



**SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium
Supplemental Funding
Budget Narrative**

**Submitted to the U.S. Department of Education
on January 6, 2011**



SBAC Supplemental Funding Proposal Budget Summary Table

| Budget Modules by Year¹ | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Budget Module | Project Year 1 | Project Year 2 | Project Year 3 | Project Year 4 | Total |
| 1a. Curriculum Materials | \$263,532 | \$766,828 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,030,360 |
| 1b. Formative Processes and Tools/Professional Development | \$122,850 | \$1,056,850 | \$4,379,685 | \$1,876,903 | \$7,436,288 |
| 1c. Implementation of Common Core Systems | \$517,850 | \$452,850 | \$0 | \$0 | \$970,700 |
| 1d. Communications | \$544,375 | \$604,761 | \$602,911 | \$588,856 | \$2,340,903 |
| 2. Aligning Assessments to Readiness | \$0 | \$187,909 | \$1,636,147 | \$352,850 | \$2,176,906 |
| 3. Support for Technology Transitions | \$405,700 | \$252,850 | \$0 | \$0 | \$658,550 |
| 4. Technical Assistance Meetings | \$148,600 | \$152,315 | \$78,061 | \$80,013 | \$458,989 |
| 5. PMP Management | \$200,000 | \$200,000 | \$200,000 | \$200,000 | \$800,000 |
| Total Supplemental Funds Requested | \$2,202,907 | \$3,674,363 | \$6,896,804 | \$3,098,622 | \$15,872,696 |

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

¹ Full case detail available upon request.

Supplemental Budget Module Detailed Narrative: Direct Support to States and Districts for Transition to Common Core Standards

The overarching goal of SBAC is to ensure that, through improved teaching and increased student learning, all students leave high school prepared for postsecondary success in college or career. High-quality assessment components that strategically balance and support summative, interim, and formative purposes should be designed to provide essential, but not sufficient supports to enable a learning system to meet this goal (Darling-Hammond & Pecheone, 2010; Rabinowitz, 2010).

This module's four focus areas (1a. Curriculum Materials; 1b. Formative Processes and Tools/Professional Development; 1c. Multi-state Collaborative Supporting Implementation of Common Core Systems; and 1.d Communications) support the information, coordination, and overall system design needs at the local, state, and Consortium levels for implementing the Common Core State Standards. The activities encompassed within the four areas of this module are designed to work in concert toward the development and implementation of integrated learning and assessment systems to improve student outcomes in participating States.

Oversight and coordination across the activities in this module will be provided by the Consortium's Formative Processes and Tools/Professional Development (FPT/PD) work group (one of ten work groups within the Consortium) and the Policy Coordinator. Each of the Consortium's ten work groups is charged with defining the scope and time lines for a sector of Consortium work, consistent with the project's overall design; developing resource requirements for its work; monitoring its allocated budget; and overseeing and directing the work in its sector. The Policy Coordinator will provide a means of communicating directly with stakeholder groups and coordinate the development of Consortium policy across SBAC states. This "Direct Support to States and Districts for Transition to Common Core Standards" module provides the project design and resources for the FPT/PD work group.

Supplemental Budget Module Detailed Narrative: Curriculum Materials

Scope of Work Overview:

The Consortium's Theory of Action articulates that, if all high school graduates are to be prepared to leave high school for college and career, many aspects of the current state education systems must be improved, and all aspects must be better coordinated and more fully integrated with the CCSS. Building a cohesive system of curriculum, assessment, and instruction to move toward the implementation of the Common Core Standards in every classroom depends on the alignment of the curriculum development efforts currently underway nationally to the SBAC assessment development process. The curriculum materials work described here will support the transition to CCSS and improved integration of instructional practices and the assessment system.

Curriculum materials will be developed to support local implementation of the Common Core State Standards and alignment of curriculum, instruction, and standards (i.e., strategies for ensuring alignment among the CCSS, curriculum, instructional practices, and assessments).

| Supplemental Budget Module: Curriculum Materials | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Budget Categories | Project Year 1 (a) | Project Year 2 (b) | Project Year 3 (c) | Project Year 4 (d) | Total (e) |
| 1. Personnel | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 2. Fringe Benefits | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 3. Travel | \$17,832 | \$18,278 | \$0 | \$0 | \$36,110 |
| 4. Equipment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 5. Supplies | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 6. Contractual | \$240,000 | \$740,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$980,000 |
| 7. Training Stipends | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 8. Other | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1–8) | \$257,832 | \$758,278 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,016,110 |
| 10. Indirect Costs | \$5,700 | \$8,550 | \$0 | \$0 | \$14,250 |
| 11. Total Costs (add lines 9–10) | \$263,532 | \$766,828 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,030,360 |
| 12. Other Funds Allocated Toward This Work | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 13. Total Funds Requested (subtract line 12 from line 11) | \$263,532 | \$766,828 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,030,360 |

Notes:

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

Supplemental Budget Module Detailed Narrative: Curriculum Materials

Building a cohesive system of curriculum, assessment, and instruction to move toward the implementation of the Common Core Standards in every classroom depends on the alignment of the curriculum development efforts currently underway nationally to the SBAC assessment development process. SBAC will coordinate the information and collaboration efforts of existing groups who are already working on building curriculum materials, frameworks, learning progressions, and classroom-based assessments to build that cohesion. To facilitate building relationships and identifying curriculum development efforts that are supportive and aligned with the SBAC assessment system, SBAC will contract with two full-time content experts (one in English language arts and one in mathematics) for Years 1 and 2 to identify and collaborate with existing groups, professional organizations, and curriculum developers to develop an overview of the curriculum development efforts that will align with SBAC assessments. The experts will work with the groups to identify products to populate the digital library with learning progressions for each Common Core State Standard, exemplars of curriculum units, and curriculum frameworks and will report back to the Executive Committee and work groups to ensure that SBAC supports collaboration to maximize the effectiveness of the work underway.

The SBAC content experts identify curriculum development efforts/groups that are aligned to SBAC and whose work may be customized to meet the needs of SBAC to populate the digital library. SBAC will contract with the developers to adapt or extend their work to align with SBAC specifications for learning progressions, curriculum frameworks, and the initial population of the digital library. This work in Years 1 and 2 builds critical relationships to provide a support network for the building of the digital library of formative assessment tasks and tools in Years 3 and 4 by the Formative Processes and Tools/Professional Development Work Groups.

The following Curriculum Materials activities are included in the supplemental budget to support the transition to the Common Core State Standards:

Year One:

- Contract with 2 content experts to consult and collaborate with other existing efforts of professional organizations, universities, and non-profit groups to develop curriculum materials including formative processes that may be aligned with the SBAC learning progressions and approach to teaching and learning.
- Contract with identified groups to adapt their curriculum materials and formative processes to SBAC specifications to upload to the digital library.

Year Two:

- Continue contracts with content experts to continue to consult and collaborate with professional organizations and support the identification and selection of materials for the digital library.

Expected outcomes: Curriculum materials including formative assessment processes developed by professional organizations, universities, non-profit groups providing examples of new approaches and effective lessons to teach the CCSS in learning progressions aligned to the SBAC specifications are uploaded to the digital library to provide a foundation for teacher professional development.

Expected uses: Teachers will use the curriculum materials in the digital library to develop lessons with formative processes and tools to help students learn the CCSS and to prepare for college and careers.

Deliverables:

- SBAC content experts build consultative and collaborative relationships with professional organizations, universities, and non-profit groups developing curriculum materials and identify which efforts are aligned to the SBAC learning progressions and approach to teaching and learning.
- SBAC contracts with professional organizations, universities, and non-profit groups identified by the SBAC content experts to adapt their curriculum materials to SBAC specifications to upload to the digital library.
- SBAC-approved curriculum materials are uploaded to the digital library.

Expenses by Budget Category:

3. Travel

| Travel Required | Detailed Description of Services | Basis for Cost Estimates | Total Cost |
|--|--|--|------------|
| Years 1 and 2: Travel to executive committee meetings and work groups | Prepare summary materials and ongoing advice to executive committee and work groups regarding how the partnering groups' work can be best incorporated into SBAC design. | Six meetings/year (2 years, 2 people). Travel cost estimates have a basis of \$1,486 per person per trip beginning in Year 1 and include a 2.5% cost increase each successive year. | \$36,110 |

6. Contractual

| Contract Services Required | Detailed Description of Services | Basis for Cost Estimates | Total Cost |
|---|--|--|------------------|
| <p>Years 1 and 2: Staffing for mathematics and ELA respectively</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify existing groups that are developing curriculum for CCSS, including learning progressions and curriculum frameworks. • Create recommendations for SBAC as to which groups seem to be appropriate partners. • Act as a liaison for SBAC to selected groups. • Identify professional organizations that may collaborate with SBAC to work with their members to assist with the vetting and building of the digital library of curriculum materials, learning progressions, instructional tools, and lessons. | <p>Two full-time FTE at \$120,000/year for two years.</p> | <p>\$480,000</p> |
| <p>Year 2: SBAC contracts with vendors with curriculum products, learning progressions, and curriculum frameworks that can be adapted or extended to meet SBAC specifications. (1 contract)</p> | <p>Existing development efforts/groups identified by the SBAC content staff that are closely aligned to the SBAC specifications for learning progressions, curriculum units, frameworks, and exemplars receive contracts to adapt or extend their work to meet SBAC specifications and populate the SBAC digital library.</p> | <p>Curriculum development adaptations or extensions based on the specific extension or adaptation required on a case-by-case basis. Anticipated total of \$500,000 for all contracts combined.</p> | <p>\$500,000</p> |

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

Supplemental Budget Module Detailed Narrative: Formative Processes and Tools/Professional Development

Scope of Work Overview:

Support states in planning and implementing professional development initiatives, creating formative tools and processes, and constructing practice guidelines and assessment frameworks.

1. Model curriculum and instructional modules that are aligned with the CCSS.
2. Training modules that help teachers focus their instruction on the CCSS and develop teaching practices that support more in-depth learning.
3. Training of teachers to use formative assessment tools and interim assessments as well as to interpret results and use those results to determine next steps in instruction.

| Supplemental Budget Module: Formative Processes and Tools/Professional Development | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Budget Categories | Project Year 1 (a) | Project Year 2 (b) | Project Year 3 (c) | Project Year 4 (d) | Total (e) |
| 1. Personnel | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 2. Fringe Benefits | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 3. Travel | \$0 | \$0 | \$4,133,985 | \$19,203 | \$4,153,188 |
| 4. Equipment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 5. Supplies | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 6. Contractual | \$120,000 | \$1,054,000 | \$240,000 | \$1,852,000 | \$3,266,000 |
| 7. Training Stipends | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 8. Other | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1–8) | \$120,000 | \$1,054,000 | \$4,373,985 | \$1,871,203 | \$7,419,188 |
| 10. Indirect Costs | \$2,850 | \$2,850 | \$5,700 | \$5,700 | \$17,100 |
| 11. Total Costs (add lines 9–10) | \$122,850 | \$1,056,850 | \$4,379,685 | \$1,876,903 | \$7,436,288 |
| 12. Other Funds Allocated Toward This Work | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

| Supplemental Budget Module: Formative Processes and Tools/Professional Development | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Budget Categories | Project Year 1 (a) | Project Year 2 (b) | Project Year 3 (c) | Project Year 4 (d) | Total (e) |
| 13. Total Funds Requested (subtract line 12 from line 11) | \$122,850 | \$1,056,850 | \$4,379,685 | \$1,876,903 | \$7,436,288 |

Notes:

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

Supplemental Budget Module Detailed Narrative: Formative Processes and Tools/Professional Development

The most effective professional development to build assessment literacy and improve the rigor and relevance of the curriculum occurs when teachers participate in identifying and evaluating the quality of formative processes, tasks, and tools with accompanying scoring guides, examples of student work, and suggested next steps in instruction based on the student responses. The supplemental funds will be used to build such a system of professional development using high quality exemplars of formative processes, tasks, and tools to establish the quality indicators to be used by teachers to evaluate and select or develop formative for their classroom instruction.

The proposed work includes continuing the relationships with content-area professional organizations (i.e. National Council of Teachers of English) and existing state efforts developed in the Curriculum project in Years 1 and 2. SBAC will work with these groups to develop a process with state staff to bring teachers together in states and regions collaborating with the state and regional chapters of the professional organization to facilitate the delivery of professional development modules developed by SBAC in assessment literacy; formative processes, tasks and tools; and scoring and analyzing student responses to determine student learning needs. Trained teachers will identify and select existing formative processes, tasks, and tools to populate the SBAC digital library and may develop formative tasks and tools for submission to the digital library using the quality criteria established by the SBAC exemplars. To ensure that there are significant numbers of teachers from all SBAC States participating in the

identification and selection of quality formative tasks and tools for the digital library, roughly half of the funds allocated to this component will be used to reimburse travel and substitute costs to involve 2,700 teachers nationwide, facilitated by states and chapters of the professional organizations, with a process that will sustain the efforts to populate the digital library into the future.

The Formative Processes and Tools/Professional Development Work Group (FPT/PD) will continue the contracts of the content experts in English language arts and mathematics from the Curriculum Work Group and will ask them to coordinate with content-area professional organizations identified during the curriculum development to collaborate on the development of the vetting process for formative tasks and tools to be included in the digital library. The professional organizations and SBAC work group will collaborate with states to develop processes that can be sustained beyond SBAC by the states.

State membership in the Implementing the Common Core System (ICCS) SCASS will serve as a vehicle for providing technical assistance for state transitions to the Common Core Standards. Each member state will report back to the SBAC FPT/PD work group about the capacity and existing efforts within their state to develop/review curriculum materials and formative assessment tools and tasks to transition to the Common Core State Standards. Using this information, the work group and content experts will assist states in the development of state-by-state plans to build on the existing efforts within each state and coordinate the efforts with SBAC curriculum and formative assessment projects to ensure an adequate level of support for teachers in using the SBAC digital library to access formative assessment tasks and tools as well as the interim assessments and performance tasks. State chapters of the professional organizations will be included in the discussions of the existing efforts within each state and their existing efforts will be included in the state-by-state plans to ensure an adequate level of support to each state.

The FPT/PD Work Group will pick up where the Curriculum Materials work leaves off. The first project will be to coordinate with the Interim Assessment item development work group to access the learning progressions that have been specified for interim item development. The SBAC content experts will post the interim learning progressions and item clusters that will be assessed in depth on the interim assessments in the digital library. The development of the interim assessment will provide a foundation for the development of formative assessment tasks and tools to ensure they provide teachers with accurate information about what students are learning. The set of items developed to measure learning progressions for the purposes of the interim assessments will be deep in terms of content coverage for each content cluster in the CCSS—a larger number of items will be used to measure small, incremental differences in what students know and can do. Item clusters will be developed that can hone in on students' precise level of understanding of those linked pieces of knowledge and/or demonstration of skills that constitute a progression.

The Interim assessment team will specify the learning progressions as a first step in the development process. Once identified, these learning progressions will be mapped to the CCSS and the evidence-based model will be applied to determine the knowledge and/or skills a student must demonstrate to show mastery of the steps in the learning progression. As with the summative assessment, an assessment framework, test blueprint, and item specifications will be developed to guide the development of the interim assessment item bank. This work will inform the development of formative assessment exemplar modules to show teachers how to build formative processes and tools into their classroom lessons that prepare students to

demonstrate a deep understanding of the learning progressions and to use the information from the interim scoring reports to adjust instruction and develop follow-up formative assessment tasks and tools.

In Year 2 the Formative Processes and Tools work group will contract with national experts identified by the SBAC content experts in each content area. The contractors will build out a module for each exemplar to demonstrate formative processes and tools that teachers can use to prepare students to master the learning progressions for the standard and demonstrate mastery on the interim assessments and summative assessments. The exemplar modules will translate the standards into content/curricular frameworks, test maps, and item/performance event specifications to provide assessment specificity and to clarify the connections between instructional processes and assessment outcomes. These modules will describe formative tasks and tools including several tasks, scoring rubrics, and samples of student work at multiple performance levels to show the appropriate levels of cognitive demand of the unpacked standard and learning progressions. Also included in the modules are suggested instructional approaches to address the learning needs identified by the student responses. The modules will include information for teachers about the following effective practices when using each formative process and tools:

- approaches for constructing and communicating detailed and rich descriptions of learning targets, including the criteria used to evaluate students' performance, products, and work;
- strategies for helping students understand these learning expectations;
- techniques and procedures for selecting and/or constructing assessments, prompts, guides, and other appropriate materials;
- strategies and procedures that will help teachers identify barriers in presentations, assessment formats, or response modes that prevent some students from demonstrating their knowledge and skills;
- procedures and techniques for eliciting and recording students' performance;
- mechanisms, strategies, techniques and effective approaches for providing feedback; and
- examples of specific instructional responses to learning deficiencies revealed by the assessment.

The 54 exemplars will address 1 or 2 learning progressions used for the interim assessments in grades 3–11 English language arts and mathematics (3 exemplar modules in English language arts and 3 exemplar modules in mathematics).

Also in Year 2, using the formative assessment exemplar modules as part of the content, the work group will contract with vendors to develop professional development modules to show teachers how to use the learning progressions, item clusters, item specifications, and scoring reports on the interim assessments to inform their instruction. In addition they will learn how to evaluate for selection existing formative tasks and tools based on indicators of quality and alignment demonstrated in the exemplar formative assessment modules.

In Year 3, the SBAC content experts and the SBAC FPT/PD work group will facilitate the collaboration between professional organizations and states. SBAC will support states and

professional organizations to convene teachers to receive training using the professional development modules and the formative assessment exemplar modules developed in Year 2.

State staff will be responsible for utilizing existing networks for professional development and inviting the regional representatives of the professional organizations to recommend teachers to participate in the sessions to participate in the professional development and using the information learned, identify and select quality formative tasks and tools for populating the digital library. The budget will provide for 90 teachers in each state (a total of 2,790 teachers nationwide) to attend five-day training sessions with a travel reimbursement and substitute cost reimbursement of up to \$295 per day. The teachers will use the professional development modules incorporating the formative assessment exemplar modules developed by the vendors to analyze and evaluate for selection for the digital library available formative assessment tools and tasks. They will learn how to score the formative tools and tasks and how to determine the learning needs of students based on the student responses. SBAC content experts and professional organizations, working in collaboration with states, will implement processes to lead the teacher meetings and build cadres of teachers who will continue to identify/develop quality formative tasks and tools based on the learning progressions for the Common Core State Standards and populate the digital library as part of the ongoing work of the professional organizations and states in collaboration with SBAC.

In Year 4 SBAC will facilitate the development of state communication and awareness professional development using the digital library with learning progressions, exemplar formative assessment modules, interim scoring rubrics and reports as well as the formative tools and tasks identified by the teachers. SBAC content experts will work with states and professional organizations to plan the rollout of the digital library and related assessment literacy professional development to sustain the work at state conferences, regional meetings, and on websites. State staff will collaborate with professional organizations in their state and regional meetings and on their websites to maximize dissemination of the information. Each state will implement a communication and professional development system that includes at least 10 days of training for each state network to train them how to disseminate the key messages and build support for the use of the digital library and interim and formative assessment system to support teachers in planning and implementing effective learning for students.

As described above, the supplemental funding supports activities that are distinct from Formative Processes and Tools/Professional Development development activities funded in the main grant. The following table shows the year-by-year description of Formative Processes and Tools/Professional Development activities funded through the main grant and supplemental funds.

**Activities by Year and Funding Source:
Formative Processes and Tools/Professional Development**

| Main Grant | Supplemental Funds |
|--|--|
| Year One | |
| No Activities | Design digital library of formative tools and resources. |
| Year Two | |
| Vendor develops professional development products and processes for use by state networks in a Train the Trainers model to disseminate Assessment Literacy. | <p>Vendor convenes a national panel of experts identified by the content experts to develop exemplar modules of formative assessment tasks and tools in English Language Arts and Math at grades 3–11.</p> <p>Vendor develops professional development modules to train teachers to use the exemplar modules of formative assessment tasks and tools to identify and select quality formative assessment tasks and tools to upload to the digital library.</p> |
| Year Three | |
| Vendor facilitates meetings of 130 teachers organized by grade and content area to rate curriculum materials and formative assessments available from publishers for use in schools based on their alignment to the SBAC learning progressions and assessments. The results are disseminated in a “Consumer Report.” | <p>Continue contracts with content experts (noted in the Curriculum Materials section of this budget narrative) to collaborate and consult with professional organizations and support the identification and selection of materials for the digital library.</p> <p>Conduct meetings of 90 teachers in each state (over 2,700 teachers nationwide) to use the professional development modules and exemplar modules of formative tasks and tools to identify and select quality formative tasks and tools to upload to the digital library.</p> |

| Main Grant | Supplemental Funds |
|---|--|
| Year Four | |
| Vendor facilitates state network Training of Trainers on using the Consumer Report of Curriculum Materials and Formative Assessments available from publishers. State networks disseminate information to teachers. | <p>Continue contracts with content experts to collaborate and consult with professional organizations and support the identification and selection of materials for the digital library.</p> <p>Coordinate with ICCS SCASS and the Transition to Common Core work group to develop a state-by-state plan to build on existing efforts to support teachers in using the digital library.</p> <p>Contract with a vendor to develop communication materials and facilitate state meetings to “roll-out” the digital library to key audiences on state websites, at conferences, and meetings.</p> |

Expenses by Budget Category:

3. Travel

| Travel Required | Detailed Description of Services | Basis for Cost Estimates | Total Cost |
|---|--|--|-------------|
| Year 3: Teachers participating in formative processes vetting/development travel to state-sponsored vetting/development five-day session for training and completing the vetting/development of formative processes and tools digital library for the assigned grade level and subject | Teachers travel to the five-day session sponsored by the state. They are reimbursed at a rate of up to \$295 per day for travel expenses based on state travel policies. | 90 teachers per state X 5 days at \$295 per day = \$132,750 per state X 31 states. | \$4,115,250 |

| Travel Required | Detailed Description of Services | Basis for Cost Estimates | Total Cost |
|--|---|---|-------------------|
| Years 3 and 4: Content Experts travel to meet with states and Professional Organizations to plan state meetings with teachers | Meet with SBAC work group to plan the configuration of teacher meetings to vet formative tasks and tools for the digital library in collaboration with Professional organizations, state and regional leaders, and state staff. | 6 meetings/year (2 years, 2 people) Travel cost estimates have a basis of \$1,486 per person per trip beginning in Year 1 and include a 2.5% cost increase each successive year. | \$37,938 |

6. Contractual

| Contract Services Required | Detailed Description of Services | Basis for Cost Estimates | Total Cost |
|---|--|---|-------------------|
| Years 1 and 2: Consulting contract with a single technology expert | SBAC content experts work with technology contractor to design and implement the population of the digital library with the learning progressions specified for the interim assessments. | 60 days of consulting (40 in Year 1, 20 in Year 2) by Technology Expert at \$3,000 per day. | \$180,000 |

| Contract Services Required | Detailed Description of Services | Basis for Cost Estimates | Total Cost |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| <p>Year 2: Consulting contract with a single vendor to convene national content experts</p> | <p>Contract with a service provider to convene panels of national content experts identified by SBAC content experts during the curriculum development work to develop exemplar modules of formative tasks and tools based on the learning progressions of CCSS. Development of modules includes authoring of scoring guides with accompanying samples of student work, aimed at helping teachers learn how to identify quality formative tasks and tools and how to use them to determine student learning needs in their classrooms.</p> <p>Content experts develop a small number of exemplar modules at each grade span in English language arts and mathematics to provide models for teachers.</p> <p>Based on development work by content experts, service provider assists in the development of “quality indicators” that can be used to judge the quality of extant or future formative tasks/tools</p> | <p>54 exemplar modules (3 per grade for grades 3–11 for English language arts and 3 per grade for grades 3–11 for mathematics) at \$11,000 per module for development with effective instructional practices to use with several tasks, scoring rubrics, and samples of student work at multiple performance levels to show the application of the ways students may be asked to demonstrate mastery of the standard at the level of cognitive demand of the unpacked standard and learning progressions.</p> | <p>\$594,000</p> |

| Contract Services Required | Detailed Description of Services | Basis for Cost Estimates | Total Cost |
|--|---|---|------------------|
| <p>Year 2: Contract with a vendor to develop professional development modules for teacher use to vet formative tasks and tools</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SBAC contracts with a service provider to develop professional development modules to train teachers to use the exemplar formative tasks and tools developed in Year 1 to evaluate the quality of existing formative tasks and tools for consideration to be included in the digital library based on the established quality standards. • Service provider develops professional development modules for use in face-to-face and web-based delivery. The modules are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Using the interim learning progressions, item clusters, and score reports to understand student needs and plan instruction and classroom formative assessments. - Using exemplar modules to determine quality indicators for formative tasks and tools. - Identifying quality indicators in existing formative tasks and tools. - Developing high-quality formative tasks and tools. - How to develop scoring rubrics, guides, and reports for formative tools and tasks and use student responses to plan continued instruction. | <p>4 modules (one each for ELA and mathematics for grades 3–6 and grades 7–11) at \$100,000 per module in web-based and face-to-to face delivery by state networks and professional organization representatives.</p> | <p>\$400,000</p> |

| Contract Services Required | Detailed Description of Services | Basis for Cost Estimates | Total Cost |
|--|---|--|-------------------|
| <p>Years 3 and 4: Two contracts with LEAs or SEA for intergovernmental agreements to purchase staff resources for mathematics and ELA respectively</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with groups/efforts identified during Curriculum development to collaborate on the development of the vetting process for formative tasks and tools to be included in the digital library. • Identify the gaps in learning progressions developed during the curriculum development work and complete the learning progressions. • Work with PD vendors to develop modules to train teachers to vet formative assessment tools and tasks and learn how to use student responses to determine their learning needs. | <p>Two staff FTE for 2 years at \$120,000/year each.</p> | <p>\$480,000</p> |

| Contract Services Required | Detailed Description of Services | Basis for Cost Estimates | Total Cost |
|--|---|--|--------------------|
| <p>Year 4: SBAC contracts with vendors to assist States and professional organizations collaborate to plan and implement state network meetings to introduce the digital library of formative processes and tools to educators statewide through conferences, network meetings, and information on state websites</p> | <p>The vendors will work with state department staff and state and regional professional organizations to design informational presentations and tools to generate feedback on the formative processes and tools as well as training modules for teachers to analyze student responses while scoring formative tasks and tools to determine the learning needs of students and plan the next lessons.</p> | <p>10 days development of communication products and tools to incorporate into the state communication plans at conferences, websites, and meetings with key stakeholder groups to generate broad interest in the digital library of formative processes and tools to use in training teachers to analyze student responses during scoring of formative tasks and tools to determine student learning needs.</p> <p>10 days for facilitation of state meetings, conferences, and gathering feedback.</p> <p>20 days at \$2,600 per day = \$52,000 X 31 states.</p> | <p>\$1,612,000</p> |

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

Supplemental Budget Module Detailed Narrative: Multi-state Collaborative Supporting Implementation of Common Core Systems

Scope of Work Overview:

For many years the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) has supported a number of State Collaboratives for Assessment and Student Standards (SCASS), subscription-based membership groups that provide the opportunity for state-level assessment and program staff to convene on a regular basis around topics related to educational reform. In addition to coordinating the SCASS meetings, CCSSO staffs each SCASS group and provides technical assistance to the SCASSs in their work.

In 2010 CCSSO established a new SCASS: Implementing the Common Core System (ICCS). State membership in the ICCS SCASS supports six individuals identified as key leaders in the state to attend three two-and-a-half day meetings each year. Additionally, the ICCS provides facilitated technical assistance to states in the intervening time between meetings. The goal is to assist each state in a systems approach to implement the CCSS through the development of policies and practices that fully connect, coordinate, and integrate the sub-systems (curriculum, instruction, professional development, accommodations, assessment, etc.) which together form the educational delivery system for students.

This module funds ICCS SCASS membership for each governing state for two full years, and for each advisory state for one full year. CCSSO and the Consortium will seek additional private funding to support a second year's membership for Advisory states, and for membership in Years 3 and 4 for all states.

In addition to the membership services provided by CCSSO to all ICCS SCASS states, CCSSO will provide an additional service to the Consortium. On the day immediately following, or immediately preceding each ICCS meeting, CCSSO will provide a meeting room and a day's lodging and per diem for a meeting of representatives from all Consortium states. This additional CCSSO sponsorship will be for one representative from each member state, both Governing and Advisory, but will not include air fare for individuals not already at the ICCS meeting. The purpose of these one-day meetings will be for members of the Consortium to engage in within-consortium collaboration on issues related to implementation of the CCSS.

| Supplemental Budget Module: | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Multi-state Collaborative Supporting Implementation of Common Core Systems | | | | | |
| Budget Categories | Project Year 1 (a) | Project Year 2 (b) | Project Year 3 (c) | Project Year 4 (d) | Total (e) |
| 1. Personnel | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 2. Fringe Benefits | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 3. Travel | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 4. Equipment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 5. Supplies | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 6. Contractual | \$775,000 | \$450,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,225,000 |
| 7. Training Stipends | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 8. Other | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1–8) | \$775,000 | \$450,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,225,000 |
| 10. Indirect Costs | \$2,850 | \$2,850 | \$0 | \$0 | \$5,700 |
| 11. Total Costs (add lines 9–10) | \$777,850 | \$452,850 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,230,700 |
| 12. Other Funds Allocated Toward This Work | \$260,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$260,000 |
| 13. Total Funds Requested (subtract line 12 from line 11) | \$517,850 | \$452,850 | \$0 | \$0 | \$970,700 |

Notes:

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

Expenses by Budget Category:

6. Contractual

| Contract Services Required | Detailed Description of Services | Basis for Cost Estimates | Total Cost |
|---|--|--|-------------------|
| Years 1 and 2: ICCS SCASS Membership | Funding ICCS SCASS memberships (2 years for 18 Governing States, 1 year for 13 Advisory States). | Membership fees established by CCSSO as \$25,000 per year per state. | \$1,225,000 |

12. Other Funds Allocated Toward This Work

| Other Funds Required | Detailed Description of Fund Source | Basis for Cost Estimates | Total Contribution by Other Fund |
|--|--|---|---|
| \$260,000 to support 1 year's membership for Advisory States | Funding for Advisory States to be provided by reallocation of \$260,000 from original SBAC grant, under the State SCASS membership category. This reallocation leaves \$640,000 available in SBAC grant to support other SCASS memberships for Consortium work groups. | One year's membership to standard CCSSO SCASS organizations is \$16,000; \$640,000 provides for possible 40 memberships across project period, one per established SBAC work group for each year. \$640,000 matches remaining balance from main application budget. | \$260,000 |

Supplemental Budget Module Detailed Narrative: Communications

Associated Work Plan:

Develop an integrated communications strategy that can be customized to meet the needs of local districts and state agencies for the purpose of promoting broader understanding of the CCSS by a variety of stakeholders, including: the general public; education policymakers; higher education; business leaders; education stakeholder and child advocacy groups; K–12 educators; and parents.

Year 1 activities will include the development and initial implementation of a communications strategy using analyses of stakeholder needs across-states and local jurisdictions. Data collection will include questionnaires and telephone polling, guided by findings from focus groups and interviews with Consortium representatives. Year 1 activities will conclude with the launching of an interactive Web site with targeted responsiveness to users in different roles, and the initiation of a Consortium blog and presence on other social media such as Facebook and Twitter.

Also taking place in Year 1 will be the procurement of Policy Coordinator services to enhance the assessment development process and to streamline communication to SEA stakeholders throughout the grant period. Policy Coordination, a contracted service estimated to require about 100 days per year, will provide direct service to SBAC to bridge between the Consortium and Governors, State Chief School Officers, institutions of higher education (IHEs), and other national policy organizations (e.g., NEA, AFT, NASBE, NASSP). The contractor will guide the coordination of the development of Consortium policy across SBAC States and across other consortia. This contract will be under the supervision of the Executive Director. Key responsibilities will include:

1. Coordinate with the Executive Director and the Executive Committee on policy-related issues relevant to the Consortium's development of a comprehensive assessment system (e.g., developments in ESEA reauthorization, policy decisions of key stakeholder groups, common policy alignment across Consortium States, comparability across consortia).
 - a. Develop briefings for the Executive Committee on policy issues and implement strategies for issue resolution, consulting with other stakeholder groups as necessary to obtain other perspectives.
 - b. Advise the Executive Director and the Executive Committee on design and implementation implications of decisions.
 - c. Prepare policy reports on behalf of the Consortium that outline key issues, possible options, and implications for the Executive and Steering Committees.
2. Coordinate and facilitate communication with policy partners (e.g., Consortium policy groups, CCSSO, Governors and their representatives, USED).
 - a. Recruit members for and coordinate the Consortium's Policy Coordination Committee and Technical Advisory Committee.
 - b. Recruit members for and coordinate the Consortium's IHE policy group. (Given the large number of IHE/IHE systems committed to participate in the Consortium, recruitment will likely involve a different process from that used for the Policy and Technical groups.)
 - c. Convene and lead all policy group meetings.

- d. Serve as liaison to IHE presidents/system heads.
 - e. Convene meetings with leadership of member States (Governors, Chiefs, State Board Presidents, other key stakeholders)
 - f. Present recommendations of policy groups to Consortium.
3. Coordinate Consortium work around developing common definitions and policy (e.g., common definition of English learner, common policies and procedures for accommodations for English learners and students with disabilities).
 4. Advise the Executive Director and the Executive Committee on policy issues related to service providers, as necessary.
 5. Serve as an ex officio member of the Executive Committee, and as a liaison to an appropriate work group.
 6. Participate in Consortium meetings as directed by the Executive Director.

Years 2–4 will continue to support the ongoing communication needs, and will include Web site monitoring and utility analyses to guide continued improvement of communications services.

This supplemental also includes support across all four years for a one-quarter-time (0.25 FTE) coordinator-level position within the Project Management Partner (PMP) contract. This will add resources to the PMP to better meet newly-realized needs to coordinate multi-consortia collaborations, activities, and communications between and among SBAC and the other RTTA Program consortium, the two GSEG AAAS consortia, and other federally-supported or nationally-emerging assessment consortia (e.g., English-language development assessment consortia, science assessment consortia.)

| Supplemental Budget Module Communications | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Budget Categories | Project Year 1 (a) | Project Year 2 (b) | Project Year 3 (c) | Project Year 4 (d) | Total (e) |
| 1. Personnel | \$50,000 | \$100,000 | \$100,000 | \$100,000 | \$350,000 |
| 2. Fringe Benefits | \$15,000 | \$30,000 | \$30,000 | \$30,000 | \$105,000 |
| 3. Travel | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 4. Equipment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 5. Supplies | \$9,025 | \$16,332 | \$13,530 | \$8,500 | \$47,387 |
| 6. Contractual | \$464,650 | \$455,579 | \$456,531 | \$447,506 | \$1,824,266 |
| 7. Training Stipends | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 8. Other | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1–8) | \$538,675 | \$601,911 | \$600,061 | \$586,006 | \$2,326,653 |

| Supplemental Budget Module Communications | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Budget Categories | Project Year 1 (a) | Project Year 2 (b) | Project Year 3 (c) | Project Year 4 (d) | Total (e) |
| 10. Indirect Costs | \$5,700 | \$2,850 | \$2,850 | \$2,850 | \$14,250 |
| 11. Total Costs (add lines 9–10) | \$544,375 | \$604,761 | \$602,911 | \$588,856 | \$2,340,903 |
| 12. Other Funds Allocated Toward This Work | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 13. Total Funds Requested (subtract line 12 from line 11) | \$544,375 | \$604,761 | \$602,911 | \$588,856 | \$2,340,903 |

Notes:

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

Expenses by Budget Category:

1. **Personnel**— The communications supplement will be supported by one full-time FTE communications manager and webmaster. This position will be filled by April 1, 2011, and will continue throughout the grant period.

| Personnel Required | Detailed Description of Role/Responsibility | Basis for Cost Estimates | Total Cost |
|--|--|--|------------|
| Years 1–4: Communications manager and webmaster | Individual reports to Executive Director and is employed by the Lead State, or under contract to the consortium. Key responsibilities include: assisting in the development and implementation of the Consortium’s communications strategies; monitoring and updating the current status of the Consortium Web site and its postings for social interaction supports (blogs, podcasts, FAQs, Facebook, Twitter, etc.); maintaining immediate contact with communications contractor to monitor and provide first-line response to emerging or unanticipated media inquiries; building and maintaining relationships with key media contacts. | \$100,000 per year plus 30% benefits for 3.5 years (plus needed supplies and equipment). | \$455,000 |

4. Equipment— Computer, printer, associated hardware and software for 1.0 FTE, plus resources to address potential publication activities associated with the Consortium’s work.

| Equipment Required | Detailed Description of Services | Basis for Cost Estimates | Total Cost |
|---|---|--|-------------------|
| Years 1–4: Office hardware/software and supplies | Computer, printer, associated hardware and software. | WA experience with office setup for nominal employees. | \$3,525 |
| | Supplies for potential publication needs from the Consortium. | WA experience with similar print/publication activities. | \$43,862 |

6. Contractual— It is anticipated that the fiscal agent for the Consortium will procure a single vendor to develop and implement the communications strategy. Additionally, one contract will be issued to extend the current engagement of the Policy Coordinator.

| Contract Services Required | Detailed Description of Services | Basis for Cost Estimates | Total Cost |
|---|---|--|-------------------|
| Years 1–4: Communications services contract (1 contract) | Needs assessment of a variety of consortium customers; development and implementation of Web and print-based communications tools that states and local districts can use; regular utility monitoring and re-development of materials and strategies to meet developing needs of state and local customers. | Costs are based on experience in Washington for previous development of similar services at the state and several large urban districts. | \$1,200,000 |
| Years 1–4: Cross-consortia communications | WestEd contract amendment to include additional resources to coordinate cross-consortia communication | Based on .25 FTE per year for four years | \$150,000 |

| Contract Services Required | Detailed Description of Services | Basis for Cost Estimates | Total Cost |
|--|---|---|-------------------|
| Years 1–4: Policy Coordination contract | Contractor will provide senior-level policy expertise and consultation necessary for the success of Consortium-wide policies. [1 contract] | Extension of current Policy Coordinator contract: \$80,000 per year for Years 1–4. (Contract cost basis = \$800 per day X 100 days per year) Contract to include travel budget for Policy Coordinator, set at 25 trips per year, with a cost basis of \$1,486 per trip beginning in Year 1 and a 2.5% increase with each successive year. | \$474,266 |

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

Supplemental Budget Module Detailed Narrative: Aligning Assessments to Readiness

Scope of Work Overview:

- 1. IHE Validity Studies and Policy Coordination**
Conduct concurrent and predictive validity studies to show the extent to which Consortium assessments accurately measure college and career readiness.
- 2. Comparability of Achievement Levels**
Create a plan for comparability of achievement levels.
- 3. Interim Assessment System Enhancement to Support End-of-Course Testing**
Enhance the interim assessment system functionality to support the creation of an End-of-Course (EOC) assessment option for states.

| Supplemental Budget Module: Aligning Assessments to Readiness | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Budget Categories | Project Year 1 (a) | Project Year 2 (b) | Project Year 3 (c) | Project Year 4 (d) | Total (e) |
| 1. Personnel | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 2. Fringe Benefits | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 3. Travel | \$0 | \$40,509 | \$41,347 | \$0 | \$81,856 |
| 4. Equipment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 5. Supplies | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 6. Contractual | \$0 | \$136,000 | \$1,572,000 | \$350,000 | \$2,058,000 |
| 7. Training Stipends | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 8. Other | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1–8) | \$0 | \$176,509 | \$1,613,347 | \$350,000 | \$2,139,856 |
| 10. Indirect Costs | \$0 | \$11,400 | \$22,800 | \$2,850 | \$37,050 |
| 11. Total Costs (add lines 9–10) | \$0 | \$187,909 | \$1,636,147 | \$352,850 | \$2,176,906 |
| 12. Other Funds Allocated Toward This Work | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

| Supplemental Budget Module: Aligning Assessments to Readiness | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Budget Categories | Project Year 1 (a) | Project Year 2 (b) | Project Year 3 (c) | Project Year 4 (d) | Total (e) |
| 13. Total Funds Requested (subtract line 12 from line 11) | \$0 | \$187,909 | \$1,636,147 | \$352,850 | \$2,176,906 |

Notes:

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

Supplemental Budget Module Detailed Narrative: Aligning Assessments to Readiness

1. IHE Validity Studies and Policy Coordination

Validly measuring and predicting student progress towards college and career readiness is a foundational component of the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC), whereas the main grant funded activities related to ensuring the valid development of the assessment system (strategically using technical consultants and working directly with IHE groups to vet development processes and expected outcomes) studies of the predictive and concurrent validity of the assessment were not part of the main grant. Criterion validity (concurrent and predictive) studies will be supported with these supplemental funds as one way to establish the connection between indicators of readiness evidenced through the Consortium assessment system and evidence of success in college or career and relationship to other college or career success indicators. Longitudinal data systems in member states, specifically those states with a K–20 system, will be used to provide rich student data in order to analyze a variety of pathways to success and complex relationships to success indicators. Concurrent validity studies will include the correlation between students’ performance on the comprehensive summative assessment across grades as compared to college-entrance measures such as ACT and/or SAT scores, high school GPA, or other measures. Predictive validity studies will provide correlations for how well the integrated summative assessment predicts performance in college. Assuming the “gold standard” is college performance, this study will compare the comprehensive summative assessment with college outcome data such as GPA or, more specifically, grades in mathematics and English language arts college courses. These studies

will be contracted to entities with experience in conducting validity studies and will include the design, analysis, and formal reports of the validity studies.

2. Comparability of Achievement Levels

In early 2010 as several consortia were forming, some individuals and organizations opposed the notion for more than one consortium to be funded, voicing concerns of inefficiencies, duplicated efforts, and possible confusion for the public. Numerous mergers occurred among the early consortia, and the end result was two consortia. The two remaining consortia have distinct and fundamental differences in theories of action (e.g., adaptive vs. fixed form; secure through-course vs. open interim benchmarks). Ultimately the awarding of two grants was beneficial for states that were making decisions about the best match for their state goals. These differences notwithstanding, SBAC and PARCC are strongly committed to ensuring comparability between their assessments, and the main grant scope of work includes collaborative standard setting that will facilitate this comparability. Proposed in this supplemental grant is an enhancement to planned comparability activities. Three additional comparability activities will be conducted:

1. **Comparability Design Expert Consultation**— SBAC and PARCC will issue a contract for up to six white papers from psychometric experts to provide advice and direction about the considerations necessary in providing valid comparisons of scores. The papers will also focus on recommended steps to be taken to reach comparability.
2. **Joint Comparability TAC Meetings**— SBAC is proposing that SBAC and PARCC host several joint TAC meetings specifically on planning the linking and comparability work.
3. **Pre-Standard Setting Analysis**— SBAC is proposing that PARCC and SBAC conduct a pre-standard setting analysis to assist in each consortium's preparation for their respective official standard setting activities. This work could include a methodology that would establish apparent achievement levels (cut scores) in each consortium's summative test and provide discussion about the comparability if either should deviate from that initial point.

3. Interim Assessment System Enhancement to Support End-of-Course Testing

High school end-of-course assessments (EOCs) are currently used by many states. During the 2009–2010 school year, 18 states were administering one or more EOC.² Of those states, six are members of the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC). Five additional SBAC states (WA, OH, DE, AL, KY) have policies in place or are in the process of developing EOCs.³ The purposes and uses of these assessments vary; not only do some states use EOCs for federal accountability purposes, but many use them for within-state accountability, including as graduation requirements. In some instances the results from EOCs factor into student grades; in some cases they do not. Several reasons are often given for using EOCs, the most compelling of which is that state assessments directly linked to course expectations are more likely to contribute to improving learning in those courses than are assessments that cover a more broadly described set of knowledge and skills.

² Education Commission of the States, "End of Course Exams," *The Progress of Education Reform*, April 2010.

³ *Ibid.*

This supplement will support the development of a tool states can use to build end-of-course assessments aligned to the CCSS in English language arts and mathematics. SBAC states will not use these EOCs for federal accountability purposes. Rather, the EOCs will draw upon the non-secure interim item bank, and will be available to be used for state-defined purposes.

Resources in addition to those provided in the main proposal are necessary for this activity because of differences between interim assessments and EOCs that add to the complexity of designing EOCs. The range of content covered in an EOC is much broader than what would be assessed in a typical interim assessment. The interim assessments described in the main proposal are characterized as assessments that focus on a narrow subset of standards, likely encompassing all or only part of a learning progression. On the other hand, an EOC requires creating a test blueprint that can cover an entire year's worth of instruction. This presents design complexities with regard to adequate sampling of content sub-domains that need to be matched against constraints of testing time.

The EOC test-builder tool, will allow states to identify groups of standards that align with a particular course in ELA or mathematics. The test builder will construct a blueprint for the course. The test builder will provide blueprints that have the same design features as the SBAC comprehensive test with regard to types of items and extent to which complex tasks sampling deeper cognition are used, thus allowing states to use them for interim information in much the same way as the interim tests designed in grades 3-8.

Expenses by Budget Category:

1. Personnel— Consortium labor associated with this work group budget will be composed of temporary psychometrician positions (roughly three positions for six months for SBAC and PARCC).

6. Contractual— It is anticipated that up to thirteen contracts will be signed: four separate authors for the white papers guiding comparability activities (4), four TAC member contracts (4), the validity studies (1), three psychometricians conducting achievement comparability analysis (3), and system development of an EOC tool (1).

| Contract Services Required | Detailed Description of Services | Basis for Cost Estimates | Total Cost |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Year 2: Comparability of achievement levels across consortia | Contract for 4 white papers: 3 papers explicating advice and direction from experts on the considerations necessary to have comparability between consortia summative assessments, and one culminating paper derived from the various findings generated from the associated investigations underpinning the original three. [4 contracts] | Papers estimated to cost \$24,000/paper based on 2 months of effort (20 person-days at \$150/hour). | \$96,000 |
| Years 2 and 3: Cross-consortia TAC meetings | TAC members from both consortia will be brought together specifically to discuss achieving comparability between the summative assessments. [4 contracts] | Four members from the SBAC TAC will be identified and contracted at an additional 4 two-day meetings in Years 2 and 3 of the grant. The TAC contracts are paid stipends of \$2,500/day (total of 8 days). | \$80,000 |
| Year 3: Concurrent and predictive validity studies | Conduct concurrent and predictive validity studies to measure the extent of correlation of the SBAC integrative summative assessment to existing college- and career-readiness measures and standards. [1 contracts] | Based on the experience of Oregon, Washington, and Utah in contracting for similar work with longitudinal database development. | \$1,100,000 |

| Contract Services Required | Detailed Description of Services | Basis for Cost Estimates | Total Cost |
|--|---|--|-------------------|
| Year 3: Comparability of achievement levels across consortia | Conduct psychometric analysis to provide evidence for comparability. [3 contracts] | SBAC will contract with three FTE psychometricians for six months at \$150/hour. | \$432,000 |
| Year 4: High School Course-Specific Test Design and Test Builder Tool | Develop high school course-specific test designs and a flexible tool that will allow states to use items from the Interim Assessment item bank to associate individual content standards with specific high school courses. [1 contract] | Based on the experience of Oregon, Washington, and Utah in contracting for similar activities and application development. | \$350,000 |

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

Supplemental Budget Module Detailed Narrative: Support for Technology Transitions

Associated Work Plan:

1. Technology Transitions and Implementation

Develop a comprehensive interactive tool that supports states transition to the technology required to implement the Consortium Assessment System.

2. Artificial Intelligence Development Collaboration with PARCC

Collaborate with the PARCC consortium to establish common specifications for Artificial Scoring.

| Supplemental Budget Module: Support for Technology Transitions | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Budget Categories | Project Year 1 (a) | Project Year 2 (b) | Project Year 3 (c) | Project Year 4 (d) | Total (e) |
| 1. Personnel | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 2. Fringe Benefits | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 3. Travel | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 4. Equipment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 5. Supplies | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 6. Contractual | \$400,000 | \$250,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$650,000 |
| 7. Training Stipends | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 8. Other | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1–8) | \$400,000 | \$250,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$650,000 |
| 10. Indirect Costs | \$5,700 | \$2,850 | \$0 | \$0 | \$8,550 |
| 11. Total Costs (add lines 9– 10) | \$405,700 | \$252,850 | \$0 | \$0 | \$658,550 |
| 12. Other Funds Allocated Toward This Work | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

| Supplemental Budget Module: Support for Technology Transitions | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Budget Categories | Project Year 1 (a) | Project Year 2 (b) | Project Year 3 (c) | Project Year 4 (d) | Total (e) |
| 13. Total Funds Requested (subtract line 12 from line 11) | \$405,700 | \$252,850 | \$0 | \$0 | \$658,550 |

Notes:

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

Technology Transitions and Implementation

As part of its initial proposal, the Consortium plans to use the expertise of its member States to better inform the design of its next generation system through the work of a cross-consortia Technology Technical Advisory Committee and the SBAC Technology Work Group. The use of supplemental funds will extend this work to develop an online dynamic and interactive technology readiness tool. This tool will support the member State education agencies (SEA) and their local education agencies (LEAs) as they evaluate their current technology in terms of readiness to implement the Consortium assessment system and identify strategies to update their technology based on gaps identified. The readiness tool will include an evaluation of rules, policies, hardware, staffing, staff readiness, required data collection, and associated information systems deemed essential to a successful implementation of the Consortium Assessment System. The tool will guide the SEA or LEA through a process of establishing strategies to address technology needs identified by the readiness tool. Finally, the SEA or LEA will be able to use the tool as a work space to save and subsequently amend tool inputs to verify and see the impact of readiness updates. Reports from the readiness tool will be available to assist SEAs and LEAs in technology enhancement planning, describe the plan as established by the SEA or LEA, and to describe progress as the inventories are amended. The application will be designed and built in collaboration with PARCC, and will be modular such that it can connect to the larger Consortium system and be updated periodically to address any system enhancements that require changes in technology. Development of the survey will be in

collaboration with the State Educational Technology Directors Association (SETDA), and its distribution will be coordinated with the PARCC development of a similar survey addressing the readiness needs of its computer-based tests. All member states and their LEAs will have access to the tool to support their implementation of the SMARTER Balanced Assessment System.

Artificial Intelligence Development Collaboration with PARCC

The use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) is critical to the Consortium plans to provide rapid scoring of complex student responses with a minimal cost. SBAC and PARCC have had discussions on this topic sufficient to allow both to commit to collaborate on an effort to jointly explore the possibilities of what AI scoring has to offer. Although the specific rubrics each consortium uses may be different, it is likely that the two consortiums have similar needs in regard to the core specifications and functionality of the AI. Therefore, SBAC proposes to collaborate with PARCC to engage in a common requirements gathering and specifications process that will be used to establish industry standards for AI scoring, including elements of design, scoring inputs and processes, interoperability, scoring latency, validity, and reliability. Desired outcomes of this collaboration are standardization of AI scoring protocols across the two consortia; as well as cost efficiencies and enhanced cross-consortia comparability of assessment results.

Emphasis will be placed on finding areas of collaboration that will maximize grant funds, by first identifying those components of AI that appear to drive the costs associated with the operational use of AI scoring. This initial collaboration will serve as the first phase of collaboration.

Additionally, the Consortium will work with PARCC to evaluate possible collaboration on the procurement of an AI engine during this initial phase.

Expenses by Budget Category:

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

6. Contractual— It is anticipated that the fiscal agent for the Consortium will procure one vendor to create the Technology Transition Tool and procure one vendor to establish the industry standards for AI scoring.

| Contract Services Required | Detailed Description of Services | Basis for Cost Estimates | Total Cost |
|--|---|--|-------------------|
| Years 1 and 2: Technology transitions and implementation (2 contracts) | Online tool that will assist SEAs and LEAs in evaluating their readiness to implement the Consortium's system. Costs include systems analysis (1 contract) and application development (Design, Build, and Test), maintenance through Year 1 and Year 2, and support through Year 1 and Year 2 (1 contract). | Costs are based on Washington, Utah, and Oregon's experience in developing assessment-related online applications. | \$500,000 |
| Year 2: AI Industry Standards (1 contract) | Collaborate with PARCC to establish industry standards for AI that can serve as the basis for potential common specifications and potential additional collaboration on implementation | Estimates based on experience with ATP standards. | \$150,000 |

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

Supplemental Budget Module Detailed Narrative: Technical Assistance Meetings

Scope of Work Overview:

Fund travel expenses for two members from each of 18 Governing States, from each of three Advisory States that are members of SBAC only, and from four Advisory States that are members of both SBAC and PARCC, but not grantees under RTTT state awards. Support is for the purpose of attending six USED-sponsored two-day technical assistance meetings across the four-year contract.

| Supplemental Budget Module: Technical Assistance Meetings | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Budget Categories | Project Year 1 (a) | Project Year 2 (b) | Project Year 3 (c) | Project Year 4 (d) | Total (e) |
| 1. Personnel | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 2. Fringe Benefits | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 3. Travel | \$148,600 | \$152,315 | \$78,061 | \$80,013 | \$458,989 |
| 4. Equipment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 5. Supplies | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 6. Contractual | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 7. Training Stipends | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 8. Other | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1– 8) | \$148,600 | \$152,315 | \$78,061 | \$80,013 | \$458,989 |
| 10. Indirect Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 11. Total Costs (add lines 9–10) | \$148,600 | \$152,315 | \$78,061 | \$80,013 | \$458,989 |
| 12. Other Funds Allocated Toward This Work | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 13. Total Funds Requested (subtract line 12 from line 11) | \$148,600 | \$152,315 | \$78,061 | \$80,013 | \$458,989 |

Expenses by Budget Category:

3. Travel

| Travel Services Required | Detailed Description of Services | Basis for Cost Estimates | Total Cost |
|---|--|--|-------------------|
| <p>Years 1–4: Technical assistance meetings</p> | <p>Funding travel expenses to attend six technical assistance meeting across the four-year grant period.</p> | <p>Years One and Two: Four meetings: 18 Governing States (2 people per) 4 “dual” Advisory States (2 people per, PARCC supporting remaining 4 common states) 3 SMARTER Advisory State Only (2 people per) Years Three and Four: Two meetings: 18 Governing States (2 people per) 4 “dual” Advisory States (2 people per, PARCC supporting remaining 4 common states) 3 SMARTER Advisory State Only (2 people per)</p> <p>Travel cost estimates have a basis of \$1,486 per person per trip beginning in Year 1 and include a 2.5% cost increase each successive year.</p> | <p>\$458,989</p> |

Supplemental Budget Module Detailed Narrative: Project Management Partner

Scope of Work Overview:

Consistent with the roles and responsibilities defined in the SMARTER Balanced Consortium Project Management Partner Request for Proposal and WestEd response, the project management partner contract will be amended to include the management of the scope of work described within the Supplemental Fund Budget Narrative.

| Supplemental Budget Module: Project Management Partner | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Budget Categories | Project Year 1 (a) | Project Year 2 (b) | Project Year 3 (c) | Project Year 4 (d) | Total (e) |
| 1. Personnel | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 2. Fringe Benefits | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 3. Travel | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 4. Equipment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 5. Supplies | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 6. Contractual | \$200,000 | \$200,000 | \$200,000 | \$200,000 | \$800,000 |
| 7. Training Stipends | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 8. Other | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 9. Total Direct Costs (add lines 1–8) | \$200,000 | \$200,000 | \$200,000 | \$200,000 | \$800,000 |
| 10. Indirect Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 11. Total Costs (add lines 9–10) | \$200,000 | \$200,000 | \$200,000 | \$200,000 | \$800,000 |
| 12. Other Funds Allocated Toward This Work | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 13. Total Funds Requested (subtract line 12 from line 11) | \$200,000 | \$200,000 | \$200,000 | \$200,000 | \$800,000 |

Notes:

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

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

Supplemental Budget Module Detailed Narrative: Project Management Partner Contract Amendment.

6. Contractual

| Contract Services Required | Detailed Description of Services | Basis for Cost Estimates | Total Cost |
|--|---|---|-------------------|
| Years 1–4: PMP Contract Amendment | The Project Management Partner will have the same roles and responsibilities for the scope of work described in the Supplemental Fund Budget Narrative as it does for the main grant. | <p>\$200,000 per year addition to existing contract.</p> <p>The PMP Supplemental Fund cost is the same fund-proportion as the main grant, less fixed-cost resources that could serve both the management of the main grant and supplement fund without additional cost. This fixed-cost resource sharing significantly reduced the PMP cost (i.e., nearly a 15% reduction in the 6.25% rate specified in the main grant).</p> | \$800,000 |