Race to the Top Assessment

Annual Performance Report

CFDA Number: 84.395B

U.S. Department of Education
Washington, DC 20202
Revised July 5, 2012

INSTRUCTIONS FOR GRANTEES: Below, please provide the name of the consortium for which this report is prepared and the date it was submitted to the U.S. Department of Education. Complete sections one and two according to the guidelines provided in each of those sections along with the definitions included at the end of this form. Questions about preparing the report should be sent to your program officer. The completed report should be submitted electronically as a PDF document to your program officer by no later than August 15 of each reporting year. The final report is due on January 15, 2015. The Annual Performance Reports from both consortia will be posted on the Department's website as public documents.

NAME OF REPORTING CONSORTIUM: Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC)

DATE SUBMITTED: August 15, 2012

Purpose

The Race to the Top Assessment (RTTA) Annual Performance Report (APR) will document grantees' progress toward the development of an assessment system by a consortium of states that measures student knowledge and skills against a common set of college- and career-ready standards in mathematics and English language arts. The assessment system will cover the full range of those standards, elicit complex student demonstrations or applications of their knowledge and skills as appropriate, and provide an accurate measure of student achievement across the full performance continuum over a full academic year. The system will include one or more summative assessment components in mathematics and in English language arts that are administered at least once during the academic year in each of grades 3 through 8 and at least once in high school. The assessment system will include all students, including English language learners and students with disabilities. The system will produce student achievement data and student growth data that can be used to inform determinations of school effectiveness; individual principal and teacher effectiveness for purposes of evaluation; principal and teacher professional development and support needs; and teaching, learning, and program improvement.

The APR is one component of the U.S. Department of Education's (ED's) review of the RTTA program. In addition to providing basic financial information, the APR provides information on the grantees' progress in meeting key indicators for both the RTTA absolute priority (development of an assessment system as described above) and competitive preference priority (collaboration and alignment with higher education). Additional information about the grantees' progress is gathered through monthly calls and an annual review process. These activities also help to identify areas where technical assistance may be needed. Both the APR and the Department's final report from the annual review process will be made publicly available on ED's website in order to provide all stakeholders with progress updates on the development of the new assessment systems.

SECTION ONE. Key Indicators of Progress and Impact

Complete the summary tables below for the appropriate year of the grant. Use the notes field following each table as needed to explain the data provided, including explanations for any decreases from previously submitted data. For Table 3 on page 6, please add rows as needed, and include an explanation for how LEAs were assessed on meeting the minimum requirements. See Section three for definitions of selected terms, as originally provided in the Notice Inviting Applications (75 FR 18171).

Table 1. State Participation

The program requires that each consortium include a minimum of 15 states, of which at least 5 states must be Governing States.

Performance Measure		Application Data	July 1, 2011	July 1, 2012	July 1, 2013	July 1, 2014	FINAL 9/30/14
1.1.1 Number of states in the consortium by participation level	Governing States	**11**	**15**	**18**			
	Participating or Advisory States	**15**	**9**	**5**			

Notes for the 2011 data:

1.1.1: When PARCC submitted its application on June 23, 2010, the consortium had 26 member states – 11 of which were Governing States and 15 of which were participating states. Since then, four states decided to make the commitments necessary to move from participating state status to governing state status (Arkansas, Georgia, New Jersey, and Oklahoma). Additionally, two participating states withdrew from the PARCC consortium to become governing states in the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (California and New Hampshire).

Notes for the 2012 data:

Between July 1, 2011, and July 1, 2012, three states decided to make the commitments necessary to move from participating state status to governing state status in PARCC (Mississippi, New Mexico, and Ohio). Additionally, one participating state withdrew from the PARCC consortium to become a governing state in the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (South Carolina). Due to these changes, the total number of states in PARCC as of July 1, 2012, was 23. The U.S. Virgin Islands also submitted a letter of understanding, requesting to participate in PARCC as a non-state member and will cover all costs of their participation in the work.

Table 2. Progress Indicators

The performance measures below were included in the Notice Inviting Applications for the RTTA program and are used for compliance with the Government Performance and Results Act as well as illustrating grantee progress against program goals.

Performance Measure	Application Data	July 1, 2011	July 1, 2012	July 1, 2013	July 1, 2014	FINAL 9/30/14
1.2.1 Number of states in the consortium that have formally adopted a common set of college- and career-ready standards in math and English language arts (ELA)	**4**	**24**	**23**			
1.2.2 Number of states that have fully implemented the summative assessment components of the assessment systems developed by the consortium	**0**	**0**	**0**			
1.2.3 Number of institutions of higher education (IHE) that are working with the grantee to design and develop the final high school summative assessments in math and ELA	**896**	**755**	**676**			
1.2.4 Number of IHEs that have implemented policies that exempt from remedial courses and place into credit-bearing college courses students who meet the achievement standard for the final high school summative assessments in math and ELA and any other placement requirements	**0**	**0**	**0**			
1.2.5 Percentage of direct matriculation students in public IHEs that are enrolled in IHEs that are working with grantee to design and develop the final high school summative assessments in math and ELA and/or have implemented policies that exempt from remedial courses and place into	**90%**	**86%**	**86%**			

Performance Measure	Application Data	July 1, 2011	July 1, 2012	July 1, 2013	July 1, 2014	FINAL 9/30/14
credit-bearing college courses students who meet the achievement standard for the final high school summative assessments in math and ELA						

Notes for the 2011 data:

1.2.1: As of the date PARCC submitted its application for the RTTA competition (June 23, 2010), four states had officially adopted the Common Core State Standards – Kentucky (2/10/10), Maryland (5/25/10), Ohio (6/7/10), and New Jersey (6/16/10). Since then, the remaining 20 PARCC states have each adopted the CCSS.

1.2.2: Design of the summative components of PARCC assessment system began in the 2010-11 program year.

1.2.3 – The PARCC application reported that 188 public institutions or systems of higher education were committed to working with PARCC. We have converted that number to the total number of institutions in order to simplify year-to-year comparisons.

1.2.4 - We are currently working with our higher education stakeholders to identify policies that exempt from remedial courses and place into credit-bearing college courses students who meet the achievement standard for the final high school summative assessments in math and ELA and any other placement requirements to be implemented by the first administration of the PARCC assessments.

Much of the postsecondary engagement work during this phase has involved engaging high level policy makers, administrators, and institutional leaders to identify best practices and encourage their adoption of remediation and placement policies that will ensure a smooth transition to the PARCC assessments.

1.2.5 – The percentage of direct matriculation students has dropped due to the departure of California and New Hampshire from the consortium.

Notes for the 2012 data:

1.2.1 - As of the date PARCC submitted its application for the RTTA competition (June 23, 2010), four states had officially adopted the Common Core State Standards – Kentucky (2/10/10), Maryland (5/25/10), Ohio (6/7/10), and New Jersey (6/16/10). Since then, the remaining PARCC states have each adopted the CCSS prior to the end of 2011, per the PARCC Memorandum of Understanding. The reduction in the number of states from July 1, 2011, to July 1, 2012, reflects the withdrawal of South Carolina from PARCC. All states in PARCC have adopted a common set of college- and career-ready standards in math and English language arts (ELA).

1.2.2 - Design of the summative components of PARCC assessment system began in the 2010-11 program year. Development of assessment items and tasks began in June 2012 and will continue through 2014 through additional item and task development, item tryouts and field testing.

Table 3. Number of local education agencies (LEAs) for which data were submitted using the tool designed and administered by the two RTTA consortia regarding their technology capacity and the number that meet the consortium-defined minimum requirements to administer the summative assessment via computer, by state

Note: For your reference, the National Center for Education Statistics publishes the number of LEAs by state in its annual publication Numbers and Types of Public Elementary and Secondary Local Education Agencies. *These data are part of the Common Core of Data (http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/). The most recently available data, as of April 2012, are available at* http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2012/pesagencies10/tables/table_02.asp.

		July 1, 2011	*July 1, 2012*	*July 1, 2012*	*July 1, 2013*	*July 1, 2013*	*July 1, 2014*	*July 1, 2014*	*FINAL Sept. 30, 2014*
State	**Total LEAs in SY 2009-10**	**Num. meeting consortium-defined specs.**	**Num. that submitted data on tech. capacity**	**Num. meeting consor-tium-defined specs.**	**Num. that submitted data on tech. capacity**	**Num. meeting consortium -defined specs.**	**Num. that submitted data on tech. capacity**	**Num. meeting consortium -defined specs.**	**Num. meeting consortium-defined specs.**
Alabama	**171**	N/A*	0	N/A***					
Arizona	**676**	N/A*	423	N/A***					
Arkansas	**295**	N/A*	258	N/A***					
Colorado	**262**	N/A*	1	N/A***					
Delaware	**43**	N/A*	N/A	N/A***					
District of Columbia	**59**	N/A*	1	N/A***					
Florida	**75**	N/A*	73	N/A***					
Georgia	**206**	N/A*	196	N/A***					
Illinois	**1076**	N/A*	36	N/A***					
Indiana	**387**	N/A*	355	N/A***					
Kentucky	**194**	N/A*	0	N/A***					
Louisiana	**123**	N/A*	135	N/A***					
Maryland	**25**	N/A*	26	N/A***					
Massachusetts	**393**	N/A*	400	N/A***					
Mississippi	**165**	N/A*	161	N/A***					
New Jersey	**686**	N/A*	732	N/A***					
New Mexico		N/A*	0	N/A***					

State	Total LEAs in SY 2009-10	July 1, 2011	July 1, 2012	July 1, 2012	July 1, 2013	July 1, 2013	July 1, 2014	July 1, 2014	FINAL Sept. 30, 2014
		Num. meeting consortium-defined specs.	**Num. that submitted data on tech. capacity**	**Num. meeting consor-tium-defined specs.**	**Num. that submitted data on tech. capacity**	**Num. meeting consortium -defined specs.**	**Num. that submitted data on tech. capacity**	**Num. meeting consortium -defined specs.**	**Num. meeting consortium-defined specs.**
New York	**912**	N/A*	2,492	N/A***					
North Dakota	**225**	N/A*	237	N/A***					
Ohio	**1064**	N/A*	695	N/A***					
Oklahoma	**584**	N/A*	529	N/A***					
Pennsylvania	**799**	N/A*	1	N/A***					
Rhode Island	**54**	N/A*	42	N/A***					
South Carolina	**103**	N/A*	N/A	N/A***					
Tennessee	**140**	N/A*	140	N/A***					

Notes for the 2011 data:

* Minimum consortium-defined requirements will not be available prior to the 2011 annual reporting deadline.

Notes for the 2012 data:

** The data collected through the Technology Readiness Tool (TRT) reflects that number of district organizations that have accessed the TRT as of July 15, 2012.

** The TRT data may include school districts, administrative entities (e.g., Board Of Cooperative Educational Services), correctional facilities, online schools, charter entities, and other out-of-district locations that may serve as testing centers. This definition may cause the reported number to be higher than the number of LEAs in an individual state.

**The actual LEA participation data is self-reported, so some of the difference in district count could also be an artifact of how accounts were created in the TRT database.

** As reference across all years of reporting for continuity, Table 3 uses the SY 2009-10 National Center for Education Statistics data for total number of LEAs.

*** Data were not collected at this level of detail during the initial reporting window. Additionally, minimum consortium-defined requirements will not be available prior to the 2012 annual reporting deadline.

SECTION TWO. Financial Expenditures

Report the actual expenditure totals for each of the budget categories listed in Section 2A. Include federal supplemental grant funds in the totals provided for each budget category, as applicable. For Section 2B, report the total amount of non-federal and non-SEA funds (e.g., foundation funds) used to support the work of the consortium.

Section 2A – Budget Summary
U.S. Department of Education Funds

Budget Categories	Sept 2010–July 1, 2011	July 2, 2011–June 30, 2012	July 1, 2012–June 30, 2013	July 1, 2013–June 30, 2014	TOTAL FOR THE GRANT (9/30/14)
1. Personnel	See Notes	See Notes*			
2. Fringe Benefits	See Notes	See Notes*			
3. Travel	$322,816.00	$1,064,073.78			
4. Equipment	$6,181.00	$43,830.02			
5. Supplies	$686.00	$4,170,786.52			
6. Contractual	$1,258,792.00	0			
7. Training Stipends	0	$5,840.87			
8. Other	0	$5,284,803.83			
9. Total Direct Costs (Lines 1-8)	$1,688,475.00	$6,926.77			
10. Indirect Costs	0	$5,291,730.60			
11. Total Costs (Lines 9-11)	$1,688,475.00	$5,291,730,60			

Section 2B – Budget Summary
Non-Federal Funds

	Sept 2010–July 1, 2011	July 2, 2011–June 30, 2012	July 1, 2012–June 30, 2013	July 1, 2013–June 30, 2014	TOTAL FOR THE GRANT (9/30/14)
Total amount of non-federal funds used to support the work of the consortium	$196,413	$344,331**			

Notes for the 2011 data:

Personnel Costs and Fringe Benefits are included in the Contractual Services line. All personnel have been hired under a subgrant to the Tallahassee Community College which employs the personnel on behalf of the Florida Department of Education (FDOE). These personnel work onsite in the FDOE building, are directly supervised by FDOE staff, and function in every way as DOE staff. Following is a list of personnel employed by Tallahassee Community College to carry out PARCC duties and responsibilities:

• PARCC Project Director
• PARCC Contract/Fiscal Manager
• PARCC Fiscal Officer (2 individuals share this position)
• PARCC Purchasing Agent
• PARCC Accountant (2 FTE)
• PARCC Grants Specialist (Travel)

All positions are currently filled except one of the accountants.
Also please note that indirect costs are not charged on contracted services; therefore moving the personnel to contracted services significantly reduces the indirect costs charged to the grant.

Notes for the 2012 data:

* Personnel Costs and Fringe Benefits are included in the Contractual Services line. All personnel have been hired under an agreement with the Tallahassee Community College which employs the personnel on behalf of the Florida Department of Education (FDOE). These personnel work onsite in the FDOE building, are directly supervised by FDOE staff, and function in every way as DOE staff. Following is a list of personnel employed by Tallahassee Community College to carry out PARCC duties and responsibilities:

• PARCC Project Director
• PARCC Contract/Fiscal Manager
• PARCC Fiscal Officer (2 individuals share this position)
• PARCC Purchasing Agent
• PARCC Accountant (2 FTE)

• PARCC Grants Specialist (Travel)
• PARCC Attorney (.5 FTE)

All positions are currently filled.
Also please note that indirect costs are not charged on contracted services; therefore moving the personnel to contracted services significantly reduces the indirect costs charged to the grant.
** The funds listed in Section 2B come from non-federally funded positions within the Florida Department of Education that contribute to the work of PARCC.

Definitions

Achievement standard means the level of student achievement on summative assessments that indicates that (a) for the final high school summative assessments in mathematics or English language arts, a student is college- and career-ready (as defined below); or (b) for summative assessments in mathematics or English language arts at a grade level other than the final high school summative assessments, a student is on track to being college- and career ready. An achievement standard must be determined using empirical evidence over time.

College- and career-ready (or readiness) means, with respect to a student, that the student is prepared for success, without remediation, in credit-bearing entry-level courses in an Institution of Higher Education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act), as demonstrated by an assessment score that meets or exceeds the achievement standard (as defined in this notice) for the final high school summative assessment in mathematics or English language arts.

Common set of college- and career-ready standards means a set of academic content standards for grades K-12 that (a) define what a student must know and be able to do at each grade level; (b) if mastered, would ensure that the student is college- and career-ready (as defined above) by the time of high school graduation; and (c) are substantially identical across all States in a consortium A State may supplement the common set of college- and career-ready standards with additional content standards, provided that the additional standards do not comprise more than 15 percent of the State's total standards for that content area.

Direct matriculation student means a student who entered college as a freshman within two years of graduating from high school.

Governing state means a state that (a) is a member of only one RTTA consortium, and (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.

Participating state means a state that is a member of the consortium, but may also be a member of another consortium and does not play the full role of a Governing State as defined above.

Student achievement data means data regarding an individual student's mastery of test content standards. Student achievement data come from summative assessment components and 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 above) 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.