Race to the Top
Assessment Competition

Technical Assistance Workshop

U.S. Department of Education

April 22, 2010

Minneapolis, MN

Goals for the Meeting

- Provide applicants with an overview of the notice and the application
  - The information we have released – what and where to find it
  - How the application works
  - Understanding the priorities and selection criteria – together with their related definitions
- Answer all of the questions we can:
  - Technical
  - Clarifying
  - Logistical

Agenda

8:30-9:00	**Welcome and Overview of the Notice**
9:00-10:15	**Consortium Governance and Project Management:**
	Selection Criteria (A)(1) and (B)(1)
	MOUs and Procurements
	Selection Criteria (A)(8) and (B)(6)
10:15-10:30	**Break**
10:30-12:00	**Comprehensive Assessment Systems:**
	Eligibility and Other Requirements; Absolute and Competitive Priorities
	Other Selection Criteria—(A)(2) through (A)(7)
12:00-1:00	**Lunch on your own**
1:00-1:45	**Budget Tutorial**
1:45-2:30	**Other Considerations:**
	Program Requirements
	Application Submission & Application Review Process
2:30-2:45	**Break**
2:45-3:45	**High School Course Assessment Program**:
	Eligibility and Other Requirements; Absolute and Competitive Priorities
	Other Selection Criteria—(B)(2) through (B)(5)
3:45-4:00	**Break**
4:00-5:00	**Other Q&A and Closing**

Ground Rules

- Ask your questions as we go
- Webinar participants – ask your questions through "chat"
- Time keeping
- Additional questions may be submitted to racetothetop.assessment@ed.gov
- Today's session will be transcribed and posted to www.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-assessment, together with the presentation
- Cell phones on vibrate please

Introductions

- Meredith Farace, *Office of Elementary and Secondary Education*
- Jane Hess, *Office of the General Counsel*
- Rachel Peternith, *Office of the General Counsel*
- Joanne Weiss, *Director, Race to the Top Program*
- Ann Whalen, *Special Assistant to the Secretary*

and supporting the webinar participants—

- Jessica McKinney, *Office of Elementary and Secondary Education*

Overview of the Notice

Goals of this Competition

Support states in delivering a system of more effective, valid, and instructionally useful assessments that—

- Measure standards that are rigorous, globally competitive, and consistent across States
- Provide accurate information about what students know and can do:
  - Student achievement of standards
  - Student growth from year to year
  - On-track to college and career ready by the time of HS graduation
- Reflect and support good instructional practice
- Include all students from the outset, including English learners and students with disabilities
- Present data to each audience – students, parents, teachers, administrators, policymakers – in ways that are clear, useful, and actionable

Expert and Public Input

- Heard input from 42 experts and 91 members of the public over 50 hours
- Received over 200 pieces of written input
- Approximately 900 people attended, including officials from 37 states and D.C.
- Hosted 10 meetings in four cities:

Boston, MA, November 12-13
- General Assessment
- Technology & Innovation
- High School Assessment

Denver, CO, December 1-2
- General Assessment
- Assessment of English Language Learners

Atlanta, GA, November 17-18
- General Assessment
- Assessment of Students with Disabilities

Washington, DC, January 13-14
- Consortium and Project Management
- Procurement
- General Assessment

Competition Categories

Category A: Comprehensive Assessment Systems

$320M
1-2 Awards

- Support assessment systems (*e.g.*, summative, interim, formative, scoring/moderation, PD)
- At a minimum, administered annually in Grades 3-8 & CCR
- Support Federal accountability – replace current ESEA assessments

Category B: High School Course Assessment Program

$30M
1 Award

- Support high school improvement efforts
- Increase access to rigorous courses
- Support diverse course offerings (academic, career/technical)
- No Federal accountability "stakes"

Key Dates

Notice Inviting Applications Published	April 9, 2010
Technical Assistance Workshop Held	April 22, 2010 Minneapolis, MN
Notice of Intent to Apply Due (optional)	April 29, 2010
Applications Due	June 23, 2010
Awards Made	September 2010

Next Generation of Assessments

Multiple grants and competitions to meets states' needs and timelines:

- Race to the Top Assessment Competition:
  - Category A: Comprehensive Assessment Systems
  - Category B: High School Course Assessment Program
- Alternate Academic Assessment (1% Assessment)
- English Language Proficiency Assessment
- Science Assessments

Resources to Help

- Executive Summary
- Category A – Application
- Category B – Application
- Notice Inviting Applications
- Materials from Expert and Public Input Meetings

- All available on our website: www.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-assessment

Overview of the Notice

States must meet:

Eligibility Requirements:
- Consortium size
- Proposed project management partner
- Assurances on common content standards and achievement standards

Application Requirements, e.g.:
- Consortium structure
- Application signatures
- Procurement assurances
- MOUs from member States
- Application contents

Program/Other Requirements, e.g.:
- Technical assistance
- Cooperate on research
- Deadlines
- Technology
- Waiver requests

Applications will be evaluated based on:

Priorities:
- Absolute: Comprehensive Assessment Systems
- Competitive: Collaboration and Alignment with Higher Ed

Selection Criteria:
- Consortium Governance
- Theory of Action
- Assessment System Design
- Assessment System Development
- Research and Evaluation
- Professional Capacity and Outreach
- Technology Approach
- Project Management

Overview of the Notice

States must meet:

Eligibility Requirements:
- Consortium size
- Proposed project management partner
- Assurances on common content standards and achievement standards

Application Requirements, e.g.:
- Consortium structure
- Application signatures
- Procurement assurances
- MOUs from member States
- Application contents

Program/Other Requirements, e.g.:
- Technical assistance
- Cooperate on research
- Deadlines
- Technology
- Waiver requests

must meet in order to be eligible

Applications will be evaluated based on:

Priorities:
- e Assessment
- on and Alignment with Higher Ed

Selection Criteria:
- Consortium Governance
- Theory of Action
- Assessment System Design
- Assessment System Development
- Research and Evaluation
- Professional Capacity and Outreach
- Technology Approach
- Project Management

Overview of the Notice

States must meet:

Eligibility Requirements:
- Consortium size
- Proposed project management partner
- Assurances on common content standards and achievement standards

Application Requirements, e.g.:
- Consortium structure
- Application signatures
- Procurement assurances
- MOUs from member States
- Application contents

Program/Other Requirements, e.g.:
- Technical assistance
- Cooperate on research
- Deadlines
- Technology
- Waiver requests

Applications will be evaluated based on:

Priorities:
- Absolute: Comprehensive Assessment Systems
- Competitive: Collaboration and Alignment with Higher Ed

Selection Criteria:
- Consortium Governance
- [illegible]em Design
- [illegible]em Development
- Research and Evaluation
- Professional Capacity and Outreach
- Technology Approach
- Project Management

basic information about what must be in the application

Overview of the Notice

States must meet:

Eligibility Requirements:
- Consortium size
- Proposed project management partner
- Assurances on common content standards and achievement standards

Application Requirements, e.g.:
- Consortium structure
- Application signatures
- Procurement assurances
- MOUs from member States
- Application contents

Program/Other Requirements, e.g.:
- Technical assistance
- Cooperate on research
- Deadlines
- Technology
- Waiver requests

Applications will be evaluated based on:

Priorities:
- Absolute: Comprehensive Assessment Systems
- Competitive: Collaboration and Alignment with Higher Ed

Selection Criteria:
- Consortium Governance
- Theory of Action
- Assessment System Design
- Assessment System Development
- Research and Evaluation
- Professional Capacity and Outreach
- Technology Approach
- Project Management

requirements for all grantees

Category A: Comprehensive Assessment Systems

Overview of the Notice

States must meet:

Eligibility Requi

- Consortium si
- Proposed proj
- Assurances on common content standard and achievement standards

must address – and meet – this priority

Application Requirements, e.g.:

- Consortium structure
- Application signatures
- Procurement assurances
- MOUs from member States
- Application contents

Program/Other Requirements, e.g.:

- Technical assistance
- Cooperate on research
- Deadlines
- Technology
- Waiver requests

Applications will be evaluated based on:

Priorities:

- Absolute: Comprehensive Assessment Systems
- Competitive: Collaboration and Alignment with Higher Ed

Selection Criteria:

- Consortium Governance
- Theory of Action
- Assessment System Design
- Assessment System Development
- Research and Evaluation
- Professional Capacity and Outreach
- Technology Approach
- Project Management

Overview of the Notice

States must meet:

Eligibility Requirements:

- Consortium size
- Proposed pr
- Assurances o and achiever

optional – earns "extra" competitive preference points

Application Requirements, e.g.:

- Consortium structure
- Application signatures
- Procurement assurances
- MOUs from member States
- Application contents

Program/Other Requirements, e.g.:

- Technical assistance
- Cooperate on research
- Deadlines
- Technology
- Waiver requests

Applications will be evaluated based on:

Priorities:

- Absolute: Comprehensive Assessment Systems
- Competitive: Collaboration and Alignment with Higher Ed

Selection Criteria:

- Consortium Governance
- Theory of Action
- Assessment System Design
- Assessment System Development
- Research and Evaluation
- Professional Capacity and Outreach
- Technology Approach
- Project Management

Overview of the Notice

States must meet:

Eligibility Requirements:
- Consortium size
- Proposed project management partner
- Assurances on common content standards and achievement standards

Application Requirements, e.g.:
- Consortium structure
- Applicatio
- Procurem
- MOUs fro
- Applicatio

Program/Other Requirements, e.g.
- Technical assistance
- Cooperate on research
- Deadlines
- Technology
- Waiver requests

applicants write to these, and the reviewers judge and score the responses

Applications will be evaluated based on:

Priorities:
- Absolute: Comprehensive Assessment Systems
- Competitive: Collaboration and Alignment with Higher Ed

Selection Criteria:
- Consortium Governance
- Theory of Action
- Assessment System Design
- Assessment System Development
- Research and Evaluation
- Professional Capacity and Outreach
- Technology Approach
- Project Management

Category A: Comprehensive Assessment Systems

Filling out the Application

Selection Criterion Text (in gray)

(A)(1) Consortium Governance (*up to 20 points*)

The extent to which the consortium's proposed governance structure will enable the successful design, development, and implementation of the proposed assessment system. In determining the extent to which the consortium's proposed governance structure will enable the successful design, development, and implementation of the proposed assessment system, we will consider—

(a) The consortium's vision, goals, role, and key deliverables (*e.g.*, assessment components, scoring and moderation system, professional development activities), and the consistency of these with the consortium's theory of action;

Directions

***Directions**: Provide a narrative that addresses this criterion in the space below, and complete the required tables and/or attachments. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.*

Tables & Attachments

Required Tables and/or Attachments:
- *Summary Table for (A)(1)(b)(ii): States' Roles in the Consortium*
- *Summary Table for (A)(1)(b)(v): Consortium's Policy and Definition Timeline*

Optional:
- *For (A)(1)(b)(i): A visual model that conveys the consortium's organizational structure.*

Response Length

Recommended maximum response length: 5 pages (excluding tables and/or attachments).

Application Narrative

[Enter text here]

If There's a Table…

Summary Table for (A)(1)(b)(ii): States' Roles in the Consortium

Directions: *In addition to addressing the criterion in narrative, applicants must indicate in the table below the differentiated roles each member State may hold and provide a brief description of the rights and responsibilities associated with that role.*

Role Types of Member States	Description of the Rights and Responsibilities Associated with Role	Member States in this Role

…**fill it in** and **reference it** in the narrative!

If there's no table or attachment and one would help, by all means add it!

Write to *all* elements of a criterion – do not assume that the table includes everything.

Consortium Governance and Project Management

Selection Criteria (A)(1) and (B)(1)

MOUs and Procurements

Selection Criteria (A)(8) and (B)(6)

Governance and Project Management

- Critical success factors for *consortia*—
  - Common vision and goals across members; clear roles, responsibilities, and decision making processes
  - These are codified in writing and are binding (MOU)
  - Procurement issues figured out up-front
- Critical success factors for *project management*—
  - Qualified entity responsible for day-to-day operations and management (*e.g.*, state, university, nonprofit)
  - Defined, specific workplan, timeline, budget – act as project blueprints
- *Cooperative agreements* between ED and grantees (rather than grants) allow for mid-course corrections

Consortia – What the Code of Federal Regulations Says

- Either of the following can constitute a "consortium"—
  - The consortium establishing itself as a separate eligible legal entity and applying for a grant on its own behalf; or
  - One member of the consortium (*i.e.*, a State) applying for a grant on behalf of the consortium
- In either case, every State member of a consortium must execute a Memoranda of Understanding or other binding agreement that, among other things, binds the State to every statement and assurance made in the application.

Category A: Key Requirements

This concerns Category A (though the definitions apply to both categories)

Eligibility Requirement: To be eligible to receive an award under this category, an eligible applicant must—

1. Include a minimum of 15 States, of which at least 5 States must be governing States (as defined);
2. Identif who is not partne an award under
3. Submi um that, to remai mmon set of colleg o later than Decem ndards (as define

Governing State means a State that
(a) is a member of only one consortium applying for a grant in the competition category,
(b) has an active role in policy decision-making for the consortium, and
(c) is committed to using the assessment system or program developed by the consortium.

Estimated Size of Award: $160,000,000

Project Period: Up to 48 months

Category A: Key Requirements

Eligibility Requirement: To be eligible to receive an award under this category, an eligible applicant must—

1. Include a minimum of 15 States, of which at least 5 States must be governing States (as defined);
2. Identify a proposed project management partner who is not partnered with any other consortium applying for an award under this category; and
3. Submit assurances from each State in the consortium that, to remain in the consortium, the State will adopt a common set of college- and career-ready standards (as defined) no later than December 31, 2011, and common achievement standards (as defined) no later than the 2014-2015 school year.

Estimated Size of Award: $160,000,000

Project Period: Up to 48 months

Category B: Key Requirements

This concerns Category B

Eligibility Requirement: To be eligible, an eligible applicant must—

1. Include a minimum of 5 governing States (as defined); and
2. Identify in its application a proposed project management partner who is not partnered with any other consortium applying for an award under this category.

Estimated Size of Award: $30,000,000 (binding maximum)

Project Period: Up to 48 months

(A)(1) Consortium Governance (up to 20 points)

(B)(1) is worth up to 30 points

Goal: The extent to which the consortium's proposed governance structure will enable the successful design, development, and implementation of the proposed assessment system.

We will consider—

a) The consortium's **vision, goals, role,** and **key deliverables** (e.g., assessment components, scoring and moderation system, professional development activities), and the consistency of these with the consortium's theory of action;

(A)(1) Consortium Governance (cont.)

We will consider—

b) The consortium's **structure and operations**, including—

i. The organizational structure of the consortium and the differentiated roles that a member State may hold (e.g., lead State, governing State (as defined), advisory State);

ii. For each differentiated role, the rights and responsibilities (including the level of commitment to adopting and implementing the assessment system) associated with the role;

iii. The consortium's method and process (e.g., consensus, majority) for making different types of decisions (e.g., policy, operational);

iv. The protocols by which the consortium will operate, including the protocols for member States to change roles or leave the consortium and for new member States to join the consortium;

v. The consortium's plan, including the process and timeline, for setting key policies and definitions for the proposed assessment system, including a common set of college- and career-ready standards (as defined), a common set of performance level descriptors (as defined), a common set of achievement standards (as defined), common assessment administration procedures, common item release and test security policies, a common definition of "English learner," and a common set of policies and procedures for accommodations (as defined) and student participation; and

vi. The consortium's plan for managing funds received under this grant category;

(A)(1) Consortium Governance (cont.)

We will consider—

b) The consortium's **structure and operations**, including—

i. The organizational structure of the consortium and the differentiated roles that a member State may hold (e.g., lead State, governing State (as defined), advisory State);

ii. For each differentiated role, the rights and responsibilities (including the level of commitment to adopting and implementing the assessment system) associated with the role;

iii. The consortium's method and process (e.g., consensus, majority) for making different types of decisions (e.g., policy, operational);

iv. The protocols by which the consortium will operate, including the protocols for member States to change roles or leave the consortium and for new member States to join the consortium;

v. The consortium's plan, including the process and timeline, for setting key policies and definitions for the proposed assessment system, including a common set of college- and career-ready standards (as defined), a common set of performance level descriptors (as defined), a common set of achievement standards (as defined), common assessment administration procedures, common item release and test security policies, a common definition of "English learner," and a common set of policies and procedures for accommodations (as defined) and student participation; and

vi. The consortium's plan for managing funds received under this grant category;

(B)(1) (b)(v) The key policies and definitions to which all member States will adhere, the rationale for choosing these policies and definitions, and the consortium's plan (including the process and timeline) for developing them.

Table for (A)(1)(b)(ii) and (B)(1)(b)(ii)

Summary Table for (A)(1)(b)(ii): States' Roles in the Consortium

Directions: *In addition to addressing the criterion in narrative, applicants must indicate in the table below the differentiated roles each member State may hold and provide a brief description of the rights and responsibilities associated with that role.*

Role Types of Member States	Description of the Rights and Responsibilities Associated with Role	Member States in this Role

Table for (A)(1)(b)(v)

Summary Table for (A)(1)(b)(v): Consortium's Policy and Definition Timeline

Directions: *In addition to addressing the criterion in the (A)(1) narrative, applicants must indicate the approximate dates of initiation and completion for each policy or definition to be adopted by the consortium.*

Policy or Definition to be Adopted	Approx Date to Initiate	Approx Date to Adopt
Common set of performance level descriptors		
Common set of achievement standards		
Common assessment administration procedures		
Common item release policy		
Common test security policy		
Common definition of "English learner"		
Common policies and procedures for accommodations for English learners		
Common policies and procedures for accommodations for students with disabilities		
Common policies and procedures for student participation for English learners		
Common policies and procedures for student participation for students with disabilities		
Other (explain)		

(A)(1) Consortium Governance (cont.)

We will consider—

c) The terms and conditions of the **Memoranda of Understanding** or other binding agreements executed by each member State, including—

   i. The consistency of the terms and conditions with the consortium's governance structure and the State's role in the consortium; and

   ii. The State's commitment to and plan for identifying any existing barriers in State law, statute, regulation, or policy to implementing the proposed assessment system and to addressing any such barriers prior to full implementation of the summative assessment components of the system; and

d) The consortium's **procurement process**, and evidence of each member State's commitment to that process.

(A)(1) Consortium Governance (cont.)

We will consider—

c) The terms and conditions of the **Memoranda of Understanding** or other binding agreements executed by each member State, including—

   i. The consistency of the terms and conditions with the consortium's governance structure and the State's role in the consortium; and

   ii. The State's commitment to and plan for identifying any existing barriers in State law, statute, regulation, or policy to implementing the proposed assessment system and to addressing any such barriers prior to full implementation of the summative assessment components of the system; and

(B)(1) does not include sub-criterion (c)(ii)

d) The consortium's **procurement process**, and evidence of each member State's commitment to that process.

General Requirements Regarding MOUs

- Each member State must execute an MOU (Consortium Agreement) that:
  - Details the activities that members of the consortium will perform (see Application Requirement 4);
  - Binds each member of the consortium to every statement and assurance made in the application (see Application Requirement 4);
  - Includes a procurement assurance, signed by the State's chief procurement official (or designee), that the State has reviewed its applicable procurement rules and determined that it may participate in and make procurements through the consortium(see Application Requirement 4 and Criteria (A/B)(1)(d)); and
  - Is signed by the Governor, the State's chief school officer, and, if applicable, the president of the State board of education (see Application Requirement 4)

General Requirements Regarding MOUs (cont.)

- Each member State must execute an MOU that:
  - *For Category A Only*: Includes an assurance that, to remain in the consortium, the State will adopt a common set of college- and career-ready standards (as defined) by December 31, 2011, and common achievement standards (as defined) by the 2014-2015 school year (see Eligibility Requirement 3).

General Requirements Regarding MOUs (cont.)

- Each member State should address in the MOU:

  Program Requirement 4

  - *Category A:* An eligible applicant awarded a grant under this category must – Ensure that the summative assessment components of the assessment system in both mathematics and English language arts are fully implemented statewide by each State in the consortium no later than the 2014-2015 school year.
  - *Category B:* An eligible applicant awarded a grant under this category must – Ensure that at least one course assessment developed under the high school course assessment program will be implemented in each State in the consortium no later than the 2013-2014 school year and that all assessments in the assessment program will be operational no later than the 2014-2015 school year.

Writing to Program Requirement 4

- Describe the process by which your State will adopt and implement the assessments developed under this program by school year 2014-15, if your State remains in the consortium at that time; and
- Provide additional explanatory information, if necessary, about how you will undertake this process consistent with your State's law.

General Requirements Regarding MOUs (cont.)

- To get full points, the MOU should also:
  - Be consistent with the consortium's governance structure and the State's role in the consortium (see criterion (A/B)(1)(c)(i)); and
  - Be included in the application.
  - *For Category A Only:* Describe the State's plan for identifying any barriers (in law, statute, regulation, or policy) to implementing the proposed assessment system, and for addressing them (see criterion (A)(1)(c)(ii)).

Procurement

- Thinking about procurement up-front:
  - A competitive procurement process based on a "best value" selection* must be used. (This is handled as an application assurance.)
  - Each State's chief procurement official must assure that its State may participate in and make procurements through the consortium (see member States' MOU).
  - Consider the way the consortium will assign procurement responsibilities, for example—
    - by identifying one or more lead States as procurers; or
    - by identifying the project management partner as the procurer (provided it is clear that State laws are complied with and that the agreement with the partner clearly articulates this role).

* Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR, section 2.101) defines "best value" as the expected outcome of an acquisition that, in the Government's estimation, provides the greatest overall benefit in response to the requirement.

(A)(8) Project Management (up to 30 points)

(B)(6) is worth up to 35 points

Goal: The extent to which the eligible applicant's project management plan will result in implementation of the proposed assessment system on time, within budget, and in a manner that is financially sustainable over time.

We will consider—

a) The quality, qualifications, and role of the **project management partner**, as evidenced by its mission, date of founding, size, experience (including past success in implementing similar projects), and key personnel assigned to this project (including their names, curricula vitae, roles, percent of time dedicated to this project, and experience in managing similar projects);

Table for (A)(8)(a) and (B)(6)(a)

Key Project Management Personnel

- There is a summary table, but it does not include all of the information you are asked to provide in the narrative response. Please be sure your narrative response is complete.

Names of Key personnel from Proposed Project Management Partner	Role Assigned	Percent of Time Dedicated to Project	Vita Attached
			❑
			❑

(A)(8) Project Management (cont.)

We will consider—

b) The project **workplan and timeline**, including, for each key deliverable (e.g., assessment component, scoring and moderation system, professional development activities), the major milestones, deadlines, and entities responsible for execution; and the approach to identifying, managing, and mitigating risks associated with the project;

c) The extent to which the eligible applicant's **budget**—

i. Clearly identifies Level 1 budget modules and any Level 2 budget modules (as defined);

ii. Is adequate to support the development of an assessment system that meets the requirements of the absolute priority; and

iii. Includes costs that are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and significance of the proposed project and the number of students to be served; and

d) For each member State, the estimated costs for the ongoing administration, maintenance, and enhancement of operational assessments in the proposed assessment system and a plan for how the State will **fund the assessment system over time** (including by allocating to the assessment system funds for existing State or local assessments that will be replaced by assessments in the system).

(A)(8) Project Management (cont.)

We will consider—

b) The project **workplan and timeline**, including, for each key deliverable (e.g., assessment component, scoring and moderation system, professional development activities), the major milestones, deadlines, and entities responsible for execution; and the approach to identifying, managing, and mitigating risks associated with the project;

c) The extent to which the eligible applicant's **budget**

i. Clearly identifies Level 1 budget modules and any Level 2

ii. Is adequate to support the development of an assessment sy requirements of the absolute priority; and

iii. Includes costs that are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and significance of the proposed project and the number of students to be served; and

(B)(6) does not include sub-criterion (c)(i)

d) For each member State, the estimated costs for the ongoing administration, maintenance, and enhancement of operational assessments in the proposed assessment system and a plan for how the State will **fund the assessment system over time** (including by allocating to the assessment system funds for existing State or local assessments that will be replaced by assessments in the system).

Table for (A)(8)(b) and (B)(6)(b)

Project Workplan and Timeline

- Again, there is a summary table, but it does not include all of the information you are asked to provide in the narrative response. Please be sure your narrative response is complete.

Major Milestones	Associated Tasks	Start Date	End Date	Responsible Entity

Comprehensive Assessment Systems

This section is all about Category A – but listen closely because Category B has a lot in common with this

Eligibility and Other Requirements
Absolute and Competitive Priorities
Other Selection Criteria—(A)(2) through (A)(7)

Overview:
Comprehensive Assessment Systems Grants

Priorities

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

Competitive Preference Priority: Collaboration and Alignment with Higher Education

Selection Criteria

(A)(1) Consortium Governance (up to 20 points)

(A)(2) Theory of Action (up to 5 points)

(A)(3) Assessment System Design (up to 55 points)

(A)(4) Assessment System Development (up to 35 points)

(A)(5) Research and Evaluation (up to 30 points)

(A)(6) Professional Capacity and Outreach (up to 15 points)

(A)(7) Technology Approach (up to 10 points)

(A)(8) Project Management (up to 30 points)

Absolute Priority:
Comprehensive Assessment Systems

***Directions**: The absolute priority cuts across the entire application and should not be addressed separately. It is assessed, after the proposal has been fully reviewed and evaluated, to ensure that the application has met the priority.*

Goal: The Department supports the development of new assessment systems that—

- Will be used by multiple States;
- Are valid, reliable, and fair for their intended purposes and for all student subgroups; and
- Measure student knowledge and skills against a common set of college- and career-ready standards in mathematics and English language arts.

Absolute Priority (cont.)

Applicant must demonstrate that it will develop and implement an assessment system that—

a) Measures student knowledge and skills against a common set of college- and career-ready standards (as defined) in mathematics and English language arts in a way that—

   i. Covers the full range of those standards, including standards against which student achievement has traditionally been difficult to measure;

   ii. As appropriate, elicits complex student demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills;

   iii. Provides an accurate measure of student achievement across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students; and

   iv. Provides an accurate measure of student growth over a full academic year or course;

Absolute Priority (cont.)

Applicant must demonstrate that it will develop and implement an assessment system that—

b) Consists of assessment components in mathematics and in English language arts that include, for each subject, one or more summative assessment components that—

   i. Are administered at least once during the academic year in grades 3 through 8 and at least once in high school*; and

   ii. Produce student achievement data and student growth data (both as defined) that can be used to determine whether individual students are college- and career-ready (as defined) or on track to being college- and career-ready (as defined);

* Assessment components, including summative components, may be administered more than once during an academic year. High school assessments under this category may be course-specific or comprehensive or both.

Absolute Priority (cont.)

Applicant must demonstrate that it will develop and implement an assessment system that—

c) Assesses all students, including English learners (as defined) and students with disabilities (as defined); and

English learner means a student who is an English learner as that term is defined by the consortium. The consortium must define the term in a manner that is uniform across member States and consistent with section 9101(25) of the ESEA.

Student with a disability means, for purposes of this competition, a student who has been identified as a student with a disability under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, as amended (IDEA), except for a student with a disability who is eligible to participate in alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards consistent with 34 CFR 200.6(a)(2).

Fully includes the "2%" students

Absolute Priority (cont.)

Applicant must demonstrate that it will develop and implement an assessment system that—

c) Assesses all students, including English learners (as defined) and students with disabilities (as defined); and

d) Produces data, including student achievement data and student growth data, that can be used to inform—

   i. Determinations of school effectiveness for purposes of accountability under Title I of the ESEA;

   ii. Determinations of individual principal and teacher effectiveness for purposes of evaluation;

   iii. Determinations of principal and teacher professional development and support needs; and

   iv. Teaching, learning, and program improvement.

Competitive Preference Priority: Collaboration and Alignment with Higher Education

Goal: Promote collaboration and alignment between member States' public K-12 systems and their public IHEs.

- Must provide, for each IHE or IHE system, a letter of intent that—

   a) Commits the IHE or IHE system to participate with the consortium in the design and development of the consortium's final high school summative assessments in mathematics and English language arts in order to ensure that the assessments measure college readiness;

   b) Commits the IHE or IHE system to implement policies, once the final high school summative assessments are implemented, that exempt from remedial courses and place into credit-bearing college courses any student who meets the consortium-adopted achievement standard (as defined) for each assessment and any other placement requirement established by the IHE or IHE system;

   c) Indicates the total number of direct matriculation students (as defined) in the partner IHE or IHE system in the 2008-2009 school year; and

   d) Is signed by the State's higher education executive officer (if the State has one) and the president or head of each participating IHE or IHE system.

Competitive Preference Priority (cont.): Collaboration and Alignment with Higher Education

- The Department will award up to 20 points based on:
  - Strength of commitment demonstrated in the letters of intent; and
  - Percentage of direct matriculation students served by the public IHEs in the member States who are direct matriculation students in the partner IHEs or IHE systems.
- To receive full points, letters of intent must:
  - Demonstrate strong commitment from each partner IHE or IHE system; and
  - Represent at least 30% of direct matriculation students in public IHEs in member States;
- No points will be awarded for letters of intent that represent fewer than 10% of direct matriculation students in public IHEs in member States.

Table for Competitive Preference Priority

State (List all in Consortium)	Name of Participating IHEs	IHE Committed to Participating w/Consortium? (Y/N)	IHE Committed to Exempting Students from Remediation? (Y/N)	LOI Signed by IHE Leader(s)? (Y/N)	Number of Direct Matriculation Students in IHE in 2008-2009	Total Direct Matriculation Students in State in 2008-2009	Direct Matriculation Students in Participating IHEs as % of State Total
TOTAL	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	[total across **participating IHEs**]	[total in **all public IHEs** in all member States]	[percent participating IHEs are of all IHEs]

Selection Criteria:
Comprehensive Assessment Systems Grants

(A)(1) Consortium Governance (up to 20 points)
(A)(2) Theory of Action (up to 5 points)
(A)(3) Assessment System Design (up to 55 points)
(A)(4) Assessment System Development (up to 35 points)
(A)(5) Research and Evaluation (up to 30 points)
(A)(6) Professional Capacity and Outreach (up to 15 points)
(A)(7) Technology Approach (up to 10 points)
(A)(8) Project Management (up to 30 points)

(A)(2) Theory of Action
(up to 5 points)

Goal: The extent to which the eligible applicant's theory of action is logical, coherent, and credible, and will result in improved student academic outcomes.

We will consider the description of, and rationale for—

a) Each component of the proposed assessment system and the relationship of the component to other components in the system;
b) How the assessment results produced by each component will be used;
c) How the assessments and assessment results will be incorporated into a coherent educational system (i.e., a system that includes standards, assessments, curriculum, instruction, and professional development); and
d) How the educational system as a whole will improve student achievement and college- and career-readiness (as defined).

(A)(3) Assessment System Design
(up to 55 points)

Goal: The extent to which the design of the eligible applicant's proposed assessment system is innovative, feasible, and consistent with the theory of action.

We will consider—

a) The number and types of components (e.g., through-course summative assessments (as defined), end-of-year summative assessments, formative assessments, interim assessments) in mathematics and in English language arts in the assessment system;

Through-course summative assessment means an assessment system component or set of assessment system components that is administered periodically during the academic year. A student's results from through-course summative assessments must be combined to produce the student's total summative assessment score for that academic year.

(A)(3) Assessment System Design
(cont.)

We will consider—

b) For the assessment system as a whole—

i. How the assessment system will measure student knowledge and skills:
   - Against the full range of the college- and career-ready standards, including the standards against which student achievement has traditionally been difficult to measure;
   - Provide an accurate measure of student achievement, including for high- and low-performing students; and
   - Provide an accurate measure of student growth over a full academic year or course;

ii. How the assessment system will produce the required student performance data (i.e., student achievement data and student growth data (both as defined)) that can be used to determine whether individual students are college- and career-ready (as defined) or on track to being college- and career-ready (as defined);

(A)(3) Assessment System Design

Pause for Definitions…

Student achievement data means data regarding an individual student's mastery of tested content standards. Student achievement data from summative assessment components must be reported in a way that can be reliably aggregated across multiple students at the subgroup, classroom, school, LEA, and State levels.

Student growth data means data regarding the change in student achievement data (as defined) between two or more points in time. Student growth data from summative assessment components must be reported in a way that can be reliably aggregated across multiple students at the subgroup, classroom, school, LEA, and State levels and over a full academic year or course.

Student subgroups are used as defined in section 1111(b)(3)(C)(xiii) of the ESEA (i.e., by gender, by each major racial and ethnic group, by English proficiency status, by migrant status, by students with disabilities as compared to nondisabled students, and by economically disadvantaged students as compared to students who are not economically disadvantaged).

(A)(3) Assessment System Design

Pause for Definitions… (cont.)

College- and career-ready means, with respect to a student, that the student is prepared for success, without remediation, in credit-bearing entry-level courses in an IHE, as demonstrated by an assessment score that meets or exceeds the achievement standard (as defined) for the final high school summative assessment in mathematics or English language arts.

On track to being college- and career-ready (used in place of the term "proficient") means that the student is performing at or above grade level such that the student will be college- and career-ready (as defined) by the time of high school graduation.

(A)(3) Assessment System Design (cont.)

We will consider—

b) For the assessment system as a whole—

i. How the assessment system will be accessible to all students, including English learners and students with disabilities, and include appropriate accommodations (as defined) for students with disabilities and English learners; and

ii. How and when during the academic year different types of student data will be available to inform and guide instruction, interventions, and professional development; and

(A)(3) Assessment System Design (cont.)

We will consider—

c) For each component in mathematics and in English language arts in the assessment system—

i. The types of data produced by the component, including student achievement data (as defined), student growth data (as defined), and other data;

ii. The uses of the data produced by the component, including:

- Determining whether individual students are college- and career-ready (as defined) or on track to being college- and career-ready (as defined);
- Informing determinations of school effectiveness for the purposes of accountability under Title I of the ESEA;
- Informing determinations of individual principal and teacher effectiveness for the purposes of evaluation;
- Informing determinations of principal and teacher professional development and support needs;
- Informing teaching, learning, and program improvement; and
- Other uses;

(A)(3) Assessment System Design (cont.)

We will consider—

c) For each component in mathematics and in English language arts in the assessment system—

iii. The frequency and timing of administration of the component, and the rationale for these;

iv. The number and types of items (e.g., performance tasks, selected responses, brief or extended constructed responses) and the distribution of item types within the component, including the extent to which the items will be varied and elicit complex student demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (descriptions should include a concrete example of each item type proposed); and the rationale for using these item types and their distributions;

(A)(3) Assessment System Design (cont.)

We will consider—

c) For each component in mathematics and in English language arts in the assessment system—

v. The component's administration mode (e.g., paper-and-pencil, computer-based, or other electronic device), and the rationale for the mode;

vi. The methods for scoring student performance on the component, the estimated turnaround times for scoring, and the rationale for these; and

vii. The reports produced based on the component, and for each report, its intended use, target audience (e.g., students, parents, teachers, administrators, policymakers), and the key data it presents.

Table for (A)(3)(c): ELA and Math

- There is a summary table, but it does not include all of the information you are asked to provide in the narrative response. Please be sure your narrative response is complete.
- In addition, you are asked to provide examples of item types. If you cannot represent these on paper, you may submit them on CD (see Application Submission).

Grade	Type of Component	Types of data produced / how used	Frequency and timing of administration	Number and types of items, and distribution of item types	Administration mode	Scoring method and estimated turnaround time	Report(s) produced, intended use, audience

(A)(4) Assessment System Development (up to 35 points)

Goal: The extent to which the eligible applicant's plan for developing the proposed assessment system will ensure that the assessment system is ready for wide-scale administration in a manner that is timely, cost-effective, and consistent with the proposed design and incorporates a process for ongoing feedback and improvement.

We will consider—

a) The approaches for developing assessment items (e.g., evidence centered design, universal design for learning) and the rationale for using those approaches; the development phases and processes to be implemented consistent with the approaches; and the types of personnel involved in each development phase and process (e.g., practitioners, content experts, assessment experts, experts in assessing English learners, experts in assessing students with disabilities, psychometricians, cognitive scientists, IHE representatives, career and technical education experts);

(A)(4) Assessment System Development (cont.)

We will consider—

b) The approach and strategy for designing and developing accommodations (as defined), accommodation policies, and methods for standardizing the use of those accommodations for—
   i. English learners; and
   ii. Students with disabilities;

Accommodations means changes in the administration of an assessment, including but not limited to changes in assessment setting, scheduling, timing, presentation format, response mode, and combinations of these changes, that do not change the construct intended to be measured by the assessment or the meaning of the resulting scores. Accommodations must be used for equity in assessment and not provide advantage to students eligible to receive them.

(A)(4) Assessment System Development (cont.)

We will consider—

b) The approach and strategy for designing and developing accommodations (as defined), accommodation policies, and methods for standardizing the use of those accommodations for—
   i. English learners; and
   ii. Students with disabilities;

c) The approach and strategy for ensuring scalable, accurate, and consistent scoring of items, including the approach and moderation system (as defined) for any human-scored items that are part of the summative assessment components and the extent to which teachers are trained and involved in the scoring of assessments;

(A)(4) Assessment System Development (cont.)

We will consider—

d) The approach and strategy for developing the reporting system; and

e) The overall approach to quality control; and the strategy for field testing assessment items, accommodations, scoring systems, and reporting systems, including, with respect to assessment items and accommodations, the use of representative sampling of all types of student populations, taking into particular account high- and low-performing students and different types of English learners and students with disabilities.

(A)(5) Research and Evaluation (up to 30 points)

Goal: The extent to which the eligible applicant's research and evaluation plan will ensure that the assessments developed are valid, reliable, and fair for their intended purposes and for all student subgroups.

We will consider—

a) The plan for identifying and employing psychometric techniques suitable to verify, as appropriate to each assessment component, its construct, consequential, and predictive validity; external validity; reliability; fairness; precision across the full performance continuum; and comparability within and across grade levels; and

b) The plan for determining whether the assessments are being implemented as designed and the theory of action is being realized, including whether the intended effects on individuals and institutions are being achieved.

(A)(6) Professional Capacity and Outreach (up to 15 points)

Goal: The extent to which the eligible applicant's plan for implementing the proposed assessment system is feasible, cost-effective, and consistent with the theory of action.

We will consider—

a) The plan for supporting teachers and administrators in implementing the assessment system and for developing, in an ongoing manner, the professional capacity to use the assessments and results to inform and improve instructional practice; and

b) The strategy and plan for informing the public and key stakeholders (including legislators and policymakers) in each member State about the assessment system and for building support for the system from the public and those stakeholders.

(A)(7) Technology Approach (up to 10 points)

Goal: The extent to which the eligible applicant is using technology effectively to improve the quality, accessibility, cost-effectiveness, and efficiency of the proposed assessment system.

We will consider—

a) The description of, and rationale for—

   i. The ways in which technology will be used in assessment design, development, administration, scoring, and reporting;

   ii. The types of technology to be used (including whether the technology is existing and commercially-available or is being newly developed); and

   iii. How other States or organizations can re-use in a cost effective manner any technology platforms and technology components developed under this grant;

b) How technology-related implementation or deployment barriers will be addressed (e.g., issues relating to local access to internet-based assessments).

Technology-Related Program Requirements

An eligible applicant awarded a grant under this category must—

- Use technology to the maximum extent appropriate to develop, administer, and score assessments and report assessment results (Program Requirement 7).

Technology-Related Program Requirements (cont.)

These technology requirements apply to both Categories A and B

- Unless otherwise protected by law or agreement as proprietary information, make any assessment content (*i.e.*, assessments and assessment items) developed with funds from this grant category freely available to States, technology platform providers, and others that request it for purposes of administering assessments (provided they comply with consortium or State requirements for test or item security and with privacy laws) (Program Requirement 6).
- Maximize the interoperability of assessments across technology platforms and the ability for States to switch their assessments from one technology platform to another by (Program Requirement 5)—
  - Developing all assessment items to an industry-recognized, open-licensed interoperability standard that is approved by the Department during the grant period, without non-standard extensions or additions; and
  - Producing all student-level data in a manner consistent with an industry-recognized open-licensed interoperability standard that is approved by the Department during the grant period.

Budget Tutorial

Category A – Budget Background

We'll focus first on Category A – but listen closely because Category B has a lot in common with this

- Because the Department is unsure how many applicants it will fund, it is uncertain how much funding will be available for each applicant.
- Therefore, in order to fund as fully as possible those applicants that the Department selects as grantees, we ask you to organize your budgets under Category A of this competition into Level 1 and Level 2 budget modules (both as defined).
- Note: There is no requirement that 50% of these funds – for either Category A or B – be passed through to LEAs.

Category A – Level 1 Budget Modules

A Level 1 budget module means a budget module that (a) is necessary to delivering operational summative assessments in both mathematics and English language arts no later than school year 2014-2015, or (b) is otherwise necessary to the eligible applicant's proposed project and consistent with the eligible applicant's theory of action.

- A Level 1 budget may consist of one or more "modules," which, in aggregate, cannot exceed $150M in total funds requested. (A "module" organizes work into smaller "chunks," to allow for cases, for example, where different entities are responsible for different pieces of work.)
- All of the budget items required to meet the absolute priority and deliver operational summative assessments by SY2014-2015 must be included in Level 1 budget modules.
- If you are able to create your proposed Comprehensive Assessment System with total requested funds of $150 million or less, only include Level 1 budget modules – there's no need for Level 2.

Category A – Level 2 Budget Modules

- If you cannot fully fund your proposal within $150 million, then you can include Level 2 budget modules. If there is funding available, the Department will fund Level 2 budgets modules, informed by your prioritization.
- No Level 2 budget module may exceed $10 million in total funds requested. There is no limit on how many Level 2 budget modules you may include in your application.
- You should assign each Level 2 budget module a unique priority, where "1" is the highest priority.

Level 2 budget module means any budget module for which an eligible applicant is seeking funds under the Comprehensive Assessment Systems grant category other than a Level 1 budget module. An eligible applicant must prioritize Level 2 budget modules in the order of importance to the implementation of the proposed project.

Budget Formats

- *For Category A Only*: You must submit a detailed budget table and narrative for each proposed Level 1 and Level 2 budget module.
- *For Category B Only*: You must submit one budget table and one narrative for the entire project. The total funds requested may not exceed $30 million.
- The budget tables and narratives are designed to allow you to describe in detail how your budgets align with your proposed tasks and activities in supporting the design, development, implementation, and evaluation of the proposed assessments.
- You are encouraged to use other Federal, State, or philanthropic funds toward the design, development, implementation, and evaluation of the proposed assessments. You may include these funds in your budget; they will reduce the "total funds requested" under the grant.

Category A – Budget Formats

- **Budget Summary** (Budget Part A)
  - *Budget Summary Table*. Cover sheet that summarizes the total budget requested for each Level 1 and Level 2 budget module.
- **Level 1 Budget Modules** (Budget Part B)
  - *Level 1 Budget Modules – Summary Table*. Total budget requested across all Level 1 budget modules, by budget category and for each year in which funds will be expended.
  - *Level 1 Budget Module – Detailed Table*. Budget for each Level 1 budget module, by budget category and for each year in which funds will be expended.
  - *Level 1 Budget Module – Detailed Narrative*. Narrative providing backup detail associated with each budget category.
- **Level 2 Budget Modules** (Budget Part C)
  - *Level 2 Budget Module – Detailed Table*. Budget for each Level 2 budget module, by budget category and for each year in which funds will be expended.
  - *Level 2 Budget Module – Detailed Narrative*. Narrative providing backup detail associated with each budget category.

Category A – Budget Formats

- **Budget Summary** (Budget Part A)
  - *Budget Summary Table*. Cover sheet that summar
    requested for each Level 1 and Level 2 budget mod
- **Level 1 Budget Modules** (Budget Part B)
  - *Level 1 Budget Modules – Summary Table*. Total bu
    Level 1 budget modules, by budget category and f
    will be expended.
  - *Level 1 Budget Module – Detailed Table*. Budget for eac evel 1 budget module,
    by budget category and for each year in which fund
  - *Level 1 Budget Module – Detailed Narrative*. Narr
    associated with each budget category.
- **Level 2 Budget Modules** (Budget Part C)
  - *Level 2 Budget Module – Detailed Table*. Budget for e
    by budget category and for each year in which fu
  - *Level 2 Budget Module – Detailed Narrative*. Narrativ
    associated with each budget category.

4. Finally, we'll look at the Budget Summary Table

2. Then we'll look at the Level 1 Summary

1. We're going to look at the Level 1 Detail Narrative & Table first

3. We'll show you that Level 2 looks a lot like the Level 1 Detail

Category A – Level 1 Budget Module Detailed Narrative

Begin the detailed narrative for each Level 1 budget module with this information:

- **Name:** The name or identifier you use in your application to refer to this Level 1 budget module
- **Associated Workplan:** The workplan items associated with and developed under this Level 1 budget module
- **Rationale:** The rationale for why this is a Level 1 budget module, describing why the work done under this budget module (a) is necessary to delivering operational summative assessments in both mathematics and English language arts no later than school year 2014-2015, or (b) is otherwise necessary to the eligible applicant's proposed project and consistent with the eligible applicant's theory of action

Then provide a detailed explanation of each expenditure requested in each budget category.

Detailed Narrative – Guidance

Examples of Detail Level to be Provided

- Personnel – Line 1

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Project Director (1): Jane Doe will be responsible for the overall leadership and management of the States working on the mathematics assessments. She has twelve years of experience in this field, and had leadership roles in XYZ. She will report to ABC. Her qualifications are described in detail in the project management plan on page D-24 of the Appendix.	100%	$85,000/yr	$85,000/yr

- Travel – Line 3

Travel: Travel expenses average $500/person, in addition to an amount of per diem of $50.	# Trips	$ per Trip	Total
Quarterly in-person governance meetings for all governing States, lasting two days each. (See criterion (A)(1) for more information about these governance meetings.)	2 people/State x 7 governing States x 4 mtgs/yr	$600/ person	$336,000

(See application for Category A p. 53-57; for Category B p. 41-45)

Detailed Narrative – Guidance

- Contractual – Line 6

For all contractor expenses, provide as much line-item detail as you are able to make your assumptions and calculations clear. At a minimum, provide:

- The products to be acquired and/or the professional services to be provided.
- The estimated cost per expected procurement and detailed basis for cost estimates.
- For professional services contracts, the amounts of time to be devoted to the project, including the costs to be charged to this proposed grant award.
- A brief statement that the 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.
- Any additional basis for cost estimates or computations.
- Explain the purpose and relation to the project.

Note: Because grantees must use appropriate procurement procedures to select contractors, applicants should not include information in their grant applications about specific contractors that may be used to provide services or goods for the proposed project if a grant is awarded.

Detailed Narrative – Guidance

- Other Funds Allocated Toward this Work – Line 12

For other funds allocated toward this work, provide:

- Any financial contributions being made by States in the consortium toward the completion of this work, through the repurposing or reallocation of existing Federal or State funds.
- Any financial contributions to this work being made by third parties such as foundations.
- Any in-kind contributions to this work being made by third parties such as foundations or professional services firms.

Explain:

- Each funding source, what work they are funding or providing, and any requirements placed on the use of the funds or the timing of the work.

Include:

- This total "outside" funding on the "Other Funds Allocated Toward This Work" row.

Category A – Level 1 Budget Module Detailed Table

Complete one table and one narrative for each budget module (put the name at the top)

Budget Part B: Level 1 Budget Module – Detailed Table

Name: *[indicate the identifier used when referring to this budget module]*

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual					
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)					
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Total Costs (add lines 9-10)					
12. Other Funds Allocated Toward this Work					
13. Total Funds Requested (subtract line 12 from line 11)					

For each module, include here the budget by category for each year of the grant

You may include indirect costs

Deduct other funds received

To arrive at the total funds requested

Category A – Level 1 Budget Modules Summary Table

Budget Part B: Level 1 Budget Modules – Summary Table					
Budget Categories	**Project Year 1 (a)**	**Project Year 2 (b)**	**Project Year 3 (c)**	**Project Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual					
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)					
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Total Costs (add lines 9-10)					
12. Other Funds Allocated Toward this Work					
13. Total Funds Requested (subtract line 12 from line 11)					

Then total up each budget category across all Level 1 budget modules, and transfer these figures to this Level 1 Budget Modules – Summary Table.

Total Funds Requested cannot exceed $150M

Category A – Level 2 Budget Module Detailed Narrative

You have to complete one "Level 2 Budget Module – Detailed Table" and one accompanying "Level 2 Budget Module – Detailed Narrative" for each Level 2 budget module you propose.

Begin the detailed narrative with this information:

- **Name:** The name or identifier you use in your application to refer to this Level 2 budget module.
- **Associated Workplan:** The workplan items associated with and developed under this Level 2 budget module.
- **Priority/Rationale:** The priority assigned to this module and the rationale for assigning this priority.

Then, using the same guidance provided for Level 1, include a detailed explanation of each expenditure requested in each budget category.

Category A – Level 2 Budget Module Detailed Table

- Level 2 Budget Module – Detailed Table looks just like the Level 1 Detailed Table.
- Create a budget table for each Level 2 budget module, by budget category and for each year in which funds will be expended.
- Include at the top the name of the budget module and its priority.

Budget Part III: Level 2 Budget Module – Detailed Table
Name: *[indicate the identifier used when referring to this budget module]*
Priority: *[indicate the unique priority assigned to this budget module, where Priority 1 is the highest]*

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual					
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)					
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Total Costs (add lines 9-10)					
12. Other Funds Allocated Toward this Work					
13. Total Funds Requested (subtract line 12 from line 11)					

Category A – Summary Budget Table

Include each Level 1 budget module

Level 1 total may not exceed $150M

Include each Level 2 budget module, listed in priority order – no row may exceed $10M

This is the grand total requested – should not exceed $350M

Budget Part A: Summary Budget Table

Budget Module	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
Level 1 Budget Modules					
1. [*insert Level 1 budget module name*]					
2. [*insert additional rows as required*]					
3. **Total Funds Requested – Level 1 Budget Modules** (lines 1-5)					
Level 2 Budget Modules					
4. [*insert Level 2 budget module name*] Priority 1					
5. [*insert additional rows as required*]					
6. **Total Funds Requested – Level 2 Budget Modules** (lines 7-11)					
7. **Total Funds Requested for Comprehensive Assessment System** (lines 6 plus 12)					

Finally, include the budget for each budget module for each year of the grant (line 13 from each Budget Module Detail Table)

Category B – Budget Summary Narrative

This is how Category B works

You have to complete one "Budget Summary Table" and one accompanying "Budget Summary Narrative" for Category B.

Include as part of the detailed narrative:

- The **workplan** items associated with each budget item.
- The **rationale** describing why the work done is necessary.

Using the same guidance provided for Level 1, include a detailed explanation of each expenditure requested in each budget category.

Category B – Budget Summary Table

- The Category B Budget Summary Table looks just like the Level 1 Detailed Table.
- The total funds requested may not exceed $30M.

Summary Budget Table					
Budget Categories	**Project Year 1 (a)**	**Project Year 2 (b)**	**Project Year 3 (c)**	**Project Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual					
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1-8)					
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Total Costs (add lines 9-10)					
12. Other Funds Allocated Toward this Work					
13. Total Funds Requested (subtract line 12 from line 11)					

Other Considerations

Program Requirements
Application Submission
Application Review Process

These sections apply to both Categories A and B

General Information

- Page length/formatting
- Preparing a Table of Contents and Numbering Pages
- Preparing an Executive Summary
  - No more than 2 pages (binding page limit)

Selected Program Requirements

An eligible applicant awarded a grant under this category must—

- Actively participate in any applicable technical assistance activities conducted or facilitated by the Department or its designees, including periodic expert reviews, collaboration with other consortia that receive funds under this program, and other activities as determined by the Department;
- Work with the Department to develop a strategy to make student-level data* that result from the assessment system available on an ongoing basis for research (e.g., for prospective linking, validity, and program improvement studies);

*Applicants awarded a grant under this program must comply with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and 34 CFR Part 99, as well as State and local requirements regarding privacy.

Selected Program Requirements (cont.)

An eligible applicant awarded a grant under this category must—

- Use funds from this grant category only for the design, development, and evaluation of the assessment system. An eligible applicant awarded a grant under this category may not use funds for the administration of operational assessments; and
- Identify any current assessment or accountability requirements in Title I of the ESEA that would need to be waived in order for member States to fully implement the proposed assessment system for purposes of assessment under Title I.

Application Submission Procedures

- Submit applications in paper copy, including one original and one copy.
- Ensure that the original and one copy include signed original versions of Sections I.E and I.F of the application and one copy of that signed original.
- Indicate CFDA number 84.395B (Comprehensive Assessment Systems) or 84.395C (High School Course Assessments Program) on the mailing envelope
- Use Hand Delivery or Overnight Mail (Note different addresses for Hand Delivery and Overnight mail delivery)

Application Submission Procedures (cont.)

- Content that cannot be submitted in paper form should be submitted on CD-ROM or DVD-ROM. Files must be in a .DOC,.DOCX, .PDF , .PPT/PPTX, .HTML, .JPEG, .GIF, .PNG, .TIFF, .XLS/XLSX, .XML/.XSD, .CSV, .TXT, or .ZIP format. Applicant must include ten (10) copies of such CD-ROMs or DVD-ROMs.
- Applications must be **received** (not postmarked!) by 4:30:00 p.m. (Washington DC time) on **June 23, 2010.** ***Late applications will not be accepted.***

How Applications Will Be Reviewed

- A consortium may apply for a grant in either or both categories.
- The Department will score and rank applications separately in each grant category.
- There will likely be one panel of expert reviewers* who will review all applications in both competition categories.
- General review process:
  - Reviewers will review applications independently, write preliminary comments, and assign preliminary scores.
  - Reviewers will convene to review and discuss applications.
  - Reviewers will independently finalize their comments and scores. (There will be no State or consortia presentations in either competition category.)
  - The Department will average the reviewers' scores and rank order the applicants separately for each category of the competition.
  - The Secretary will make the final determination of winner(s) in each category.

* The Department reserves the right to constitute more than one review panel if it receives too many eligible applications for one panel to handle effectively.

Scoring Rubric

- Reviewers will allot points based on the quality of the applicant's proposal.
- Points are allotted by criterion; the reviewers exercise independent judgment about the extent to which the responses to the sub-criteria constitute a high-quality response to the criterion overall.
- Reviewers will assign points using this guidance:

Maximum Point Value	Quality of Applicant's Response		
	Low	Medium	High
60	0-15	16-44	45-60
55	0-14	15-40	41-55
45	0-11	12-33	34-45
35	0 – 9	10 – 25	25 – 35
30	0 – 8	9 - 21	22 – 30
25	0 – 7	8-18	19 – 25
20	0-5	6-14	15-20
15	0-4	5-10	11-15
10	0-2	3-7	8-10
5	0-1	2-3	4-5

High School Course Assessment Program

Eligibility and Other Requirements
Absolute and Competitive Priorities
Other Selection Criteria—(B)(2) through (B)(5)

Now it's all about Category B

Overview: High School Course Assessment Program Grants

Priorities

Absolute Priority: High School Course Assessment Programs

Competitive Preference Priority 1: Focus on Preparing Students for Study in STEM-Related Fields

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Focus on Career Readiness and Placement

Selection Criteria

(B)(1) Consortium Governance (up to 30 points)

(B)(2) Theory of Action (up to 5 points)

(B)(3) Course Assessment Program Design and Development (up to 60 points)

(B)(4) Research and Evaluation (up to 25 points)

(B)(5) Course Assessment Program Implementation (up to 45 points)

(B)(6) Project Management (up to 35 points)

Absolute Priority:
High School Course Assessment Programs

***Directions**: The absolute priority cuts across the entire application and should not be addressed separately. It is assessed, after the proposal has been fully reviewed and evaluated, to ensure that the application has met the priority.*

Goal: The Department supports the development of—

- New or adapted assessments for high school courses;
- That are used by multiple States; and
- Are valid, reliable, and fair for their intended purposes and students.

Absolute Priority (cont.):
High School Course Assessment Programs

Applicant must demonstrate that it will develop and implement a high school course assessment program that—

a) For each course in the assessment program—
   i. Measures student knowledge and skills against standards from a common set of college- and career-ready standards (as defined) in subjects for which such a set of standards exists, or otherwise against State or other rigorous standards;
   ii. As appropriate, elicits complex student demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills;
   iii. Produces student achievement data (as defined) and student growth data (as defined) over a full academic year or course that can be used to inform—
      A. Determinations of individual principal and teacher effectiveness and development and support needs; and
      B. Teaching, learning, and program improvement; and
   iv. Is designed to assess the broadest possible range of students, including English learners (as defined) and students with disabilities (as defined);

Similar to Category A but "lighter"

Absolute Priority (cont.):
High School Course Assessment Programs

Applicant must demonstrate that it will develop and implement a high school course assessment program that—

b) Includes assessments for multiple courses that will be implemented in each member State at a scale that will enable significant improvements in student achievement outcomes statewide; and

c) Includes a process for certifying the rigor of each assessment in the assessment program and for ensuring that assessments of courses covering similar content have common expectations for rigor.

Competitive Preference Priority 1:
Focus on Preparing Students for Study in STEM-Related Fields

Goal: Develop, with input from one or more four-year degree-granting IHEs, assessments for high school courses that comprise a rigorous course of study that is designed to prepare high school students for postsecondary study and careers in the STEM fields, including technology and engineering. Any such course of study may include cross-cutting or interdisciplinary STEM courses (e.g., computer science, information technology, bioengineering) and be designed to address the needs of underrepresented groups.

Competitive Preference Priority 1 (cont.):

Focus on Preparing Students for Study in STEM-Related Fields

- Applicant must address the priority throughout the application narrative, and must provide a separate plan that describes—
  a) The courses for which assessments will be developed*;
  b) How the courses comprise a rigorous course of study that is designed to prepare high school students for postsecondary study and careers in the STEM fields; and
  c) How input from one or more four-year degree-granting IHEs will be obtained in developing assessments for the courses.
- Ten points will be awarded on an "all or nothing" basis (i.e., 10 points or zero points) for applicants meeting this priority.

* Applicants may not use the same course of study to address both this priority and Competitive Preference Priority 2 (Focus on Career Readiness and Placement).

Competitive Preference Priority 2:

Focus on Career Readiness and Placement

Goal: Develop, with relevant business community participation and support, assessments for high school courses that comprise a rigorous course of study in career and technical education that is designed to prepare high school students for success on technical certification examinations or for postsecondary education or employment.

Competitive Preference Priority 2 (cont.):
Focus on Career Readiness and Placement

- Applicant must address the priority throughout the application narrative, and must provide a separate plan that describes—
  a) The courses for which assessments will be developed*;
  b) How the courses comprise a rigorous course of study in career and technical education that is designed to prepare high school students for success on technical certification examinations or for postsecondary education or employment; and
  c) How relevant business community participation and support will be obtained in developing assessments for the courses.
- Ten points will be awarded on an "all or nothing" basis (i.e., 10 points or zero points) for applicants meeting this priority.

* Applicants may not use the same course of study to address both this priority and Competitive Preference Priority 1 (Focus on Preparing Students for Study and Careers in STEM-Related Fields).

Selection Criteria: High School Course Assessment Program Grants

(B)(1) Consortium Governance (up to 30 points)

(B)(2) Theory of Action (up to 5 points)

(B)(3) Course Assessment Program Design and Development (up to 60 points)

(B)(4) Research and Evaluation (up to 25 points)

(B)(5) Course Assessment Program Implementation (up to 45 points)

(B)(6) Project Management (up to 35 points)

We highlight only those areas that are significantly different from the Category A competition.

(B)(2) Theory of Action
(up to 5 points)

Goal: The extent to which the eligible applicant's theory of action is logical, coherent, and credible, and will result in improved academic outcomes for high school students across the States in the consortium.

(B)(2) Theory of Action
(cont.)

We will consider the description of and rationale for—

a) How the proposed high school course assessment program will be incorporated into a coherent high school educational system (i.e., a system that includes standards, assessments, curriculum, instruction, and professional development);

b) How the assessment program's rigor will be demonstrated and maintained over time;

c) How the assessment program will cover diverse course offerings that provide a variety of pathways to students; and

d) How the assessment program will be implemented at a scale that, across the States in the consortium, increases access to rigorous courses for students who have not typically had such access, and broadly improves student achievement and college and career readiness (as defined).

(B)(3) Course Assessment Program Design and Development (up to 60 points)

Goal: The extent to which the design and development of the eligible applicant's proposed high school assessment program is feasible, scalable, and consistent with the theory of action.

We will consider—

a) The high school courses for which the consortium will implement assessments; the rationale for selecting those courses, including a need to increase access to rigorous courses for students who have not typically had such access; and the processes by which new high school course assessments will be added to the assessment program over time and existing course assessments will be updated and refreshed;

(B)(3) Course Assessment Program Design and Development (cont.)

We will consider—

b) How the assessments will measure student knowledge and skills against standards from a common set of college- and career-ready standards (as defined) in subjects for which such a set of standards exists, or otherwise against State or other rigorous standards;

c) How the consortium will certify the rigor of each assessment in the assessment program, whether the assessment is new or adapted; and how the consortium will maintain consistent and high levels of rigor over time; and

(B)(3) Course Assessment Program Design and Development (cont.)

Similar to (A)(3) and (A)(4) but "lighter"

We will consider—

d) The general design and development approach for course assessments, including—

   i. The number and types of components (e.g., mid-term tests, through-course summative assessments (as defined), end-of-course assessments) in a high school course assessment;

   ii. The extent to which, and, where applicable, the approach for ensuring that, assessment items will be varied and elicit complex student demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills;

   iii. How the assessments will produce student achievement data (as defined) and student growth data (as defined);

   iv. The approach and strategy for ensuring scalable, accurate, and consistent scoring of assessments, and the extent to which teachers are trained and involved in the scoring of assessments; and

   v. How the course assessments will be accessible to the broadest possible range of students, including English learners and students with disabilities, and include appropriate accommodations (as defined) for students with disabilities and English learners.

(B)(4) Research and Evaluation (up to 25 points)

Similar to (A)(5) but "lighter"

Goal: The extent to which the eligible applicant's research and evaluation plan will ensure that the assessments developed are valid, reliable, and fair for their intended purposes and for all students.

We will consider—

a) The plan for verifying validity, reliability, and fairness; and

b) The plan for determining whether the assessments are being implemented as designed and the theory of action is being realized, including whether the intended effects on students and schools are being achieved.

(B)(5) Course Assessment Program Implementation (up to 45 points)

Goal: The extent to which the eligible applicant's plan for implementing the proposed high school course assessment program will result in increased student enrollment in courses in the assessment program (and therefore improved student academic outcomes) in each member State.

(B)(5) Course Assessment Program Implementation (cont.)

We will consider—

a) The approach to be used in each member State for promoting participation in the high school course assessment program by high schools, by teachers, and by students (e.g., voluntary participation, mandatory participation, incentive programs); the plan for implementing the approach, including goals, major activities, timelines, and entities responsible for execution; and the expected participation levels in each member State and across the consortium overall, including—

   i. The number and percentage of high schools expected to implement at least one of the assessments in the high school course assessment program in each of five consecutive years beginning with the 2013-2014 school year;

   ii. For each assessment in the assessment program, the number and percentage of high schools expected to implement the assessment in each of five consecutive years beginning with the 2013-2014 school year; and

   iii. The unduplicated number and percentage of high school students expected to take at least one assessment in the assessment program in each of five consecutive years beginning with the 2013-2014 school year; and

Tables for (B)(5)(a)(i), (ii) and (iii)

By State, the number and percentag of high schools expected to implement at least one of the assessments each year beginning SY2013-2014.

State in Consortium	2013-2014		2014-2015		2015-2016		2016-2017		2017-2018	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%

By State and for each assessment in the assessment program, the number and percentage of high schools expected to implement the assessment each year beginning SY2013-2014.

State in Consortium	Course Assessments	2013-2014		2014-2015		2015-2016		2016-2017		2017-2018	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%

By State, the unduplicated number and percentage of high school students expected to take at least one assessment each year beginning SY2013-2014.

State in Consortium	2013-2014		2014-2015		2015-2016		2016-2017		2017-2018	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%

(B)(5) Course Assessment Program Implementation (cont.)

We will consider—

b) The plan for supporting teachers and administrators in implementing the high school course assessment program and for developing, in an ongoing manner, the professional capacity to use the assessments and results to inform and improve instructional practice.

Similar to (A)(6)(a) but "lighter"

Wrap Up and Questions

Resources and Assistance

Website: www.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-assessment

Official Documents/Regulations:

- *Notice Inviting Applications*
- ***Application for Category A***
- ***Application for Category B***

Supporting Materials:

- ***Executive Summary***
- ***Frequently Asked Questions*** (coming soon – will be updated regularly)
- Presentations and transcripts (for calls and convenings)
- Expert and Public Input Meetings – presentations, transcripts, and written submissions

Start with these

Contact Us

- Website: www.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-assessment
- Email: racetothetop.assessment@ed.gov
- Telephone: 202-453-7246