

Race to the Top Assessment Annual Performance Report

CFDA Number: 84.395B

**U.S. Department of Education
Washington, DC 20202
Revised June 25, 2014**

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 90 days after the end of the grant project period. 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 (Smarter Balanced)

DATE SUBMITTED: September 03, 2014

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

To be eligible for initial award of the Race to the Top Assessment comprehensive grants, a consortium needed to 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
1.1.1 Number of states in the consortium by participation level	Governing States	17	19	22	21	21	
	Participating or Advisory States	14	10	5	4	1	
	Affiliates				1 (territory)	1 (territory)	

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)

Notes for the 2013 data:
Additions: AK (AS), USVI (AF*); * AF = Affiliate status included in Smarter Balanced governance document
Withdrawals: Colorado (AS), Utah (GS), AL (AS)
Change Status: None

Notes for the 2014 data:
Additions: None
Withdrawals: KS (GS), SC (GS), AK (AS)
Change Status: ND (AS → GS), WY (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
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	25 [24 states + 1 territory] <i>(See Notes)</i>	23 [22 states + 1 territory]	
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>	NA <i>(See Notes)</i>	NA <i>(See Notes)</i>	

<p>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</p>	<p>162 IHEs/IHE systems committed to participate with the Consortium in the design and development of the final high school summative assessments in ELA and mathematics</p>	<p>163 IHEs/IHE systems committed 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></p>	<p>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> 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. Smarter Balanced staff continue to encourage the remaining advisory states participation in the development activities within the capacity the states can afford.</p>	<p>123 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> Public higher education systems in the consortium's 23 governing states are actively engaged in development of the summative and interim assessments and the digital library of formative assessment tools and practices, as evidenced by participation in consortium meetings, work groups, item/performance task development and review teams, task forces and advisory committees, and the formative assessment State Leadership Teams and State Networks of Educators.</p>	<p>123 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> Public higher education systems in consortium's 21 governing states are actively engaged in development of summative & interim assessments and digital library of formative tools and practices, as evidenced by participation in consortium meetings, work groups, item / performance task development and review teams, task forces and advisory committees, and the formative assessment State Leadership Teams and State Networks of Educators.</p>	
---	--	---	---	--	---	--

<p>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</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>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></p>	<p>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></p> <p>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 11th Grade Summative Assessment into institutional placement policies.</p> <p>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 implementing their plans.</p>	<p>123 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></p> <p>Public higher education systems all but the newest governing states have completed plans for implementation of Common Core and Smarter Balanced, including making the policy changes necessary to incorporate the 11th Grade Summative Assessment into institutional placement policies. Smarter Balanced staff, including the director of higher education collaboration and five senior regional advisors, continue to provide states with support and technical assistance as they move forward with implementation.</p>	<p>123 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></p> <p>Public higher education systems have completed plans for implementation of Common Core and Smarter Balanced, including making the policy changes necessary to incorporate the 11th Grade Summative Assessment into institutional placement policies. Smarter Balanced staff, including the director of higher education collaboration and five senior regional advisors, continue to provide states with support and technical assistance as they move forward with implementation.</p>	
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

<p>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 assessments in math and ELA</p>	74%	58%	56%	52%	48%	
---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	--

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

Notes for the 2013 data:

1.2.1 – AK is lone state in the Consortium that has not adopted the Common Core State Standards as the common set of college and career-ready standards; AK has adopted a set of college & career standards in Math and English language arts that Smarter Balanced has accepted as comparable.

1.2.2 –Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (Smarter Balanced) is in Year 3 of development of the summative assessment; no states can officially adopt until development is complete.

1.2.3 & 1.2.4 – Since the last submission,

- No IHE/IHE systems have been added
- 3 IHE/IHE systems have been removed (due to state exit)
- 3 states (VT, CA, AK) and 1 affiliate (USVI) have not submitted an IHE letters

In April 2013, the governing states approved a College Content-readiness Policy that defines the consequences of student performance at each of 4 performance levels on the Grade 11 summative assessment. This policy was developed through extensive consultation with the higher education leads and higher education faculty in the governing states. Governing state approval of the policy was contingent on a shared state decision by K12 and higher education. The policy calls for K12 and higher education in each state to collaborate on establishing Grade 12 requirements for students who did not meet the college readiness threshold at the end of Grade 11. This feature of the policy will help students, teachers, and schools identify the learning that must take place in Grade 12 in order for students to avoid remediation.

In 2013, work began on the development of a companion policy on career readiness. A task force composed of experts in career and technical education from K12 and higher education has been formed that will craft a recommended policy for state consideration. The draft policy will then undergo several rounds of state review and revision prior to a final vote planned for March 2014.

Notes for the 2014 data:

1.2.1 – All members have adopted the Common Core State Standards for English language arts/literacy and mathematics

1.2.2 – Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (Smarter Balanced) is in the final year of its four-year development project that includes a summative assessment; no states can officially adopt until development is complete. With that as background, applying the relaxation granted through the USED’s flexibility waiver on double-testing, five members (CA, CT, ID, MT and SD) effectively shifted state testing to Smarter Balanced by have near 100% participation in the scheduled field test.

1.2.3 & 1.2.4 – Since the last submission,

- No IHE/IHE systems have been added
- 2 IHE systems have been removed (KS & SC)
- 3 states (VT, CA, AK) and 1 affiliate (USVI) have not submitted an IHE letters

In March 2014, Governing States approved an optional recommended approach for counseling students on the implications of Smarter Balanced assessment results for career readiness. Governing state approval of the policy was contingent on a shared state decision by K12 and higher education.

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/>).

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
		Num. meeting consortium-defined specs. NA – (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. that submitted data on tech. capacity	Num. meeting consortium-defined specs.	Num. meeting consortium-defined specs.
Governing (21)									
California	984		1046		562	446 ¹	437	1658 ¹	
Connecticut	187		194		194	142 ²	163	176 ²	
Delaware	37		40		39	40 ³	40	40 ³	
Hawaii	1		0		16 ⁴	1 ⁴	13 ⁴	1 ⁴	
Idaho	138		161		135	DNP	111	163 ⁵	
Iowa	361		0		0	351 ⁵	0	DNP	
Maine	246		0		229	195 ⁷	0	201 ⁶	
Michigan	791		830		770	285 ⁸	517	440 ⁷	
Missouri	556		562		558	126 ⁹	90	194 [*]	
Montana	417		312		62	375 ¹⁰	18	409 ⁸	
Nevada	17		18		9	15 ¹¹	1	6 ⁹	
New Hampshire	191		104		82	47 ¹²	69	68 ¹⁰	
North Carolina	211		215		182	29 [*]	77	113 ¹¹	
North Dakota	185		237		125	11020	96	170 ¹²	
Oregon	197		199		17	197 ¹³	3	196 ¹³	
South Dakota	156		184		97	140 ¹⁵	184	150 ¹⁴	
Vermont	291		62		62	46 ¹⁶	58	300 [*]	
Washington	295		293		112	229 ¹⁷	293	289 [*]	
West Virginia	55		58		57	39 ¹⁸	56	57 ¹⁵	
Wisconsin	442		443		142	340 ¹⁹	434	383 ¹⁶	
Wyoming	48		0		19	2821	48	40 ¹⁷	
Advisory (4)									
Pennsylvania	634		1		0	DNP	0	DNP	

		July 1, 2011	July 1, 2012	July 1, 2012	July 1, 2013	July 1, 2013	July 1, 2014	July 1, 2014	FINAL
State	Total num. of LEAs in SY 2009-10	Num. meeting consortium- defined specs. NA – (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. that submitted data on tech. capacity	Num. meeting consortium- defined specs.	Num. meeting consortium- defined specs.
Affiliate (1)									
U.S. Virgin Islands			-		0	0*	0	2 ¹⁸	

Withdrawals (9)									
South Carolina	86					SC exited APR. 2014			
Alaska	133					AK exited JAN. 2014			
Kansas	316					KS exited DEC. 2013			
Alabama	133				AL exited Jan. 2013				
Colorado	179				CO exited Aug. 2012				
Utah	111				UT exited Aug. 2012				
Kentucky	174		KY exited March 2012						
Ohio	938		OH exited Nov. 2011						
New Mexico	122	NM exited June 2011							
New Jersey	686	NJ exited Apr 2011							
Oklahoma	529	OK exited Mar 2011							
Georgia	191	GA exited Nov 2010							

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.

Notes for the 2013 data:

This report shows information for devices, unless otherwise noted.

*: data from the Technology Readiness Tool (TRT)

DNP: Data Not Provided

¹CA: Approximately 15 percent of California schools completed the Smarter Balanced Technology Readiness Tool (TRT). In an attempt to garner more information, the California Department of Education developed a brief survey to determine the preparedness of local educational agencies to administer the Smarter Balanced summative assessments. Respondents were asked to rate their level of confidence using a four point scale – completely confident, considerably confident, some level of confidence, and little confidence. Of the nearly 1,050 California school districts, 687 school districts responded to this survey. Of the 687 responding school districts, 446 (65%) indicated that based on the Smarter Balanced minimum technology requirements, they are considerably to completely confident that if Smarter Balanced computer-based assessments were administered today they would be able to complete testing within a 12-week window. The survey did not include responses from all districts, so this number is likely a little low. The responding local educational agencies serve approximately 87 percent of students enrolled in California public schools. Approximately 88% of responding school districts indicated they plan to use some of the 1.25 billion dollars allocated in Assembly Bill 86 to purchase additional or new technology equipment in order to implement the Smarter Balanced assessments.

² CT: 142 districts represent the numbers of districts ready for online assessments that have over 70 % of their devices meeting minimum requirements. There is no evidence that a school needs 100% of devices to meet minimum requirements, so a 70 % threshold was set.

³ DE: data from state testing experience

⁴ HI: data from the Hawaii State Assessment; Hawaii is a single district state, within which are Complex Areas (16), managed by assistant superintendents.

⁵ IA: data from the Iowa Condition of Education Report 2012; while our 2012 data indicates sufficient devices, the unresolved issue is sufficient bandwidth for online testing. Districts must reserve a portion of their bandwidth for critical systems (the

network, student information systems, voice over IP telephones, email and other data systems used on a daily basis). Additionally, the pilot testing in Iowa revealed larger bandwidth consumption than we had anticipated.

⁶ KS: data from State Testing Experience

⁷ ME: data from the Maine Learning Technology Initiative

⁸ MI: data from the TRT. The number meeting Consortium specifications was derived from the Device to Test-Taker Readiness Report; only districts at 100% were counted.

⁹ MO: Missouri school districts/LEAs are designated as having met the criteria for assessment technology readiness if they achieve a 100% rating on the Technology Readiness Tool's (TRT) Device Indicator, Device to Test Taker Indicator, AND Network Indicator reports. Based on data self-reported in the TRT by Missouri school districts/LEAs, 83% of them have met the Device Indicator minimum requirements. In addition, 79% report to have met the Device to Test Taker Indicator goal and 88% report to have met the Network Indicator. While Missouri school districts/LEAs have made great strides in meeting the teaching and learning needs of the Generation Z student, 126 of 561 (22.46%) report meeting the criteria for all three indicators. Bandwidth and internal network readiness continues to be the primary challenge for Missouri school districts/LEAs.

¹⁰ MT: data from the TRT and State Education Agency Survey of local districts

¹¹ NV: data from Nevada Assessment Readiness Team Meetings

¹² NH: Forty-seven represents the number of LEAs that have greater than 60% of their devices meeting the minimum requirements. Since there is no evidence that a school must have 100% of its devices meet the minimum in order to be "ready", it is reasonable to use a 60% threshold. Schools will be able to maximize the effective use of the devices that do meet the minimum requirements by establishing an appropriate number of testing days and associated number of testing sessions on each day that will allow for each student to use a compliant device.

¹³ OR: has delivered Math, English Language Arts, Science, Social Science and English Language Proficiency Assessments online for over 10 years and is currently delivers these assessments to all students in the state. Oregon has been a leader in online testing and is the first state to be approved by the USED to use an adaptive engine and was the first to deliver a braille version of our adaptive test to blind and visually impaired students.

¹⁴ SC: established with Device to Test-Taker Indicators Report from the TRT.

¹⁵ SD: data from TRT, state technology inventory and school communications.

¹⁶ VT: data from the TRT; districts with over 50% devices meeting minimum requirements

¹⁷ WA: data from combination of the TRT, State Testing Experience and Technology Inventory

¹⁸ WV: data from the TRT + state data collection

¹⁹ WI: data from School Speed Test Month and limited TRT data. Wisconsin's response to the Smarter Balanced questionnaire includes the following notes: Wisconsin based its readiness results primarily on over 63,000 results from Fall 2012 School Speed Test Month. During a 6 week period, 353 out of 447 Districts, representing 1281 out of 2223 sites/schools that performed at least 1 speed test. Our results were:

SBAC Readiness -

33% of schools are SBAC ready (>50 kbps/student)

43% of schools are on the fence (10-20 to 50 kbps/student) – thus 76% meet or exceed SBAC bandwidth readiness already

24% of schools are below SBAC minimums of 10-20 kbps)

²⁰ND: data is a state-generated estimate, including data from the TRT and extrapolation.

²¹WY: data from the TRT and WDE Survey for state assessment program

CO, UT and AL were struck from the running list due to their withdrawal from the Consortium during the past year; AK and USVI were added due to their admission into the Consortium; GA, NJ, NM and OK were appended to the list as original members who withdrew during the first reporting year.

Notes for the 2014 data:

DNP: Data Not Provided

*: data from the Technology Readiness Tool (TRT)

¹CA: This number is based on participation results from the Smarter Balanced Field Test in Spring 2014 and reflects the 3,119,402 students who completed at least one CAT assessment. Note: The total number of LEAs (1689) in California includes direct funded charter schools.

²CT: Connecticut's response to the Smarter Balanced questionnaire includes the following notes: Last year we had about 90 percent of our districts successfully administer the Smarter Balanced Field Test. Ten percent took our paper/pencil legacy assessment. As a result, we have at least 90 percent of our LEAs who have sufficient technology to meet consortium minimum specifications to administer online assessments.

³DE: Data from (1) Annual School Technology Survey and (2) State Testing Experience.

⁴HI: Hawaii's response to the Smarter Balanced questionnaire includes the following notes: As cited for response to similar request on 8/14/2013, Hawaii is a single district with the State Department of Education serving as both the SEA and LEA. Also cited, is our use of the existing on-line Hawaii State Assessment, which in effect qualifies that all schools are technology ready for on-line assessments. Here is the link shared in 8/14/2013 of a press release on this subject,...<https://lilinode.k12.hi.us/STATE/COMM/DOEPRESS.NSF/a1d7af052e94dd120a2561f7000a037c/788ec65a2cb3844c0a257a3e00832fba?OpenDocument>. (Note: as described in the 2013 APR, Hawaii's one district is organized into 16 Complex Areas.)

⁵ID: During the last two school years, Idaho school districts and charter schools utilized the Technology Readiness Tool to verify the capacity to administer the field test. Every school district and charter in Idaho successfully participated in the Smarter Balanced field test this spring with no major challenges or barriers. Idaho had 164,660 students participate, totaling 639,516 started tests.

⁶ME: The data are a combination of data based on school student enrollment reports, Maine Learning Technology Initiative program data and Maine School and Library Network program data.

⁷MI: Data from the Michigan Technology Readiness Assessment Tool (MTRAx)

⁸MT: Data from Smarter Balanced Participation and Montana Office of Public Instruction Data Sets

⁹NV: Nevada's response to the Smarter Balanced questionnaire includes the following notes: Nevada has identified a number of schools that are not ready to administer SBAC and placed them on a "red flag list". Two surveys were used to derive this information. First, the Nevada Educational Technology Survey inquired about SBAC-compliant devices. Second, Nevada participated in State School Speed Test Month through Education Superhighway to derive bandwidth speeds that meet SBAC requirements.

¹⁰NH: Information from the Device Meeting Minimum Requirements data in the Technology Readiness Tool. 68 SAUs have indicated that 60% or greater of their devices meet the minimum requirements. The total number of SAUs that submitted data into the tool was 83, with 108 SAUs being established in the tool. 76.8 % of all SAUs had some or all schools submit data into the tool. 82% of SAUs submitting data into the tool were considered ready because 60% or more of their devices met the minimum requirements for technology readiness.'

¹¹NC: Data from State Testing Experience

¹²ND: Data from the TRT (Tech Readiness Tool) and the recent internal bandwidth assessment [North Dakota] did on the sample LEAs. The pilot test of the assessment indicated no major technology problems at any tested schools.

¹³OR: Oregon's response to the Smarter Balanced questionnaire includes the following notes: OR has delivered Math, English Language Arts, Science, Social Science and English Language Proficiency Assessments online for over 10 years and currently delivers these assessments to all students in the state. Oregon has been a leader in online testing and is the first state to be approved by the USED to use an adaptive engine and was the first to deliver a braille version of our adaptive test to blind and visually impaired students.

¹⁴SD: South Dakota's response to the Smarter Balanced questionnaire includes the following note: 150 districts participated in the field test as the state of South Dakota had all students participate in the field test. The one district not tech ready is isolated and has limited internet access.

¹⁵WV: West Virginia's response to the Smarter Balanced questionnaire includes the following notes: This information comes from the TechReadiness section of the county technology plans. Each county Technology Director/Coordinator is required to complete a technology plan each year through an online collection process. Part of the plan includes the TechReadiness information that matches the format of the Smarter Balanced TechReadiness site, which is now closed. The information is exported from the site, imported into an Excel template. The formulas help to filter through the data to determine which equipment meets the minimum specs for each school and LEA.

¹⁶WI: Data from the October 2013 Wisconsin Online Assessment Readiness Survey

¹⁷WY: Data from the TRT report titled Overall Readiness Indicators. I counted each district where it was green (75-100%) on three indicators: % of devices meeting minimum requirements, AND % of students that can be tested on existing devices, AND % of students that can be tested with Existing infrastructure.

¹⁸VI: Virgin Island's response to the Smarter Balanced questionnaire includes the following notes: Based on information gathered from the Technology Readiness Tool in the 2012-13 school year, funding was set aside to close the gaps for schools that did not have sufficient number of devices that met the minimum requirements. Additional devices were installed in schools during the 2013-14 school year.

= AK, KS and SC 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	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
1. Personnel	\$69,084	\$304,556	\$556,194	\$671,648	\$1,601,482
2. Fringe Benefits	\$15,391	\$73,134	\$137,838	\$164,024	\$390,386
3. Travel	\$5,932	\$108,266	\$408,938	\$348,645	\$871,781
4. Equipment	-	-	-	-	-
5. Supplies	\$3,425	\$29,739	\$25,680	\$10,231	\$69,075
6. Contractual	\$2,257,788	\$13,906,773	\$33,124,379	\$79,009,548	\$128,298,487
7. Training Stipends	-	-	-	-	-
8. Other	-	-	-	-	-
9. Total Direct Costs (Lines 1-8)	\$2,351,620	\$14,422,467	\$34,253,028	\$80,204,096	\$131,231,211
10. Indirect Costs	\$17,381	\$99,878	\$192,572	\$323,963	\$633,794
11. Total Costs (Lines 9-11)	\$2,369,001	\$14,522,345	\$34,445,600	\$80,528,059	\$131,865,005

**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
Total amount of non-federal funds used to support the work of the consortium	\$2,704	\$714,456	\$1,051,858	\$1,218,558	\$2,987,575

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).

Notes for the 2013 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, 2013).

Notes for the 2014 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, 2014).

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.