
<td>424,729</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>$7,250,000</td>
<td>$6,350,500</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$13,600,500</td>
<td>283,000</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
<td>57,461</td>
<td>8,727</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$4,200,000</td>
<td>66,188</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>$5,549,609</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>768,545</td>
<td>122,022</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$14,549,609</td>
<td>890,567</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>$8,699,540</td>
<td>$2,259,441</td>
<td>79,997</td>
<td>14,246</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$10,958,981</td>
<td>94,243</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>$1,216,000</td>
<td>$3,648,000</td>
<td>127,799</td>
<td>20,105</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$4,864,000</td>
<td>147,904</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>$2,496,270</td>
<td>$3,100,000</td>
<td>210,322</td>
<td>36,805</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$5,596,270</td>
<td>247,127</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>$587,388</td>
<td>$2,537,514</td>
<td>268,569</td>
<td>44,762</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$3,124,902</td>
<td>313,331</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>$5,032,800</td>
<td>$3,355,200</td>
<td>302,400</td>
<td>46,900</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$8,388,000</td>
<td>349,300</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>$3,116,856</td>
<td>$3,621,015</td>
<td>84,113</td>
<td>14,052</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$6,737,871</td>
<td>98,165</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>$16,246,817</td>
<td>$3,146,789</td>
<td>794,485</td>
<td>137,365</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$19,393,606</td>
<td>931,850</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,575,000</td>
<td>407,934</td>
<td>67,612</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$5,575,000</td>
<td>475,546</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,639,235</td>
<td>64,160</td>
<td>10,741</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$2,639,235</td>
<td>74,901</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>$2,706,926</td>
<td>$3,738,135</td>
<td>201,552</td>
<td>28,043</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$6,445,061</td>
<td>229,595</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>$1,350,000</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
<td>90,012</td>
<td>15,794</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$3,100,000</td>
<td>105,806</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>$20,725,000</td>
<td>$9,760,000</td>
<td>623,149</td>
<td>98,605</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$30,485,000</td>
<td>721,754</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>$9,181,525</td>
<td>$3,345,000</td>
<td>149,521</td>
<td>22,448</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$12,526,525</td>
<td>171,969</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>$3,400,000</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>679,358</td>
<td>98,359</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$6,900,000</td>
<td>777,717</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>$621,250</td>
<td>$3,020,500</td>
<td>45,439</td>
<td>8,015</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$3,641,750</td>
<td>53,454</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>$37,300,000</td>
<td>$8,400,000</td>
<td>801,338</td>
<td>139,010</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$45,700,000</td>
<td>940,348</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>$6,526,259</td>
<td>$5,745,774</td>
<td>283,189</td>
<td>42,578</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$12,272,033</td>
<td>325,767</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>$2,216,250</td>
<td>$2,216,250</td>
<td>258,425</td>
<td>43,422</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$4,432,500</td>
<td>301,847</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>$18,355,505</td>
<td>$9,177,752</td>
<td>798,088</td>
<td>140,893</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$27,533,257</td>
<td>938,981</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>$9,593,658</td>
<td>$5,400,000</td>
<td>324,049</td>
<td>55,452</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$14,993,658</td>
<td>379,501</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
<td>$3,600,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$5,500,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>$383,000</td>
<td>$1,597,000</td>
<td>263,399</td>
<td>38,404</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,980,000</td>
<td>301,803</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,653,258</td>
<td>40,869</td>
<td>7,966</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,653,258</td>
<td>48,835</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>$18,062,000</td>
<td>$4,555,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$22,617,000</td>
<td>525,000</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>123,167</td>
<td>19,118</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>142,285</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>$2,700,000</td>
<td>$5,300,000</td>
<td>265,000</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>333,000</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$211,721,403</strong></td>
<td><strong>$128,986,613</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,579,387</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,575,477</strong></td>
<td><strong>$340,708,016</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,154,864</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$31</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix CPP-1: IHE Letters of Intent

Following this page are IHE letters of intent for the following SBAC States:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBAC States</th>
<th>(Governing States are identified with an asterisk.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Washington *</td>
<td>2. Missouri *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Connecticut *</td>
<td>4. Nevada *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Utah *</td>
<td>6. Idaho *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Maine *</td>
<td>8. Wisconsin *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. New Mexico *</td>
<td>12. Hawaii *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. –</td>
<td>14. Kansas *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Michigan *</td>
<td>16. Montana *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. West Virginia *</td>
<td>18. Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Iowa</td>
<td>20. South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. North Dakota</td>
<td>24. Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. New Hampshire</td>
<td>28. Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Oklahoma</td>
<td>30. New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Georgia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Direct matriculation numbers provided in the letters of intent were used in the Summary Table for the Competitive Preference Priority only when they were confirmed to reflect reasonably accurate data, as confirmed by either the NCES IPEDS and/or IHE websites. The main data source for matriculation numbers in the Summary Table is IPEDS, as described in the narrative for the Competitive Preference Priority.