

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: SMARTER BALANCED ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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	17	19	22			
	Advisory States	14	10	5			

Notes for the 2011 data:
 Notes: Advisory State = Participating State
 Additions: CA (Governing State or GS), WY (Advisory State or AS)
 Withdrawals: GA (AS), OK (AS), NJ (AS), NM (GS)
 Change Status: NH (AS → GS), IA (AS → GS)

Notes for the 2012 data:
 Additions: None
 Withdrawals: KY (AS), OH (AS)

Change Status: SC (AS → GS), DE (AS → GS), SD (AS → GS)

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)	11 <i>(See Notes)</i>	27 <i>(See Notes)</i>	27			
1.2.2 Number of states that have fully implemented the summative assessment components of the assessment systems developed by the consortium	NA	NA <i>(See Notes)</i>	NA <i>(See Notes)</i>			
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	162 IHEs/IHE systems committed to participate with the Consortium in the design and development of the final high school summative	163 IHEs/IHE systems committed to participate with the Consortium in the design and development of the final high school	161 IHEs/IHE with original commitments to participate with the Consortium in the design and development of the final high school summative assessments in ELA and mathematics <i>{See Notes}</i>			

Performance Measure	Application Data	July 1, 2011	July 1, 2012	July 1, 2013	July 1, 2014	FINAL 9/30/14
	assessments in ELA and mathematics	summative assessments in ELA and mathematics <i>{See Notes}</i>	<p>Public higher education systems in the consortium's 22 governing states are actively engaged in development of the final summative assessment, as evidenced by participation in consortium meetings, review of design documents, and nomination of individuals to serve on work groups and advisory committees.</p> <p>Smarter Balanced staff continue to encourage the remaining advisory states participation in the development activities within the capacity the states can afford.</p>			

Performance Measure	Application Data	July 1, 2011	July 1, 2012	July 1, 2013	July 1, 2014	FINAL 9/30/14
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	162 IHEs/IHE systems committed to implement policies that exempt from remedial courses and place into credit-bearing college courses any student who meets the Consortium-adopted achievement standard for each assessment and any other placement requirement established by the IHE or IHE system	163 IHEs/IHE systems committed to implement policies that exempt from remedial courses and place into credit-bearing college courses any student who meets the Consortium-adopted achievement standard for each assessment and any other placement requirement established by the IHE or IHE system <i>{See Notes}</i>	161 IHEs/IHE systems with original commitments to central tenets of the objective and other criteria previously designated in earlier years' reporting. <i>{See Notes}</i> Public higher education systems in 19 of 22 governing states have completed plans for implementation of Common Core and Smarter Balanced, including making the policy changes necessary to incorporate the 11 th Grade Summative Assessment into institutional placement policies. Smarter Balanced staff are assisting the remaining states with completing plans and will provide advice and technical assistance to all member states as they begin			

Performance Measure	Application Data	July 1, 2011	July 1, 2012	July 1, 2013	July 1, 2014	FINAL 9/30/14
			implementing their plans.			
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 credit-bearing college courses students who meet the achievement standard for the final high school summative	74%	58%	56%			

Performance Measure	Application Data	July 1, 2011	July 1, 2012	July 1, 2013	July 1, 2014	FINAL 9/30/14
assessments in math and ELA						

Notes for the 2011 data:

1.2.1 – At the time of application, NJ, which has since withdrawn from the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC), had adopted the common standards; as of the July 1, 2011 report date, MT and WA were the remaining states within SBAC that had not formally adopted the Common Core State Standards. (WA has since adopted – July 20, 2011)

1.2.2 – At present the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) summative assessment is still under development.

1.2.3 & 1.2.4 – Since the grant submission:

- 10 IHE/IHE systems have been added (submitted signed commitment letters)
- 9 IHE/IHE systems have been removed (due to state exit)
(2 states--VT and CA--have not submitted any IHE letters)

Notes for the 2012 data:

1.2.2 – At present the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium (Smarter Balanced) summative assessment is still under development.

1.2.3 & 1.2.4 – Since the grant submission:

- No IHE/IHE systems have been added
- 2 IHE/IHE systems have been removed (due to state exit)
- 2 states--VT and CA--have not submitted IHE letters

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.

State	Total num. of 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. NA - (See Notes)	Num. that submitted data on tech. capacity	Num. meeting consortium-defined specs. {See Notes}	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.
California	984		1046						
Connecticut	187		194						
Delaware	37		40						
Hawaii	1		0						
Idaho	138		161						
Iowa	361		0						
Kansas	316		0						
Maine	246		0						
Michigan	791		830						
Missouri	556		562						
Montana	417		312						

State	Total num. of 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. NA - (See Notes)	Num. that submitted data on tech. capacity	Num. meeting consortium-defined specs. {See Notes}	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.
Nevada	17		18						
New Hampshire	191		104						
North Carolina	211		215						
Oregon	197		199						
South Carolina	86		91						
South Dakota	156		184						
Utah	111		42						
Vermont	291		62						
Washington	295		293						
West Virginia	55		58						
Wisconsin	442		443						
Alabama	133		0						
Colorado	179		1						
Kentucky	174								
North Dakota	185		237						
Ohio	938								
Pennsylvania	634		1						
Wyoming	48		0						

Notes for the 2011 data:

Report has listed each state currently a member of the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) and the corresponding number of LEAs (Regular School Districts and Charter Agencies). Since SBAC has not defined its minimum requirements for participation in the online assessment there is no data to share for the July 1, 2011 period regarding LEAs meeting requirements to administer. SBAC is currently soliciting for vendor support to devise a readiness tool that will collect this information; expectation is for information to be available within the 2012 calendar year.

Notes for the 2012 data:

Report has listed each state currently a member of the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (Smarter Balanced) and the corresponding number of LEAs (Regular School Districts and Charter Agencies) as reported through the initial collection effort of the Technology Readiness Tool. As Smarter Balanced just completed its gathering of initial readiness data from LEAs – the data submission window closed June 30, 2012 – the Consortium is able to submit data on the number of submissions, but until analysis of the data is completed, cannot yet report on the number of LEAs meeting the minimum requirements. This information will be available later in calendar year 2012.

KY and OH were struck from the running list due to their withdrawal from the consortium during the past year.

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	July 1, 2011	July 1, 2012	July 1, 2013	July 1, 2014	TOTAL FOR THE GRANT (9/30/14)
1. Personnel	\$69,084	\$304,556			\$373,640
2. Fringe Benefits	\$15,391	\$73,134			\$88,525
3. Travel	\$5,932	\$105,843			\$111,775
4. Equipment	-	-			-
5. Supplies	\$3,425	29,739			\$33,164
6. Contractual	\$2,257,788	\$12,712,571			\$14,970,359
7. Construction	-	-			-
8. Other	-	-			-
9. Total Direct Costs (Lines 1-8)	\$2,351,620	\$13,225,843			\$15,577,463
10. Indirect Costs	\$17,381	\$99,878			\$117,259
11. Training Stipends	-	-			-

12. Total Costs (Lines 9-11)	\$2,369,001	\$13,325,721			\$15,694,722
------------------------------	-------------	--------------	--	--	--------------

**Section 2B – Budget Summary
Non-Federal Funds**

	July 1, 2011	July 1, 2012	July 1, 2013	July 1, 2014	TOTAL FOR THE GRANT (9/30/14)
Total amount of non-federal funds used to support the work of the consortium	\$2,704	\$714,456			\$717,160

Notes for the 2011 data:

Dollar values presented represent only those funds available through the federal grant and subsequent foundation awards provided directly in support of the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC). The expenditures represent only the payout WA has completed as of the reporting period end date (July 1, 2011).

Notes for the 2012 data:

Dollar values presented represent only those funds available through the federal grant and subsequent foundation awards provided directly in support of the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (Smarter Balanced). The expenditures represent only the payout WA has completed as of the reporting period end date (July 1, 2012).

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.