

State of Wisconsin

Race to the Top Application

CFDA# 84.395A

January 19th 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 2 3 4	Cover Letter to Secretary Duncan from Governor Jim Doyle and State Superintendent Tony Evers Race to the Top Application Assurances Accountability, Transparency, Reporting and Other Assurances and Certifications Eligibility Requirements	4 6 8 11
	Section A: State Success Factors	
5	Section A1: Articulating State's Reform Agenda and LEAs Participation in it	12
6	Section A2: Building Strong Statewide Capacity to Implement, Scale Up and Sustain Proposed Plans	54
7	Section A3: Demonstrating Significant Progress in Raising Achievement and Closing Gaps	71
	Section B: Standards & Assessments	
8	Section B1: Developing and Adopting Common Standards	87
9	Section B2: Developing and Implementing Common, High-Quality Assessments	94
10	Section B3: Supporting the Transition to Enhance Standards and High-Quality Assessments	103
	Section C: Data Systems to Support Instruction	
11	Section C1: Fully Implementing a Statewide Longitudinal Data System	115
12	Section C2: Accessing and Using State Data	120
13	Section C3: Using Data to Improve Instruction	125
	Section D: Great Teachers & Leaders	
14	Section D1: Providing High-Quality Pathways for Aspiring Teachers and Principals	139
15	Section D2: Improving Teacher and Principal Effectiveness Based on Performance	145
16	Section D3: Ensuring Equitable Distribution of Effective Teachers and Principals	175
17	Section D4: Improving the Effectiveness of Teacher and Principal Preparation Programs	190
18	Section D5: Providing Effective Support to Teachers and Principals	196

	Section E: Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools	
19	Section E1: Intervening in the Lowest Achieving Schools and LEAs	204
20	Section E2: Turning Around the Lowest Achieving Schools	208
	Section F: General	
21	Section F1: Making Education Funding a Priority	230
22	Section F2: Ensuring Successful Conditions for High-Performing Charter Schools and Other Innovative	235
	Schools	
23	Section F3: Demonstrating Other Significant Reform Conditions	247
	Competition Priorities	
24	Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	252
25	Priority 3: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes	258
26	Priority 4: Expansion and Adaptation of Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems	263
	BUDGET SECTION	
27	Budget Indirect Cost Information Form	266
28	Budget Summary	267
29	Budget Overview	268
30	Project Level Detail	272
	APPENDICES	
31	Appendices	340



STATE OF WISCONSIN

January 15, 2010

Dear Secretary Duncan:

On behalf of Wisconsin's school children, we are pleased to present to you our application for the US Department of Education's Race to the Top program. We were honored when President Obama traveled to Wisconsin to announce his vision for this vital program and we are ready to accept the President's challenge to make education America's mission.

We are proud of the steps we are taking to align our assessments with high standards, foster effective teachers and leaders, raise student achievement and transform our lowest performing schools. Over the last several months Wisconsin has pushed an educational reform agenda that has brought together over 430 Wisconsin school districts and charter schools together around these central themes.

Race to the Top funding will be instrumental in supporting and accelerating Wisconsin's education agenda. While Wisconsin has great students, parents, teachers and leaders we recognize that more must be done to ensure that our students are prepared to compete in a global economy. The strong application presented to you today does just that.

Wisconsin's application contains aggressive goals supported by a comprehensive plan. These goals are targeted at not only high performing schools and students but also address our lowest performers. For example, over the next four years Wisconsin, with your support, is on track to:

- > Ensure all of our children are proficient in math and reading.
- > Drastically reduce the number of high school dropouts.
- Increase the high school graduation growth rate for Native American, African American and Hispanic students.
- Significantly increase the annual growth in college entrance in 2010 and maintain that level of growth over the next four years.
- > Drastically cut our achievement gap.

These goals are supported by a comprehensive plan with a high degree of accountability. Our plan is focused on research proven advancements that tackle many of the challenges facing Wisconsin schools. Advancements such as the following:

- Raising standards -- joined consortium with 48 other states to develop and adopt internationally benchmarked standards.
- More useful assessments -- changes to our testing process to provide more meaningful information to teachers and parents.
- Expanded data systems -- including the ability to tie students to teachers so that we can ultimately learn what works and what doesn't in education.
- More support for teachers -- both for new teachers through mentoring and for other teachers through coaching.
- Increased capacity at the state and regional level to assist with instructional improvement efforts including providing training for coaches and mentors.
- An emphasis on providing additional supports, particularly in early childhood and middle school to high school transition, to ensure that Wisconsin narrows its achievement gap and raises overall achievement.
- Turning around our lowest performing schools -- enhancing the capacity for Milwaukee Public Schools and the state to support that effort; contracting out to external organizations with research-proven track records where appropriate.
- Providing wraparound services, complimenting school efforts in specific neighborhoods in Milwaukee to get low income children the supports necessary to succeed within and outside the school yard.
- Investing in STEM -- Building off our currently successful Science, Mathematics, Engineering and Technology efforts to ensure that more students have access to high-quality STEM courses and training.

The agenda that you have before you is one that builds on our great successes yet recognizes that we can and must do more to ensure our children are prepared for success. We appreciate your consideration of Wisconsin's strong commitment to this mission. We look forward to joining President Obama and you in America's Race to the Top.

Sincerely,

- Dah

Jim Doyle Governor

Tony Evers State Superintendent

(2) RACE TO THE TOP APPLICATION ASSURANCES

(CFDA No. 84.395A)

Legal Name of Applicant (Office of the Governor):	Applicant's Mailing Address:	s:			
Office of the Governor	115 East, State PO Box 7863 Madison, WI - 5	state Capitol 63 WI 53707-7863			
Employer Identification Number:	Organizational DUNS:				
396028867	001778349				
State Race to the Top Contact Name: (Single point of contact for communication)	Contact Position and Office:				
Chris Patton	Policy Director, Office of	f the Governor			
Contact Telephone:	Contact E-mail Address:				
(608) 266-2093	<u>christopher.patton@wi</u>	sconsin.gov			
Required Applicant Signatures:	<u>.</u>				
To the best of my knowledge and belief, all of the infor	mation and data in this application	are true and correct.			
I further certify that I have read the applicatiou, am full	y committed to it, and will support	its implementation:			
Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governo	r (Printed Name): Tele	ephone:			
Signature of Governor or Authorized Representative of	the Governor: Dat	te:			
\square	Da Da	~ 15,2010			
Jam Mrs					
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name):	Tele	ephone:			
Signature of the Chief State School Officer:	Date	e:			
long fre		115/2010			
President of the State Board of Education (Printed Nam	e):	ephone:			

6

State Attorney General Certification

I certify that the State's description of, and statements and conclusions concerning, State law, statute, and regulation in its application are complete, accurate, and constitute a reasonable interpretation of State law, statute, and regulation.

(See especially Eligibility Requirement (b), Selection Criteria (B)(1), (D)(1), (E)(1), (F)(2), (F)(3).)

I certify that the State does not have any legal, statutory, or regulatory barriers at the State level to linking data on student achievement (as defined in this notice) or student growth (as defined in this notice) to teachers and principals for the purpose of teacher and principal evaluation.

State Attorney General or Authorized Representative (Printed Name):

Telephone:

Date:

J.B. Van Hollen

Signature of the State Attorney General or Authorized Representative:

Von Holle

01-14-2010

608-266-1221

(3) ACCOUNTABILITY, TRANSPARENCY, REPORTING AND OTHER ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATIONS

Accountability, Transparency and Reporting Assurances

The Governor or his/her authorized representative assures that the State will comply with all of the accountability, transparency, and reporting requirements that apply to the Race to the Top program, including the following:

- For each year of the program, the State will submit a report to the Secretary, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may require, that describes:
 - the uses of funds within the State;
 - how the State distributed the funds it received;
 - o the number of jobs that the Governor estimates were saved or created with the funds;
 - the State's progress in reducing inequities in the distribution of highly qualified teachers, implementing a State longitudinal data system, and developing and implementing valid and reliable assessments for limited English proficient students and students with disabilities; and
 - if applicable, a description of each modernization, renovation, or repair project approved in the State application and funded, including the amounts awarded and project costs (ARRA Division A, Section 14008)
- The State will cooperate with any U.S. Comptroller General evaluation of the uses of funds and the impact of funding on the progress made toward closing achievement gaps (ARRA Division A, Section 14009)
- If the State uses funds for any infrastructure investment, the State will certify that the investment received the full review and vetting required by law and that the chief executive accepts responsibility that the investment is an appropriate use of taxpayer funds. This certification will include a description of the investment, the estimated total cost, and the amount of covered funds to be used. The certification will be posted on the State's website and linked to <u>www.Recovery.gov</u>. A State or local agency may not use funds under the ARRA for infrastructure investment funding unless this certification is made and posted. (ARRA Division A, Section 1511)
- The State will submit reports, within 10 days after the end of each calendar quarter, that contain the information required under section 1512(c) of the ARRA in accordance with any guidance issued by the Office of Management and Budget or the Department. (ARRA Division A, Section 1512(c))
- The State will cooperate with any appropriate Federal Inspector General's examination of records under the program. (ARRA Division A, Section 1515)

Other Assurances and Certifications

The Governor or his/her authorized representative assures or certifies the following:

- The State will comply with all applicable assurances in OMB Standard Forms 424B (Assurances for Non-Construction Programs) and to the extent consistent with the State's application, OMB Standard Form 424D (Assurances for Construction Programs), including the assurances relating to the legal authority to apply for assistance; access to records; conflict of interest; merit systems; nondiscrimination; Hatch Act provisions; labor standards; flood hazards; historic preservation; protection of human subjects; animal welfare; lead-based paint; Single Audit Act; and the general agreement to comply with all applicable Federal laws, executive orders and regulations.
- With respect to the certification regarding lobbying in Department Form 80-0013, no Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the making or renewal of Federal grants under this program; the State will complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," when required (34 C.F.R. Part 82, Appendix B); and the State will require the full certification, as set forth in 34 C.F.R. Part 82, Appendix A, in the award documents for all sub awards at all tiers.
- The State will comply with all of the operational and administrative provisions in Title XV and XIV of the ARRA, including Buy American Requirements (ARRA Division A, Section 1605), Wage Rate Requirements (section 1606), and any applicable environmental impact requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1970 (NEPA), as amended, (42 U.S.C. 4371 et seq.) (ARRA Division A, Section 1609). In using ARRA funds for infrastructure investment, recipients will comply with the requirement regarding Preferences for Quick Start Activities (ARRA Division A, Section 1602).
- Any local educational agency (LEA) receiving funding under this program will have on file with the State a set of assurances that meets the requirements of section 442 of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) (20 U.S.C. 1232e).
- Any LEA receiving funding under this program will have on file with the State (through either its Stabilization Fiscal Stabilization Fund application or another U.S. Department of Education Federal grant) a description of how the LEA will comply with the requirements of section 427 of GEPA (20 U.S.C. 1228a). The description must include information on the steps the LEA proposes to take to permit students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries to overcome barriers (including barriers based on gender, race, color, national origin, disability, and age) that impede access to, or participation in, the program.
- The State and other entities will comply with the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), including the following provisions as applicable: 34 CFR Part 74–Administration of Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Non-Profit Organizations; 34 CFR Part 75–Direct Grant Programs; 34 CFR Part 77–Definitions that Apply to Department Regulations; 34 CFR Part 80–Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments, including the procurement provisions; 34 CFR Part 81–General Education Provisions Act–Enforcement; 34 CFR Part 82– New Restrictions on Lobbying; 34 CFR Part 84–

Governmentwide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Financial Assistance); 34 CFR Part 85–Governmentwide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement).

Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor (Printed Name):	
Signature of Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor:	Date: 1/15/0

ì

(4) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

(See Previous Certifications)

A State must meet the following requirements in order to be eligible to receive funds under this program.

Eligibility Requirement (a)

The State's applications for funding under Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund program must be approved by the Department prior to the State being awarded a Race to the Top grant.

The Department will determine eligibility under this requirement before making a grant award.

Eligibility Requirement (b)

At the time the State submits its application, there are no legal, statutory, or regulatory barriers at the State level to linking data on student achievement (as defined in this notice) or student growth (as defined in this notice) to teachers and principals for the purpose of teacher and principal evaluation.

The certification of the Attorney General addresses this requirement. The applicant may provide explanatory information, if necessary. The Department will determine eligibility under this requirement.

SELECTION CRITERIA: PROGRESS AND PLANS IN THE FOUR EDUCATION REFORM AREAS

(A) State Success Factors (125 total points)

(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEAs participation in it (65 points)

The extent to which-

(i) The State has set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform agenda that clearly articulates its goals for implementing reforms in the four education areas described in the ARRA and improving student outcomes statewide, establishes a clear and credible path to achieving these goals, and is consistent with the specific reform plans that the State has proposed throughout its application; (5 points)

(ii) The Participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) are strongly committed to the State's plans and to effective implementation of reform in the four education areas, as evidenced by Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) (as set forth in Appendix D)¹ or other binding agreements between the State and its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) that include— (45 points)

- (a) Terms and conditions that reflect strong commitment by the participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to the State's plans;
- (b) Scope-of-work descriptions that require participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to implement all or significant portions of the State's Race to the Top plans; and

¹ See Appendix D for more on participating LEA MOU's and for a model MOU.

(c) Signatures from as many as possible of the LEA superintendent (or equivalent), the president of the local school board (or equivalent, if applicable), and the local teachers' union leader (if applicable) (one signature of which must be from an authorized LEA representative) demonstrating the extent of leadership support within participating LEAs (as defined in this notice); and

(iii) The LEAs that are participating in the State's Race to the Top plans (including considerations of the numbers and percentages of participating LEAs, schools, K-12 students, and students in poverty) will translate into broad statewide impact, allowing the State to reach its ambitious yet achievable goals, overall and by student subgroup, for—(15 points)

- (a) Increasing student achievement in (at a minimum) reading/language arts and mathematics, as reported by the NAEP and the assessments required under the ESEA;
- (b) Decreasing achievement gaps between subgroups in reading/language arts and mathematics, as reported by the NAEP and the assessments required under the ESEA;
- (c) Increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice); and
- (d) Increasing college enrollment (as defined in this notice) and increasing the number of students who complete at least a year's worth of college credit that is applicable to a degree within two years of enrollment in an institution of higher education.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion, as well as projected goals as described in (A)(1)(iii). The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (A)(1)(ii):

- An example of the State's standard Participating LEA MOU, and description of variations used, if any.
- The completed summary table indicating which specific portions of the State's plan each LEA is committed to implementing, and relevant summary statistics (see Summary Table for (A)(1)(ii)(b), below).
- The completed summary table indicating which LEA leadership signatures have been obtained (see Summary Table for (A)(1)(ii)(c), below).

Evidence for (A)(1)(iii):

- The completed summary table indicating the numbers and percentages of participating LEAs, schools, K-12 students, and students in poverty (see Summary Table for (A)(1)(iii), below).
- Tables and graphs that show the State's goals, overall and by subgroup, requested in the criterion, together with the supporting narrative. In addition, describe what the goals would look like were the State not to receive an award under this program.

Evidence for (A)(1)(ii) and (A)(1)(iii):

• The completed detailed table, by LEA, that includes the information requested in the criterion (see Detailed Table for (A)(1), below).

Recommended maximum response length: Ten pages (excluding tables)

(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEAs participation in it

The extent to which—

(A)(1)(i) The State has set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform agenda that clearly articulates its goals for implementing reforms in the four education areas described in the ARRA and improving student outcomes statewide, establishes a clear and credible path to achieving these goals, and is consistent with the specific reform plans that the State has proposed throughout its application;

Accelerating change: A reform agenda to address Wisconsin's achievement and graduate rate gaps

The citizens of Wisconsin value public education. At the State and local levels, public education is the highest priority. This long-standing commitment which is demonstrated by the high quality of the PK-12 system, the cutting-edge programs of the public technical college system, and the outstanding public university system led by the internationally recognized University of Wisconsin-Madison. Wisconsin's performance is documented through nation-leading graduation rates, strong college entrance exam scores, and significant increases in students taking rigorous college-level courses.

Realizing a quality public education for all of Wisconsin's children no matter where they live, no matter their race, their ethnicity, what language they speak, or their parents' income or education level is a priority at every level of government and in every household. <u>*Therein*</u> *lies the challenge for Wisconsin.*

In Wisconsin, achievement gaps are too large, in particular, those between our African-American and white students which by some measures are the worst in the nation. Although the latest NCES Common Core of Data report (on 2005-06 graduates) reported Wisconsin's graduation rate of 87.5% to be the highest in the nation, the gaps by race, ethnicity, and socio-economic condition are too high and too many of our students drop out. *This simply cannot continue*.

Wisconsin government, education, and business leaders have come together through a broad agenda of reforms and initiatives to do better for our public school students. While Wisconsin citizens are proud of our accomplishments thus far, the status quo is not acceptable. President Obama and Secretary Duncan's Race to the Top initiative provides Wisconsin with the ability to expand these State and local efforts and deliver hope through the power of public education. Wisconsin will leverage federal funds to expand current efforts and innovation in our schools. At the same time, our ongoing efforts for systemic change position and prepare Wisconsin, at the State and local level, for using Race to the Top funding meaningfully and ensuring scale and sustainability of those efforts, in anticipation of the eventual decline in federal funding.

Wisconsin has laid the foundation for success in the four fundamental reforms areas outlined in Race to the Top legislation, including: standards and assessment, data systems, great teachers and leaders, and turning around struggling schools.

In the area of **standards**, Wisconsin, under the power and authority of the State Superintendent, will adopt the Common Core Standards for English Language Arts and the Common Core Standards for Mathematics, which will form the foundation for instruction in the State. Wisconsin prepared itself for the move to these rigorous, internationally benchmarked standards through work that began two years ago with the American Diploma Project and the Partnership for 21st Century Skills. Once complete, Wisconsin's standards will be among the highest in the nation.

In the area of **assessments**, Wisconsin began a thorough examination of the State assessment system in September 2008. The Next Generation Assessment Task Force began with a review of best practices in other states and embraced the notion of creating a more balanced assessment system in Wisconsin. The Task Force, with representatives from business and PK-16 education, concluded that a balanced system of formative, benchmark, and summative assessment is necessary to inform classroom teachers, to hold schools accountable, and to effectively report back to parents, community leaders, and students.

As a result of the work of the Task Force, Wisconsin is developing a new State assessment system that provides a summative assessment as part of the developing national assessment and a series of formative and benchmark assessments through collaboration with a consortium of

states. These formative and benchmark assessments will provide for computer-based testing and results that can impact individual student instruction quickly.

Wisconsin, along with Nebraska, is co-leading the Multiple Opportunities for Student Assessment and Instruction Consortium (MOSAIC), a consortium of 26 states developing formative assessment strategies and benchmark assessments. The move to using assessments developed at the national level with nationally set standards for proficiency will provide a clearer and more consistent understanding of student progress for students, parents, teachers, and other education stakeholders. No longer will there be questions regarding the cut score for proficiency set by Wisconsin or any other State.

In addition, one of our major public research universities, the University of Wisconsin-Madison, is the national leader in developing value added growth models for data analysis at district, school, and classroom levels for use in improving instruction and turning around struggling schools. The Value-Added Research Center (VARC) currently calculates value-added scores for all schools in the State with the tested grades (3-8) on the State summative assessment and is working with Milwaukee, Madison and approximately 20 other districts to help them use the reports to make educational improvements.

In the area of **data systems**, transparency and availability have been the hallmarks of Wisconsin's approach beginning twelve years ago with the development of the Internet-based Wisconsin Information Network for Successful Schools (WINSS). Since that time, Wisconsin's State data system has been greatly expanded and will continue to increase both its breadth and scope. Over the last several years, Wisconsin has built a new system to collect data and to display data in more meaningful ways, allowing users to mine the data to inform instructional decision making. Through a combination of work streams from our Longitudinal Data Systems grant and Race to the Top funds, Wisconsin is ready to take the next step in data driven decision making by linking students to their course records, and their course records to teachers, in order to begin to use this longitudinal data system to explore questions about what works in our education system. It will also enable us to track the effectiveness of educator preservice programs, help identify teachers in need of additional support and allow a more robust measure of student growth from one year to the next.

In the area of **effective teachers and principals**, Wisconsin has 10 years experience in implementing a major license reform initiative moving to a tiered licensing system for teacher, administrators, and pupil services personnel that focuses on preservice preparation, mentorship, and career-long professional development. This work has produced a strong partnership with education organizations and universities. Additionally, the State has recently adopted legislation that allows for the use of student test data and other factors in teacher evaluation. Furthermore, Wisconsin has been in a multi-year partnership with the Wallace Foundation to strengthen the instructional leadership of principals in our five largest cities, including Milwaukee. Other efforts to strengthen the instructional leadership of principals in Milwaukee include two partnerships; one between the Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS) and New Leaders for New Schools and the other between MPS and the New Teacher Project.

Currently, Wisconsin has nine alternative route programs that prepare candidates for teaching licenses and two programs that prepare candidates for administrative licenses. These programs are operated by non-profit agencies, public and private colleges/universities, and a for-profit organization. Wisconsin alternative route programs prepare candidates for critical shortage areas and/or seek to increase the diversity of Wisconsin teachers. Examples of critical shortage content fields are special education, math, science, computer science, bilingual-bicultural, and ESL. Content areas difficult to fill due to geographic location may also be considered a critical shortage area. In addition, Teach for America is now operating in Milwaukee, with 38 corps members placed in hard to staff schools and critical shortage areas.

In the area of **struggling schools**, extensive work has been done to turn around struggling schools in Wisconsin, but much more work needs to be done. The State has prioritized federal and State aid and services to struggling districts and schools. A State-wide System of Support (SSOS) was developed to provide technical assistance to districts with Title I schools Identified for Improvement (SIFI), Title I schools that have missed Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), and other Title I high priority schools. SSOS processes and tools are designed to enhance a district's ability to improve the effectiveness of its programs and strategies for providing support to low-performing schools. The system also includes tools and strategies to build capacity at the local level for district-focused school improvement. Wisconsin's RTTT proposal also

includes plans to contract with external providers with expertise in turning around struggling schools to help us ensure that schools can be improved faster.

Milwaukee Public Schools, under State direction, has restructured its school system by creating nine school support clusters. Each cluster is staffed by a school improvement supervisor. These supervisors are administrative positions. The supervisors provide school-level oversight to ensure implementation of all improvement strategies required under corrective action. Examples of improvement strategies currently required of Title I SIFI include: extended learning time in reading and mathematics K-8, reading intervention courses in all high schools, summer school, after school and/or before school tutoring by highly qualified teachers, and implementation of Response to Intervention (RtI). Two SIFIs will be required to implement an extended calendar in the 2010-11 school year. The school improvement supervisors also arrange for internal or external technical assistance to improve implementation of school improvement supervisors work with SIFI principals and the Director of District and School Improvement. The school improvement supervisors work with SIFI principals and staff and Central Office personnel to review achievement data on a monthly basis to determine if the improvement efforts are resulting in improved student achievement.

Wisconsin is a national leader, and one of the first in the nation, in implementing and expanding a quality charter school system that consists of over 200 charter schools serving over 36,000 students in which Wisconsin is the 6th highest in the nation. Recently, the State passed legislation, 2009 Wisconsin Act 61, that will help ensure standards of quality exist within each charter school. Over the next five years, Wisconsin expects to further expand the number of its charter schools significantly. Presently, the Wisconsin Charter School Association (WCSA) is actively recruiting high quality Charter School operators from across the United States to start schools in Milwaukee. These schools will be placed in the areas with the highest needs and in some cases will take over or replace struggling schools. The WCSA is reaching out to forty other states through their Charter State Organizations to identify these high quality operators and has recently launched a new initiative to provide substantive charter school development and design services offered by expert practitioners.

In addition, Wisconsin has developed one of the nation's most extensive statewide public school choice programs. The City of Milwaukee offers parents the nation's largest system of public and private school choice. Recent reforms have increased oversight and accountability of the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program with a goal of increasing the quality of offerings for parents and students.

Furthermore, in the fall of 2009, Wisconsin developed and is implementing a statewide Response to Intervention (RtI) Center to provide training and support as the RtI initiative is expanded throughout the State. The Center will utilize a Train-the-Trainers model to empower teachers and educators to use systems change processes, data for instructional decision making, best practices in reading and math, and best practices in social and emotional wellness programming.

As detailed throughout our application, the State of Wisconsin is well-positioned to implement the four reform areas outlined in Race to the Top, and Wisconsin's Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with participating districts requires them to implement all of the provisions within the MOU. As evidenced by the high LEA MOU participation rate, Wisconsin districts are eager and ready to take the four reform areas to the next level and continue the momentum that has been started over the last several years.

Wisconsin recognizes that our major education concerns, and--to put it bluntly--weaknesses, are the large achievement and graduation-rate gaps in our State. However, we are fortunate to have a State Superintendent of Public Instruction and a Governor who are committed to raising the bar for education in Wisconsin and guiding the State toward a more aggressive reform agenda. Their leadership is making it possible for Wisconsin to address these unacceptably large and persistent gaps and adopt rigorous new standards for proficiency on Wisconsin State tests.

Specifically, the Wisconsin reform strategy is centered around five key elements needed to raise overall achievement and reduce achievement gaps:

1) <u>High expectations</u>: Rapid implementation of new, high standards created by a consortium of states and requiring Participating LEAs to set goals and open themselves to monitoring by a third party to ensure implementation and results.

- 2) <u>An emphasis on data systems that can measure student growth</u>: All Participating LEAs must have benchmark assessments and must measure results at least in part using our statewide value-added system and must add student growth as a required component of teacher evaluation systems and principal placement.
- 3) Increased efforts to actively support teachers in ways that improve instruction: Enhanced mentoring for initial educators and more support for other teachers through instructional coaches who can provide effective professional development at school sites that increases the quality of initial instruction.
- 4) <u>More support for students who need additional help</u>: This strategy includes deeper implementation of Response to Intervention as well as increased support for students who need additional help, particularly in the largest districts and those that are failing.
- 5) <u>Building the capacity at the State and regional levels</u>: This strategy supports reforms through a combination of existing Wisconsin entities and national organizations with a research-proven track record.

The last element is critical. A portion of State funding will be used to open an Office of Education Innovation and Improvement (OEII) that will include people who may be physically located in the Community Education Service Agencies (CESA's), or in the field, working directly with our lowest performing schools. This will allow for more support for districts as well as a built-in feedback loop to the Department of Public Instruction about how Race to the Top reforms are working.

Going above and beyond in Exhibit II of the MOU

<u>Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant</u>: As previously noted, Wisconsin's LEAs are required to implement <u>all</u> the elements of the MOU. However, most participating districts² will also have an opportunity to go above and beyond by competing for additional funds under the

² This excludes Beloit, Green Bay, Kenosha, Madison, Milwaukee, and Racine, which are not eligible for the Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant program; these districts will receive an additional \$166 per pupil to implement additional high-leverage strategies around closing the achievement gap.

Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant program to implement specific high-leverage strategies in the areas of early childhood, successful school transitions, gap closing, and incentives around teacher distribution and performance (see Exhibit II for a complete list of options) or request supplemental funding for the required scope of work under the MOU. All Participating LEAs that accept funds under the Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant Program must identify clear, measurable, data-driven, achievable goals that, at a minimum, are benchmarked at the district-level in their Race to the Top Final Work Plan. For more detailed information see Table 1 and Table 2.

Areas of focus for the 'Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant Program' may include any or all of the following three general areas:

- Specific plans and proposals for additional funds that will be used to ensure that the LEA is able to implement its commitments as outlined in Exhibit I of the MOU and encapsulated in a Final Work Plan, in the case that an LEA can prove that its initial Title I based funding is inadequate.
- Specific plans and proposals for additional funds that will be used to implement additional initiatives from the potential priorities listed in Exhibit II of the MOU.

The LEA will be free to choose which elements of Exhibit II it wishes to pursue as part of its application for additional funds and all additional priorities / plans / proposals, if funded, will be encapsulated in the LEAs Final Work Plan in addition to the LEAs existing commitments as outlined in Exhibit 1 of the MOU.

 Specific plans and proposals for additional funds that will be used to implement education reform initiatives 'above and beyond' Exhibit I commitments but different to those offered as potential priorities in Exhibit II of the MOU.

The LEA will be free to propose innovative, data proven initiatives that will increase student achievement, close the achievement gap, increase high school graduation rates and/or increase college enrollment rates above and beyond the programs and funding provided Exhibit 1 of the MOU as part of its application for additional funds and all additional priorities / plans / proposals, if

funded, will be encapsulated in the LEAs Final Work Plan in addition to the LEAs existing commitments as outlined in Exhibit 1 of the MOU.

As previously noted, all LEAs that accept funds under Exhibit II and the 'Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant Program' must identify clear, measurable, data-driven, achievable goals in their Race to the Top Final Work Plan. These goals must be benchmarked for the district and individual school(s), tailored to address specific achievement challenges in the district and may build upon existing LEA goals and strategies. Metrics for evaluating progress must include, but are not limited to, value-added achievement data and measures of student growth, which may be provided through the State Longitudinal Data System.

The LEA Final Work Plan will identify how the elements and strategies from Exhibit I and Exhibit II (where applicable) will be used to meet these benchmarked goals. Accepting these funds does not alter any of the terms or conditions of the Race to the Top District Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

Assessment criteria for all competitive grant applications received will include but not be limited to;

- The quality of the plans and proposals, in terms of their; specificity, measurability, ease of implementation, realism of goals and planned outcomes and the timing, level and pace of change in line with the RTTT ethos of ambitious yet achievable plans for implementing coherent, compelling, and comprehensive education reform.
- The quality of plans and proposals in terms of their; focus on reform initiatives that are proven to be effective (with supporting evidence and / or data of their effectiveness); the availability of detailed and accurate, validated budget information; the levels of long term sustainability (avoidance of 'funding cliffs' at the end of the four year grant period)
- The likelihood of success of the proposed plan, including the strength and clarity of articulation in the plan in the areas of responsibilities, implementation and timings (who will do what and when), clarity on goals / expected outcomes (with clear metrics

and mechanisms to measure progress and success) and the extent to which the plan ensures adequate resources, capacity and capability is in place or brought in to execute the plan.

• The 'return on investment' – ensuring the level of change and improvement to be delivered is commensurate with the level of funding being applied for and compares well with alternative funding applications and their projected results.

	WISCONSIN ACHIEVES COMPI	ETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM	
GOAL	KEY ACTIVITIES	TIMELINE	KEY PARTIES
Distribute Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant to aid small and mid size LEAS choosing to participate in Exhibit II MOU to implement the Exhibit II activities highlighted in their Final Work Plan, or where applicable, to supplement Exhibit I plans	 Formulate Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant application process including timings, forms, evaluation criteria, evaluation process and how the grant application links to the 90 day Final Work Plan period / process 	• Finished 1 week after confirmation of RTTT funding	 WDPI /OEII Governor's Office External accountability firm (* if in place)
	• Communicate the above to LEAs	• As soon as ready	WDPI /OEII
	 Receive grant proposals from LEAs 	 Within 45 days of 90 day period of Final Work Plan formulation 	LEAsOEII
	 Assess grant proposals Communicate grant results to the LEAs 	• Within 15 days of above	 WDPI/OEII External accountability firm * Governor's Office
	• Ensure results of grant proposals (goals, activities which the grant will fund) are incorporated into relevant LEA Final Work Plans	 Within 30 days remaining of the 90 day Final Work Plan period 	 WDPI/OEII External accountability firm *
	Distribute grant funds	 As per Final Work Plan 	WDPI/OEII
Measure and manage progress, Evaluate results	 Annual reporting, as part of LEA report on progress on goals and vs. Final Work Plan, as part of annual evaluation on effectiveness of RTTT spend 	 As per Final Work Plan Based on results, if necessary, invoke remediation steps outlined in MOU 	External accountability firmWDPI/OEII

Table 1 – Implementation plan for Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant Program.

The 'Wisconsin Competes' competitive grant program is a \$19 million in State discretionary funding from the RTTT funds. Small and mid-size LEAs (all LEAs except Milwaukee, Beloit, Green Bay, Kenosha, Madison, and Racine) will be eligible to apply for additional funds through this competitive

grant program that supports the broad states plan and goals of increasing student achievement, closing the achievement gap, increasing high graduation rates³ and increasing college enrollment rates.⁴

The OEII will administer this grant; however, the external accountability organization may, as part of its role, aid the OEII in assessing the quality of these grant applications according to a detailed scoring rubric and the general assessment criteria as part of their possible role in helping the LEA Final Work Plan process (90 day period). The external accountability firm also will measure and report on how the \$19 million is spent in light of district Final Work Plans and progress made towards identified benchmarks and goals.

KEY TASK	YEAR 1				YEAR 2					YEAR 3				YEAR 4		
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Formulate Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant																
application process, including timings, forms, evaluation	•															
criteria, evaluation process and how the grant application																
links to the 90 day Final Work Plan period / process																
Communicate the above to LEAs	•															
Receive grant proposals from LEAs	•	•														
Assess grant proposals																
Communicate grant results to the LEAs		•														
Ensure results of grant proposals (goals, activities which		•														
the grant will fund) are incorporated into relevant LEA		•	•													
Final Work Plans																
Distribute grant funds		•	•	•	•	•	•	•								
Annual reporting, as part of LEA report on progress on																
goals and vs. Final Work Plan, as part of annual							•				•	[•	
evaluation on effectiveness of RTTT spend																

Table 2 – Timeline for implementing the Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant Program.

³ Federal Race to the Top guidelines defines high school graduation rate at the four-year or extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate. Wisconsin is currently transitioning to this new definition, which will likely be completed by July 2011. For at least three years beginning in 2010-11, the State and LEAs may track graduation rates and set goals using both the existing and revised methods in order to analyze trend data.

⁴Federal Race to the Top guidelines defines college enrollment as students who enroll in an institution of higher education within 16 months of graduation.

Additional Exhibit II requirements for select districts

Exhibit II for select districts: In order to aggressively address the achievement gap, the State will narrowly focus additional resources and requirements on the Wisconsin's five largest urban districts (which have enrollments that exceed 20,000) and the one additional district identified for improvement under the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation. These six districts have the most diverse student populations in the State and face the greatest challenges with achievement gaps. In addition to meeting the conditions of the MOU, these districts are required to implement all of the State imposed high-leverage strategies and initiatives, including early childhood initiatives; supporting successful transitions initiatives; closing achievement gap initiatives; and Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) opportunities. The investments in these districts are specifically targeted to early childhood and late middle school/transition to high school because we know that focusing resources at these levels can reduce the size of the gap when students start kindergarten and help prevent students from dropping out by setting them on a trajectory for success.

Exhibit II for MPS: In addition, the Milwaukee Public Schools' efforts will become even more aggressive and will include the development and implementation of a Milwaukee Children's Zone modeled after the Harlem Children's Zone in New York City. This project, named the Wisconsin Initiative for Neighborhoods and Schools that work for children (WINS for Children), is a four-year demonstration project slated for two delineated geographical areas. All children, ages 0 to 25 that live or attend school in these zones will receive a range of family and community supports to help them achieve academic proficiency, gain access to social and economic opportunity, and transition to productive adulthood. WINS for Children takes a comprehensive approach, bringing together evidence-based best practices in education, human development, and community development to establish a pipeline of essential services. With services ranging from essential prenatal healthcare for parents through high-quality preschool for all children, WINS for Children will focus significant resources on early childhood, allowing disadvantaged students to start kindergarten with language and other skills equal to their more privileged peers. This, in combination with the strategies for K-12 schools in the zone, will result in a closing of the achievement gap.

At the State level, Wisconsin will focus its efforts in assisting school districts with implementing the requirements of the MOU in each of the major areas. The State will create the Office of Education Innovation and Improvement to oversee the execution of Wisconsin's Race to

the Top plans. In addition, the State will continue its strong partnership with education organizations and institutions, and will develop and enhance new partnerships to develop resources, tools, staff development opportunities, best practices models, and quality standards in each of the four reform areas.

Wisconsin's agenda is aggressive and specific. Never before has the sense of urgency been greater and have districts been more willing to accept such a challenge and aggressively attack the achievement gap that exists in this State. The groundwork over the last several years demonstrates that the necessary partnerships at the local, regional, State, and national levels are in place, and the foundations for reforms to ensure sustainability of efforts are established. Commitment across the State is strong, the vision is clear, and the work is underway. The potential funding and support available under Race to the Top are powerful catalysts that will accelerate education reform in Wisconsin and transforming the lives of thousands of children. There is no better place to tackle the achievement gap than in Wisconsin, and progress cannot wait.

Exhibit II for six large Urban LEAs														
(Beloit, Kenosha, Green Bay, Madison, Milwaukee, Racine)														
GOAL	KEY ACTIVITIES	TIMELINE	KEY PARTIES											
	Develop and agree detailed Final Work	• Within 90 days of grant award	• WDPI											
	Plans		OEII											
	• Disburse money as per agreed schedule	• As per agreed schedule, over the 4	• LEAs											
Give additional support and focus to the		years of the grant	External accountability firm											
six largest urban LEAs in order to	• Work with and support LEAs in the	• As per agreed schedule, over the 4												
address their achievement gap issues	implementation of their final work plans	years of the grant												
	Review progress towards goals and key	• On a regular basis, over the 4 years												
	milestones, as laid out in Final Work	of the grant												
	Plans and the States plan													

Table 3 – Implementation plan for Exhibit II.

Exhibit II for six large Urban LEAs																
(Beloit, Kenosha, Green Bay, Madison, Milwaukee, Racine)																
KEY TASK		YEA	AR 1			YEA	AR 2			YEA	AR 3			YEA	R 4	
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Develop and agree detailed Final Work	•	•														
Plans	•	•														
Disburse money as per agreed schedule			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Work with and support LEAs in the			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
implementation of their Final Work Plans			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Review progress towards goals and key																
milestones, as laid out in Final Work			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Plans and the States plan																

Table 4 – Timeline for implementing Exhibit II activities.

(A)(1)(ii) The participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) are strongly committed to the State's plans and to effective implementation of reform in the four education areas, as evidenced by Memoranda of Understanding (MOU's) (as set forth in Appendix D) or other binding agreements between the State and its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) that include—

(A)(1)(ii)(a) Terms and conditions that reflect strong commitment by the participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to the State's plans;

An aggressive State Plan

The Wisconsin State Plan is based on the four core reform areas on which the State and its school districts will focus their efforts. These reform areas build on Wisconsin's strong education reform foundation that has been created over the years. Because of the extensive work that Wisconsin has completed in the areas of standards and assessments, data systems, great teachers and leaders, and turning around struggling schools, the State is in a unique position to develop a scope of work that requires participating LEAs to commit to all four core reform areas in the State's Plan and to the respective strategies included under each. Further, our ongoing emphasis on Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) education through programs such as Project Lead the Way, as well as policies that promote science equivalency credit for agriculture courses and encourage other avenues for credit equivalency is the basis for requiring strong commitments from the participating districts to advance STEM. For broad statewide impact to occur, a "tipping point" of both district and research-based

practices leading to increased student achievement; higher graduation rates; increased college enrollment rates; and, most importantly, *decreasing the achievement gaps* must be in place.

Thus, Wisconsin's MOU for districts and the preliminary scope of work is targeted to those districts that, like the State, have already made significant and strong efforts in the four reform areas and STEM. Furthermore, we made the decision to require participating LEAs to implement all four reform areas, rather than a significant portion in order to ensure broad state-wide impact in all of the four areas.

(A)(1)(ii)(b) Scope-of-work descriptions that require participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to implement all or significant portions of the State's Race to the Top plans; and

Strong LEA commitments

Wisconsin's districts vary in size, enrollment, and need. Our smallest school district is located on an island and serves 78 students. Milwaukee, our largest district, serves 85,400 students. Approximately 52% (221 out of 425) of the State's school districts serve fewer than 1,000 students. Wisconsin's challenge is to find ways to create the broad statewide impact necessary to advance the core reform areas, and to do so in such a way that accommodates the needs of large and small districts, urban and rural districts, and the range of student achievement levels and achievement gaps. We addressed this challenge by designing a system that addresses the majority of districts and those that require additional support. Wisconsin districts that sign the MOU agree to implement all of the areas identified in Exhibit I-Preliminary Scope of Work (see sample MOU in Appendix 2). This builds the "next floor" on our strong foundation and decreases disparity across the State. If Wisconsin receives the maximum amount of \$254 million that the State is requesting, the minimum that each district would receive is \$60,000 or \$60 per pupil or the allocation under the Title I formula, whichever is the greatest.

However, to address our achievement and graduation rate gaps, a more narrowed focus is also required. Wisconsin recognizes that a significant achievement gap exists in our State between students of color and white students and that to decrease this gap an additional set of

strategies is needed along with additional financial support. To close those gaps, Wisconsin is focusing its efforts on the five largest and most diverse school districts in the State (Green Bay, Kenosha, Madison, Milwaukee, and Racine), as well as those districts identified for improvement under federal law (Milwaukee and Beloit). The investments in those districts are specifically targeted to early childhood and late middle school/high school transition; because we know that focusing resources at these levels can reduce achievement and graduationrate gaps, setting students on a trajectory of success. Furthermore, the additional resources and requirements targeted at these districts are designed to ensure that Wisconsin meets key goals, including: raising overall student performance and significantly narrowing the achievement gap on national and state assessments, reducing the number of high school dropouts by half, and accelerating the annual growth in postsecondary enrollment.

Under federal law, Milwaukee Public Schools is identified as a District Identified for Improvement-Level 4. Under ESEA (Wisconsin's Elementary and Secondary Education Act), the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) requires Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS) to take corrective action designed to meet the goal of having all students achieve at the proficient or advanced performance levels. In 2007, WDPI directed the district to restructure its organization through the MPS district and School Accountability Model. Under this model, MPS grouped its 207 schools into nine clusters to ensure communities of learning and quality of instruction are present in every building. The State developed MPS-specific requirements for Exhibit II to address low student achievement, the Black-white achievement gap (as evidenced on State and national assessments), and the district's corrective action status. By signing Exhibit II, MPS is eligible for a minimum of an additional \$166 per student, which will be used to support the RTTT core reform areas that are aligned with the Corrective Action Requirements for Milwaukee Public Schools.

Similarly, Wisconsin's other large urban districts, which include Green Bay, Kenosha, Madison, and Racine, as well as Beloit, which is also identified for improvement, demonstrated significant achievement gaps. These districts have agreed to implement aggressive, research-based intervention strategies and will receive the additional fiscal support necessary to increase student achievement and decrease the achievement gap. If the State receives the maximum amount of \$254 million as requested in this application, these districts are eligible for at

a minimum, an additional \$166 per student to focus their Final Work Plans on early childhood initiatives, improving the middle school transition and closing the achievement gap in their respective districts.

The remaining Local Education Agencies (LEAs) in the State that sign the MOU will be eligible for additional dollars through a competitive grant program. If Wisconsin receives the requested \$254 million, \$19 million will be used to establish the Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant Program. These LEAs will be eligible for funds that support the broader State Plan and goals of increasing student achievement, decreasing the achievement gap, increasing the high school graduation rates, and increasing college enrollment rates. Proposals will be accepted to implement initiatives from the list of priorities found in Exhibit II: Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant Program.

For additional information related to State support, requirements of LEAs and the proposed State internal grants please refer to the following Appendices:

Appendix 1 - Letter from Governor Jim Doyle and State Superintendent Tony Evers; December 15, 2009

- Appendix 2 Participating LEA Memorandum of Understanding and Exhibit I Preliminary Scope of Work; December 15, 2009
- Appendix 3 Letter from Governor Jim Doyle and State Superintendent Tony Evers; January 6, 2010
- Appendix 4 State Reform Plan and Budget Overview
- Appendix 5 Exhibit II: Additional Funds and Strategies to Close the Achievement Gap, Milwaukee Specific

Appendix 6 - Exhibit II: Additional Funds and Strategies to Close the Achievement Gap, Select Districts

Appendix 7 - Exhibit II: Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant Program

(A)(1)(ii)(c) Signatures from as many as possible of the LEA superintendent (or equivalent), the president of the local school board (or equivalent, if applicable), and the local teachers' union leader (if applicable) (one signature of which must be from an authorized LEA representative) demonstrating the extent of leadership support within participating LEAs (as defined in this notice); and

Near universal participation

Wisconsin has almost universal participation among its LEAs, with 431 out of 442 participating. For the participating LEAs, all 431 superintendents (or equivalent) signed the MOU, demonstrating a strong commitment from LEA management to implement all of the RTTT core reforms. Additionally, the majority of school board presidents also signed (362 out of 431), demonstrating a significant commitment from local governance and school boards. While relatively few MOUs were signed by the local teachers' union leader (48 signatures), state and local union leaders were engaged in the process and generally receptive to the State plan. As expected, union leaders have expressed reservations about aspects of the core reform areas that may impact collective bargaining agreements. We anticipate that as the State negotiates the Final Work Plans with LEAs, many of the collective bargaining concerns will be resolved.

(A)(1)(iii) The LEAs that are participating in the State's Race to the Top plans (including considerations of the numbers and percentages of Participating LEAs, schools, K-12 students, and students in poverty) will translate into broad statewide impact, allowing the State to reach its ambitious yet achievable goals, overall and by student subgroup, for—(15 points)

Powerful goals with broad statewide impact

There was an overwhelming commitment from Wisconsin's LEAs to participate in our Race to the Top application. Of the 442 LEAs across the state, which includes 17 independent charters, 431 LEAs have signed on to participate—representing 97.5% of school districts. These 431 LEAs serve 97.7% of the 872,227 students in Wisconsin and represent 97.4% of the students in poverty. Perhaps more importantly, the LEA response rate demonstrates almost unanimous support for the four core reform areas outlined in the MOU and the State plan that comprise Wisconsin's Race to the Top application.

Furthermore, the six key urban districts, Beloit, Green Bay, Kenosha, Madison, Racine and Milwaukee, have signed on to participate and will receive additional aid to implement strategies around reducing the achievement gap in their schools. This is particularly important in Milwaukee, where MPS and the State will focus intensely on turning around our five lowest performing schools. Additionally, because most of the minority students in Wisconsin are concentrated in these six districts, these districts are crucial to driving the closure of our achievement gap. By signing the MOU and Exhibit II, these districts have agreed to provide quality learning experiences for four year olds, support successful transitions through provision of tutoring and mentoring, require three years of math and science for high school graduation and provide opportunities for teachers to participate in STEM training. Furthermore, these six districts have agreed to develop and implement district plans to distribute highly effective teachers more equitably, provide coaching for struggling principals, and implement other initiatives specifically targeted to narrowing the achievement gap. The largest district in the State, Milwaukee, has also agreed to engage in even more intensive and far reaching reform conditions, including full participation in WINS for Children, a neighborhood initiative modeled in part on the Harlem Children's Zone.

These pledges of support and overwhelming participation are clear evidence of the strong commitment from around the state to Wisconsin's Race to the Top application. Given the opportunity to fund these initiatives with Race to the Top, Wisconsin is committed to accelerating its efforts in all four reform areas. Race to the Top funds would provide a much-needed opportunity to assist these districts, while also raising the bar even higher in Wisconsin in terms of standards and expectations of our K-12 system.

Wisconsin has a progressive history of pioneering education reform and strong overall academic performance by our students. However, despite strong overall student performance, a deep achievement and graduation-rate gap between students of color and white students persists, especially in Milwaukee. For almost a decade, Wisconsin has struggled to effectively address these gaps, with some notable success in improving graduation rates among students of color. Nevertheless, the data is conclusive and more decisive action is need.

The Governor and State Superintendent are committed to closing the achievement and graduation-rate gap among students and view Race to the Top as a catalyst for expediting needed changes. Wisconsin has set the following aggressive goals to drive these changes:

<u>Goal 1</u>: Set Wisconsin's State improvement goals for National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) equivalent to the average growth in performance of the States with growth in the top ten percent.

<u>Goal 2</u>: Set Wisconsin's State achievement gap closing goals for NAEP equivalent to the average growth in performance of the States with growth in the top ten percent.

<u>Goal 3</u>: Accelerate progress by increasing the rate of growth by 1.5 standard deviations to more rapidly increase the percentage of students achieving at both the proficient and the advanced levels on the WKCE.

<u>Goal 4</u>: Reduce the achievement gaps by ensuring disadvantaged and low-performing groups meet the ambitious achievement goals established under Goal 3.

Goal 5: Reduce the number of dropouts statewide by 50 percent by 20013-14.

<u>Goal 6</u>: Double the rate of growth in high school graduation for American Indian, Black and Hispanic students in 2010 and maintain that level of growth.

Goal 7: Accelerate the growth in postsecondary enrollment by 40 percent in 2010 and maintain that level of growth.

(A)(1)(iii)(a) Increasing student achievement in (at a minimum) reading/language arts and mathematics, as reported by the NAEP and the assessments required under the ESEA; and

(A)(1)(iii)(b) Decreasing achievement gaps between subgroups in reading/language arts and mathematics, as reported by the NAEP and the assessments required under the ESEA;

Increase achievement and closing gaps on the NAEP

To drive change and in the spirit of Race to the Top, Wisconsin has set ambitious yet achievable goals for student achievement on NAEP. These goals are based on the level of growth observed in the top tier of states. Specifically, we set our goals to be 1.5 standard deviations above the mean growth on NAEP (in scale score, percent below basic, percent at proficient, percent at advanced, and percent proficient and above), for every subgroup in both reading and mathematics. This procedure results in a specific growth target for every subgroup that is ambitious (it places Wisconsin's growth rate in the top ten percent of all states), and yet is achievable (it has been attained by some states). Projected scores on NAEP are calculated by adding the gain goals in Tables 1 through 4 to the most current year's NAEP data (2006-07 for reading and 2008-09 for mathematics). The resulting student achievement targets are presented in Figure 1 (please refer to Appendix 8 for the underlying data).

<u>Goal 1</u>: Set Wisconsin's State improvement goals for NAEP equivalent to the average growth in performance of the States with growth in the top ten percent.

Based on the specific growth goals for NAEP reading and mathematics outlined above, achievement gaps between the lowest achieving subgroups and all students are projected to decrease. In general, target groups with the largest achievement gaps are projected to reduce those gaps most significantly. Gap reductions are projected from the most recent data (2006-07 for reading and 2008-09 for mathematics) through the 2013 NAEP administration

Table 5 - Reading goals for NAEP Grade 4.

			G	oals for Chang	ge per NAEP A	dministration				
Group	2007 Scale score	Scale score goal	2007 Below Basic	Below Basic goal	2007 Proficient	Proficient goal	2007 Advanced	Advanced goal	2007 Proficient and Advanced	Proficient and Advanced goal
All	223.3	3.6	29.6%	-4.0%	27.4%	1.9%	8.2%	1.2%	35.6%	2.8%
American Indian	*	6.6	*	-8.4%	*	3.3%	*	1.6%	*	4.4%
Asian / Pacific Island	222.5	7.2	28.9%	-8.3%	28.1%	5.5%	5.1%	4.9%	33.2%	8.5%
Black	191.1	5.9	64.7%	-6.9%	8.8%	2.7%	2.1%	0.8%	10.9%	3.2%
EconDis	205.3	4.3	49.3%	-5.1%	15.2%	1.9%	2.7%	0.6%	17.9%	2.3%
ELL	201.4	10.0	57.7%	-9.8%	9.3%	3.0%	1.0%	1.2%	10.4%	3.6%
Hispanic	208.4	5.3	50.4%	-6.7%	14.4%	2.4%	2.2%	1.1%	16.7%	3.1%
SwD	190.7	9.4	62.6%	-9.2%	11.0%	3.7%	3.0%	1.6%	14.0%	4.9%
White	229.2	3.3	22.8%	-3.9%	31.2%	2.2%	9.7%	1.4%	40.9%	3.2%

Table 6 - Mathematics goals for NAEP Grade 4.

			Go	oals for Change	e per NAEP A	iministration				
Group	2009 Scale score	Scale score goal	2009 Below Basic	Below Basic goal	2009 Proficient	Proficient goal	2009 Advanced	Advanced goal	2009 Proficient and Advanced	Proficient and Advanced goal
All	243.6	3.3	15.0%	-3.6%	15.0%	3.2%	37.4%	1.4%	7.6%	4.4%
American Indian	227.7	4.0	29.3%	-5.8%	29.3%	3.7%	19.7%	0.7%	1.0%	4.1%
Asian / Pacific Island	240.4	5.1	21.0%	-4.8%	21.0%	4.5%	26.8%	4.1%	11.9%	6.6%
Black	216.7	4.0	45.3%	-6.2%	45.3%	3.6%	11.0%	0.5%	0.4%	4.0%
EconDis	229.3	3.5	27.5%	-5.1%	27.5%	3.4%	22.0%	0.5%	1.8%	3.8%
ELL	223.0	5.5	33.9%	-8.3%	33.9%	3.8%	14.1%	0.7%	1.1%	4.2%
Hispanic	228.1	4.7	28.7%	-6.6%	28.7%	4.5%	20.1%	0.7%	1.4%	4.9%
SwD	222.0	5.1	39.6%	-7.3%	39.6%	3.8%	15.5%	0.9%	2.0%	4.5%
White	249.7	3.3	8.6%	-2.5%	8.6%	3.7%	44.1%	2.1%	9.4%	5.3%
Table 7 - Reading goals for NAEP Grade 8.

	Goals for Change per NAEP Administration												
Group	2007 Scale score	Scale score goal	2007 Below Basic	Below Basic goal	2007 Proficient	Proficient goal	2007 Advanced	Advanced goal	2007 Proficient and Advanced	Proficient and Advanced goal			
All	264.2	1.4	24.1%	-2.0%	30.6%	1.3%	2.6%	0.2%	33.2%	1.2%			
American Indian	*	4.4	*	-6.1%	*	4.7%	*	1.2%	*	5.3%			
Asian / Pacific Island	263.7	4.4	27.9%	-4.6%	22.0%	5.6%	4.6%	1.3%	26.6%	5.7%			
Black	231.3	3.1	60.4%	-3.6%	7.3%	2.0%	0.7%	0.3%	8.0%	2.2%			
EconDis	245.8	2.8	43.4%	-3.7%	15.0%	1.9%	0.7%	0.2%	15.6%	1.9%			
ELL	243.4	3.8	46.1%	-5.1%	11.2%	1.3%	0.0%	0.2%	11.2%	1.4%			
Hispanic	247.4	5.5	41.7%	-6.5%	16.2%	3.6%	0.6%	0.5%	16.8%	3.8%			
SwD	220.5	5.4	72.6%	-6.2%	2.9%	2.3%	0.3%	0.3%	3.3%	2.5%			
White	269.5	1.7	18.1%	-2.3%	35.0%	1.8%	2.8%	0.3%	37.8%	1.8%			

Table 8 - Mathematics goals for NAEP Grade 8.

Goals for Change per NAEP Administration											
Group	2009 Scale score	Scale score goal	2009 Below Basic	Below Basic goal	2009 Proficient	Proficient goal	2009 Advanced	Advanced goal	2009 Proficient and Advanced	Proficient and Advanced goal	
All	288.1	3.2	21.0%	-3.0%	21.0%	1.9%	31.0%	1.7%	8.4%	3.3%	
American Indian	*	3.7	*	-4.8%	*	2.6%	*	1.6%	*	3.1%	
Asian / Pacific Island	289.0	7.0	18.2%	-6.0%	18.2%	4.1%	32.9%	6.1%	6.6%	7.1%	
Black	253.6	4.8	61.5%	-5.8%	61.5%	2.8%	9.4%	0.7%	1.6%	3.3%	
EconDis	269.2	4.1	39.7%	-4.8%	39.7%	2.5%	18.2%	0.7%	1.8%	3.1%	
ELL	258.5	5.0	54.8%	-5.7%	54.8%	1.7%	8.9%	0.6%	0.4%	2.1%	
Hispanic	268.4	5.6	44.0%	-7.1%	44.0%	3.5%	17.4%	0.9%	2.8%	4.0%	
SwD	254.9	5.4	55.2%	-5.6%	55.2%	2.2%	8.7%	0.7%	0.9%	2.7%	
White	294.4	3.4	13.8%	-2.7%	13.8%	2.1%	35.1%	2.2%	9.9%	4.0%	



Figure 1 - Charts of Wisconsin's current and projected growth in NAEP Scale Scores in mathematics and reading by grade.

<u>Goal 2</u>: Set Wisconsin's State achievement gap closing goals for NAEP equivalent to the average growth in performance of the States with growth in the top ten percent.

Wisconsin has made significant gains in NAEP achievement among some groups over the years, but the growth among other groups has remained static or even gone down in some cases. Without the strong push provided by Race to the Top funds, our current growth trends are likely to remain the same. For example, the percent of 4th grade Black students scoring proficient or above on NAEP reading decreased from 12.5 percent in 2003 to a low in 2005 of 9.6 percent, and since then has only increased slightly to 10.9 percent in 2007. With the impetus from Race to the Top, Wisconsin will almost double the percent of 4th grade Black students scoring proficient or above on NAEP reading, to over 17 percent.

Table 9 - Projected NAEP gap closing in scale score points (based on growth goals, with all students as the reference group).

		Reading Grad	e 4		Mathematics Grade 4						
Group	2007 Gap	2011 Gap	2013 Gap	Gap reduction (2007-2013)	Group	2009 Gap	2011 Gap	2013 Gap	Gap reduction (2007-2013)		
Black	32.2	29.9	27.5	4.7	Black	26.8	26.2	25.5	1.3		
Hispanic	15.0	13.3	11.6	3.3	Hispanic	15.4	14.1	12.7	2.8		
SwD	32.7	26.9	21.0	11.6	SwD	21.6	19.8	18.0	3.6		
EconDis	18.0	17.4	16.7	1.3	EconDis	14.3	14.1	13.9	0.4		
ELL	21.9	15.6	9.2	12.7	ELL	20.6	18.4	16.2	4.4		

		Reading Grad	e 8		Mathematics Grade 8						
Group	2007 Gap	2011 Gap	2013 Gap	Gap reduction (2007-2013)	Group	2009 Gap	2011 Gap	2013 Gap	Gap reduction (2007-2013)		
Black	32.9	31.1	29.4	3.5	Black	34.5	33.0	31.4	3.1		
Hispanic	16.7	12.6	8.5	8.3	Hispanic	19.7	17.3	14.9	4.8		
SwD	43.7	39.6	35.6	8.1	SwD	33.2	31.1	28.9	4.3		
EconDis	18.4	17.0	15.6	2.7	EconDis	18.9	18.0	17.1	1.8		
ELL	20.8	18.3	15.9	4.9	ELL	29.6	27.8	26.0	3.6		

Increase achievement and closing gaps on the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Exam (WKCE):

The State's emphasis on closing achievement gaps and driving LEAs and students to the highest level of performance is reflected in our methodology for establishing performance goals on the current state assessment, the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examination (WKCE). The State has set goals for improvement both in terms of the percent proficient and the percent advanced for all students as well as each subgroup. This ensures that we can measure the increase in student achievement at all levels, while closing the achievement gap. Growth targets were derived by determining the mean annual increase over the last five years (2004-2009) in the percentage of students who achieve proficiency or better and for the percentage of students who have achieved advanced on the WKCE. The state then set the target growth rate 1.5 standard deviations above that mean for every subgroup in both reading and mathematics at 4th, 8th, and 10th grade. This procedure results in a specific growth target for every subgroup that is ambitious but achievable since it is a function of accelerated prior growth.

To ensure that goals are ambitious, minimum annual progress goals are identified based on current achievement and utilized if the above methodology does not produce sufficiently ambitious goals (or negative predicted growth). Minimum goals are identified in Table 6 below. To ensure that goals are achievable, specific maximum annual progress goals are established to avoid statistical outliers or aberrations. Additionally, once groups achieve 90 percent proficiency, it is difficult to make big jumps in achievement; therefore, a maximum annual progress goal of two percent was put in place for subgroups that achieve the 90 percent benchmark. Projected scores on WKCE are calculated by adding the progress goals in Table 6 and Table 7 to the most current year's WKCE data.

<u>Goal 3</u>: Accelerate progress by increasing the rate of growth by 1.5 standard deviations to more rapidly increase the percentage of students achieving at both the proficient and the advanced levels on the WKCE.

Based on these growth targets, we expect, for example, to increase achievement for Black fourth grade students by 5.0% per year from 58.9% proficient or better in 2008-09 to 63.9% in 2009-10 to 68.9% in 2010-11, and so on. At the same time, we expect to

raise the percentage of students achieving at an advanced level by 4.0% per year from 16.1 % advanced in 2008-09 to 20.1% in 2009-10 to 24.1% in 2010-11. Race to the Top funds and programs will make this dramatic achievement escalation possible.

Table 10 - Minimum and maximum progress goals for reading and mathematics percent proficient and advanced on the WKCE. Note that these values are only applied when the calculated goals are below the minimum or above the maximum goals.

2008-2009 Achievement Percent Proficient and Above	Min. Annual Progress Goal	Max. Annual Progress Goal
90% or Greater	1%	2%
80-89%	2%	7%
70-79%	3%	8%
60-69%	4%	9%
50-59%	5%	10%
Less than 50%	6%	11%

Table 11 - Minimum and maximum progress goals for reading and mathematics percent advanced on the WKCE. Note that these values are only applied when the calculated goals are below the minimum or above the maximum goals.

2008-2009 Achievement Percent Advanced	Min. Annual Progress Goal	Max. Annual Progress Goal
40% or Greater	1%	6%
30-39%	2%	7%
20-29%	3%	8%
10-19%	4%	9%
Less than 10%	5%	10%

	Reading Grade 4					Reading C	Grade 8		Reading Grade 10			
Group	Proficient /Advanced 2008-09	Proficient /Advanced Goal	Advanced 2008-09	Advanced Goal	Proficient /Advanced 2008-09	Proficient /Advanced Goal	Advanced 2008-09	Advanced Goal	Proficient /Advanced 2008-09	Proficient /Advanced Goal	Advanced 2008-09	Advanced Goal
All	81.6%	2.0%	42.3%	1.1%	84.7%	3.6%	43.1%	1.9%	74.9%	4.1%	42.5%	1.2%
American Indian	73.8%	3.0%	28.1%	3.0%	75.8%	5.3%	26.8%	5.3%	58.2%	5.2%	25.1%	3.0%
Asian/ Pacific Island	75.3%	3.0%	32.6%	2.7%	80.1%	2.0%	34.2%	5.0%	62.8%	8.0%	26.8%	4.1%
Black	58.9%	5.0%	16.1%	4.0%	61.9%	7.7%	15.6%	4.0%	41.3%	9.2%	13.8%	4.0%
Hispanic	65.3%	4.0%	19.8%	4.0%	69.9%	5.4%	22.2%	3.2%	53.1%	6.5%	21.9%	4.6%
White	87.2%	2.0%	49.5%	1.5%	89.6%	3.3%	49.5%	2.5%	81.5%	3.8%	48.5%	1.0%
EconDis	68.2%	4.0%	23.6%	3.0%	71.4%	5.9%	23.7%	3.0%	55.3%	6.5%	22.4%	3.0%
ELL	57.9%	5.1%	10.9%	5.0%	57.8%	8.9%	8.4%	5.0%	30.0%	7.5%	5.0%	5.0%
SwD	49.7%	5.0%	15.9%	4.0%	48.4%	6.0%	12.6%	4.0%	34.4%	7.5%	11.5%	4.0%

Table 12 - Annual reading goals for WKCE improvement, in percent proficient and advanced, and percent advanced.

	Mathematics Grade 4				Mathematics Grade 8				Mathematics Grade 10			
Group	Proficient /Advanced 2008-09	Proficient /Advanced Goal	Advanced 2008-09	Advanced Goal	Proficient /Advanced 2008-09	Proficient /Advanced Goal	Advanced 2008-09	Advanced Goal	Proficient /Advanced 2008-09	Proficient /Advanced Goal	Advanced 2008-09	Advanced Goal
All	81.0%	5.3%	38.3%	4.0%	78.4%	6.8%	29.3%	3.3%	69.3%	4.0%	21.4%	3.0%
American Indian	72.1%	8.0%	22.4%	6.1%	64.4%	8.7%	13.8%	4.0%	51.4%	5.0%	7.8%	5.0%
Asian/ Pacific Island	79.7%	7.6%	37.3%	5.3%	78.9%	8.0%	30.8%	6.8%	65.1%	5.4%	18.9%	4.0%
Black	54.9%	9.0%	14.3%	4.0%	45.9%	10.0%	6.4%	5.0%	26.5%	6.0%	3.2%	5.0%
Hispanic	66.6%	7.8%	20.8%	3.3%	60.1%	10.0%	11.2%	4.0%	45.1%	6.0%	6.6%	5.0%
White	86.8%	4.6%	44.2%	4.7%	84.8%	3.3%	34.3%	3.8%	76.7%	3.0%	25.1%	3.0%
EconDis	67.9%	8.0%	22.0%	3.1%	61.3%	5.9%	13.0%	4.0%	46.4%	6.0%	8.0%	5.0%
ELL	64.3%	8.7%	16.6%	4.0%	53.4%	8.9%	7.0%	5.0%	32.1%	6.0%	2.7%	5.0%
SwD	56.7%	5.8%	18.8%	4.0%	41.4%	6.0%	8.3%	5.0%	27.6%	6.0%	5.4%	5.0%

Table 13 - Annual mathematics goals for WKCE improvement, in percent proficient and advanced, and percent advanced.

<u>Goal 4</u>: Reduce the achievement gaps by ensuring disadvantaged and low-performing groups meet the ambitious achievement goals established under Goal 3.

Table 14 - WKCE projected gap closing, based on growth goals. Note that target group achievement levels are compared against the 'all students' category for simplicity and clarity. Progress towards closing achievement gaps in Wisconsin will be assessed based on comparison to the appropriate, corresponding sub-groups.

	Reading Grade 4								
Group (All students is reference group)	2009 Gap	2010 Gap	2011 Gap	2012 Gap	2013 Gap	Gap Reduction, from 2009 to 2013 in percentage points			
Black	22.6%	19.6%	16.6%	13.6%	10.6%	12.0%			
Hispanic	16.3%	14.3%	12.3%	10.3%	8.3%	8.0%			
SwD	31.9%	28.9%	25.9%	22.9%	19.9%	12.0%			
EconDis	13.4%	11.4%	9.4%	7.4%	5.4%	8.0%			
ELL	23.7%	20.6%	17.5%	14.4%	11.3%	12.4%			
			Reading Grade 8						
Group (All students is reference group)	2009 Gap	2010 Gap	2011 Gap	2012 Gap	2013 Gap	Gap Reduction, from 2009 to 2013 in percentage points			
Black	22.8%	18.7%	13.0%	7.3%	7.3%	15.5%			
Hispanic	14.9%	13.1%	9.7%	6.3%	6.3%	8.6%			
SwD	36.4%	34.0%	30.0%	26.0%	22.0%	14.4%			
EconDis	13.3%	11.0%	7.1%	3.2%	3.2%	10.1%			
ELL	26.9%	21.6%	14.7%	7.8%	7.8%	19.1%			

Reading Grade 10										
Group (All students is reference group)	2009 Gap	2010 Gap	2011 Gap	2012 Gap	2013 Gap	Gap Reduction, from 2009 to 2013 in percentage points				
Black	36.7%	33.7%	28.6%	23.5%	18.4%	18.3%				
Hispanic	25.7%	21.9%	19.5%	17.1%	14.7%	11.0%				
SwD	42.8%	40.5%	37.1%	33.7%	30.3%	12.5%				
EconDis	21.3%	19.7%	17.3%	14.9%	12.5%	8.8%				
ELL	43.8%	45.0%	41.6%	38.2%	34.8%	9.1%				
	Mathematics Grade 4									
Group (All students is reference group)	2009 Gap	2010 Gap	2011 Gap	2012 Gap	2013 Gap	Gap Reduction, from 2009 to 2013 in percentage points				
Black	26.2%	22.5%	15.5%	8.5%	8.5%	17.7%				
Hispanic	14.5%	12.0%	6.2%	0.4%	0.4%	14.1%				
SwD	24.3%	23.8%	20.0%	16.2%	12.4%	11.9%				
EconDis	13.1%	10.4%	4.4%	4.4%	4.4%	8.7%				
ELL	16.8%	13.4%	6.7%	6.7%	6.7%	10.1%				
		1	Mathematics Grade	8						
Group (All students is reference group)	2009 Gap	2010 Gap	2011 Gap	2012 Gap	2013 Gap	Gap Reduction, from 2009 to 2013 in percentage points				
Black	32.4%	29.2%	21.2%	13.2%	5.2%	27.2%				
Hispanic	18.3%	15.1%	7.1%	7.1%	7.1%	11.2%				
SwD	37.0%	37.8%	33.8%	29.8%	25.8%	11.2%				
EconDis	17.1%	18.0%	14.1%	10.2%	6.4%	10.7%				
ELL	25.0%	22.9%	16.0%	9.1%	2.2%	22.8%				

Mathematics Grade 10									
Group (All students is reference group)	2009 Gap	2010 Gap	2011 Gap	2012 Gap	2013 Gap	Gap Reduction, from 2009 to 2013 in percentage points			
Black	42.8%	40.8%	38.8%	36.8%	34.8%	8.0%			
Hispanic	24.2%	22.2%	20.2%	18.2%	16.2%	8.0%			
SwD	41.6%	39.6%	37.6%	35.6%	33.6%	8.0%			
EconDis	22.9%	20.9%	18.9%	16.9%	14.9%	8.0%			
ELL	37.2%	35.2%	33.2%	31.2%	29.2%	8.0%			

(A)(1)(iii)(c) Increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice); and

Increase Wisconsin's high school graduation rate and reduce the number of dropouts:

Increasing high school graduation rates is also a top priority for Wisconsin and is a cornerstone of State Superintendent Evers' *Every Child a Graduate* initiative (please refer to Appendix 9 for additional information). The State recognizes that not all subgroups have equal graduation rates, and we are aggressively addressing this issue.

Over 80 percent of Wisconsin's dropouts are located in 50 school districts (out of 425), creating a narrow universe of school districts where intensive dropout prevention and student intervention work will yield significant results. Wisconsin is hosting a Graduation Summit with the America's Promise Alliance for these districts, which will focus on research-based strategies to increase graduation rates. Additionally, the State is setting aggressive Race to the Top goals to slash the dropouts in half and double the growth in graduation rates for students of color. If Wisconsin had cut the number of dropouts in half in 2008-09, the statewide graduation rate would have been 93.7% instead of 89.0%--a significant difference.

<u>Note on methodology</u>: Wisconsin is currently in the process of revising how the graduation rate is calculated and reported in accordance with 34 CFR SS 200.19, and will be setting new goals and targets for graduation rate. A committee has been formed and work has been started on this project, but it will likely not be completed until July 2011, and therefore, it is not ready to be included in this application.

Once the new graduation rates, goals, and targets are finalized and approved by ED, we will likely need to revise the goals and targets in this document as well. For at least three years beginning in 2010-11, we expect to track graduation rates using both our old and new methods in order to analyze trend data and monitor if we are hitting our targets.

Goal 5: Reduce the number of dropouts statewide by 50 percent by 20013-14.

	C	1		Carla						
	Gr	aduation Num	ibers and Projec	tions Based of	n Current Patter	'ns			Goals	
Year	Expected Completers *	Annual % Change	Total Diplomas *	Annual % Change	Diplomas as % of Completers	Total # of Dropouts*	Annual % Change in Dropouts	Annual change in dropouts	Diplomas Received	% of Diplomas Received
1998-99	64,983		58,312		89.7%	6,817				
1999-00	65,537	0.9%	58,545	0.4%	89.3%	6,916	1.5%			
2000-01	65,971	0.7%	59,341	1.4%	90.0%	6,584	-4.8%			
2001-02	66,694	1.1%	60,575	2.1%	90.8%	6,265	-4.8%			
2002-03	68,896	3.3%	63,270	4.4%	91.8%	6,325	1.0%			
2003-04	66,875	-2.9%	60,979	-3.6%	91.2%	4,407	-30.3%			
2004-05⁵	71,172	6.4%	63,229	3.7%	88.8%	7,326	66.2%			
2005-06	70,539	-0.9%	63,006	-0.4%	89.3%	6,962	-5.0%			
2006-07	71,384	1.2%	63,962	1.5%	89.6%	6,724	-3.4%			
2007-08	73,271	2.6%	65,183	1.9%	89.0%	7,001	4.1%			
2008-09	74,297	1.4%	66,096	1.4%	89.0%	7,190	2.7%			
2009-10	75,337	1.4%	67,021	1.4%	89.0%	7,384	2.7%			
2010-11	76,392	1.4%	67,959	1.4%	89.0%	7,584	2.7%	1,027	68,986	90.3%
2011-12	77,461	1.4%	68,911	1.4%	89.0%	7,788	2.7%	2,054	70,964	91.6%
2012-13	78,546	1.4%	69,875	1.4%	89.0%	7,999	2.7%	3,080	72,956	92.9%
2013-14	79,645	1.4%	70,854	1.4%	89.0%	8,215	2.7%	4,107	74,961	94.1%

Table 15 - Projected dropout and graduation rate for all students to meet 50 percent reduction goal by 2013-14.

⁵ 2004-05 ENROLLMENT DATA DISCLAIMER: Major changes in Wisconsin data collection systems were implemented in 2004-05. 2004-05 enrollment data were included in this transition year collection and are not comprehensive so should be interpreted with caution. Additionally, graduation (regular diploma) and completion rate reporting changed in 1998-99 and 2003-04. 2003-04 was a year of transition to a new student data collection, and as a result 2003-04 high school completion data may not be comprehensive.

<u>Goal 6</u>: Double the rate of growth in high school graduation for American Indian, Black and Hispanic students in 2010 and maintain that level of growth.

		American	Indian			Black	K		Hispanic				
Year	Expected Completers	Regular Diplomas	Diploma %	% Change	Expected Completers	Regular Diplomas	Diploma %	% Change	Expected Completers	Regular Diplomas	Diploma %	% Change	
1998	699	528	75.54%	0	4619	2528	54.73%		1810	1282	70.83%		
1999	693	538	77.63%	2.78%	4736	2581	54.50%	-0.43%	2021	1405	69.52%	-1.85%	
2000	721	532	73.79%	-4.96%	5003	2573	51.43%	-5.63%	2086	1446	69.32%	-0.29%	
2001	748	547	73.13%	-0.89%	5134	2835	55.22%	7.37%	2209	1557	70.48%	1.68%	
2002	811	623	76.82%	5.05%	5258	3148	59.87%	8.42%	2390	1792	74.98%	6.38%	
2003	851	668	78.50%	2.18%	5082	3196	62.89%	5.04%	2455	1870	76.17%	1.59%	
2004	866	688	79.45%	1.21%	5805	3815	65.72%	4.50%	2625	2023	77.07%	1.18%	
2005 6	994	700	70.42%	11.36%	5968	3751	62.85%	-4.36%	3038	2201	72.45%	- <u>5.99%</u>	
2006	1040	776	74.62%	5.95%	6211	4040	65.05%	3.49%	3191	2430	76.15%	5.11%	
2007	1038	776	74.76%	0.19%	6374	4333	67.98%	4.51%	3421	2580	75.42%	-0.97%	
2008	1070	801	74.86%	0.13%	7240	4823	66.62%	-2.01%	3794	2840	74.86%	-0.74%	
2009	1107	840	75.83%	1.29%	7502	5138	68.49%	2.81%	3992	3029	75.86%	1.34%	
2010	1144	879	76.81%	1.29%	7764	5616	72.33%	2.81%	4191	3265	77.90%	1.34%	
2011	1181	931	78.80%	2.59%	8026	5956	74.21%	5.62%	4389	3508	79.91%	2.69%	
2012	1218	985	80.84%	2.59%	8288	6310	76.13%	5.62%	4588	3761	81.98%	2.69%	
2013	1256	1041	82.93%	2.59%	8551	6678	78.10%	5.62%	4786	4025	84.11%	2.69%	
2014	1293	1100	85.08%	2.59%	8813	7061	80.12%	5.62%	4984	4301	86.28%	2.69%	
10-Year Avg.				1.29%				2.81%				1.34%	
Doubled Grov	wth			2.59%				5.62%				2.69%	

Table 16 - Projected growth in high school graduation rate for American Indian, Black and Hispanic students by 2013-14.

⁶ Due to irregularities in the 2004-05 data collections, this year has been excluded. See footnote 5 for more detail.

(A)(1)(iii)(d) Increasing college enrollment (as defined in this notice) and increasing the number of students who complete at least a year's worth of college credit that is applicable to a degree within two years of enrollment in an institution of higher education.

Increase Wisconsin's postsecondary enrollment:

<u>Note on methodology</u>: Beginning in the 2010-11 school year, Wisconsin will have National Student Clearinghouse data for all LEAs and students. This will provide robust, national data on the postsecondary enrollment of Wisconsin students, including subgroups. At present, Wisconsin's postsecondary enrollment projections are based on data collected by the Applied Population Laboratory (APL) at the University of Wisconsin-Madison as well as WDPI. APL has provided public and private school student graduation data as well as postsecondary enrollment data for all students; however, the high school graduation targets have been aligned with WDPI data for accuracy and consistency throughout the Race to the Top application.

Based on the alignment of Race to the Top efforts with new State college-access programs like the Wisconsin Covenant, a State collegeaccess and aspiration program, and Know How 2 Go, the State has set a target growth rate one standard deviations above that mean annual average growth from 2000 - 2006. This procedure sets a specific annual growth target that is ambitious (it accelerates Wisconsin's growth rate by almost 40 percent), and yet is achievable (it is based on an acceleration of current growth).

Goal 7: Accelerate the growth in postsecondary enrollment by 40 percent in 2010 and maintain that level of growth.

		Act	ual			Baseline		Projected Grads					
	2000	2002	2004	2006	2008	2009	2009 2010		2012	2013	2014		
Wisconsin HS Graduates	63,815	65,877	66,381	68,585	70,519	71,506	72,507	73,522	74,552	75,595	76,654		
% Enrolled in Higher Ed	57.80%	58.20%	59.70%	61.90%	63.31%	64.02%	64.75%	65.95%	67.17%	68.42%	69.69%		
# Enrolled in Higher Ed	36,885	38,347	39,604	42,461			46,945	48,486	50,077	51,720	53,417		
			% Change from prior year:			1.13%	1.13%	1.86%	1.86%	1.86%	1.86%		

Table 17 - Projected growth in postsecondary enrollment by 2013-14.

Table 13. Summary tables for (A)(1).

able 18 - Summary Table for $(A)(T)(U)(b)$.		
Elements of State Reform Plans	Number of LEAs Participating (#)	Percentage of Total Participating LEAs (%)
B. Standards and Assessments		
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	431	100%
C. Data Systems to Support Instruction	1	
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction:		
(i) Use of local instructional improvement systems	431	100%
(ii) Professional development on use of data	431	100%
(iii) Availability and accessibility of data to researchers	431	100%
D. Great Teachers and Leaders		-
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance:		
(i) Measure student growth	431	100%
(ii) Design and implement evaluation systems	431	100%
(iii) Conduct annual evaluations	431	100%

Table 18 - Si (A)(1)(i)(b)Tablefo

(iv)(a) Use evaluations to inform professional development	431	100%	
(iv)(b) Use evaluations to inform compensation, promotion and retention ⁷	0	0%	
(iv)(c) Use evaluations to inform tenure and/or full certification ⁸	431	100%	
(iv)(d) Use evaluations to inform removal ⁹	431	100%	
(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals:			
(i) High-poverty and/or high-minority schools	431	100%	
(ii) Hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	431	100%	
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals:			
(i) Quality professional development	431	100%	
(ii) Measure effectiveness of professional development	431	100%	
E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools			
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	431	100%	
			<u> </u>

⁹ Ibid.

⁷Recent changes in state collective bargaining law will allow innovative teacher compensation systems to be negotiated. See sec. (F)(3), p. 251-254.

⁸ Required under current Wisconsin administrative rules. See discussion of Wis. Admin. Code § PI 8.01(2)(q) at sec. (D)(2), pp. 149.

Signatures acquired from Participating LEAs:										
Number of Participating LEAs with all applicable signatures										
	Number of	Number of								
	Signatures	Signatures	Percentage (%)							
	Obtained (#)	Applicable (#)	(Obtained / Applicable)							
LEA Superintendent (or equivalent)	431	431	100%							
President of Local School Board (or equivalent, if applicable)	362	414	87.4%							
Local Teachers' Union Leader (if applicable)	48	414	11.6%							

applicable signatures of President of Local School Board (or equivalent) and Local Teachers Union Leader (if applicable) of 414 reflects the 17 2R Charter Schools who signed an MOU to be Participating LEAs but who do not have Presidents of Local School Boards (or equivalent) or Local Teachers Union Leaders (as applicable).

Table 20 - Summary Table for (A)(1)(iii).

	Participating LEAs (#)	Statewide (#)	Percentage of Total
			Statewide (%)
			(Participating LEAs /
			Statewide)
LEAs	431	442	97.5%
Schools	2,244	2,304	97.7%
K-12 Students	852,251	872,227	97.9%
Students in poverty	287,239	292,699	97.4%

Student data is for the 2008 / 2009 academic year. LEA and School number data is for the 2009 / 2010 academic year.

Please see Appendix 10: Detailed Table (A)(1) for additional information.

This table provides detailed information on the participation of each Participating LEA (as defined in this notice) to complete the Summary Tables above. Due to the large number of Participating LEAs this table has been moved to appendices.

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up and sustain proposed plans (30 points)

The extent to which the State has a high-quality overall plan to-

(i) Ensure that it has the capacity required to implement its proposed plans by—(20 points)

- (a) Providing strong leadership and dedicated teams to implement the statewide education reform plans the State has proposed;
- (b) Supporting Participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) in successfully implementing the education reform plans the State has proposed, through such activities as identifying promising practices, evaluating these practices' effectiveness, ceasing ineffective practices, widely disseminating and replicating the effective practices statewide, holding Participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) accountable for progress and performance, and intervening where necessary;
- (c) Providing effective and efficient operations and processes for implementing its Race to the Top grant in such areas as grant administration and oversight, budget reporting and monitoring, performance measure tracking and reporting, and fund disbursement;
- (d) Using the funds for this grant, as described in the State's budget and accompanying budget narrative, to accomplish the State's plans and meet its targets, including where feasible, by coordinating, reallocating, or repurposing education funds from other

Federal, State, and local sources so that they align with the State's Race to the Top goals; and

(e) Using the fiscal, political, and human capital resources of the State to continue, after the period of funding has ended, those reforms funded under the grant for which there is evidence of success; and

(ii) Use support from a broad group of stakeholders to better implement its plans, as evidenced by the strength of the statements or actions of support from— (10 points)

- (a) The State's teachers and principals, which include the State's teachers' unions or statewide teacher associations; and
- (b) Other critical stakeholders, such as the State's legislative leadership; charter school authorizers and State charter school membership associations (if applicable); other State and local leaders (*e.g.*, business, community, civil rights, and education association leaders); Tribal schools; parent, student, and community organizations (*e.g.*, parent-teacher associations, nonprofit organizations, local education foundations, and community-based organizations); and institutions of higher education.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. The State's response to (A)(2)(i)(d) will be addressed in the budget section (Section VIII of the application). Attachments, such as letters of support or commitment, should be summarized in the text box below and organized with a summary table in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (A)(2)(i)(d):

• The State's budget, as completed in Section VIII of the application. The narrative that accompanies and explains the budget and

how it connects to the State's plan, as completed in Section VIII of the application.

Evidence for (A)(2)(ii):

• A summary in the narrative of the statements or actions and inclusion of key statements or actions in the Appendix.

Recommended maximum response length: Five pages (excluding budget and budget narrative)

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up and sustain proposed plans

The extent to which the State has a high-quality overall plan to—

(A)(2)(i) Ensure that it has the capacity required to implement its proposed plans by—

(A)(2)(i)(a) Providing strong leadership and dedicated teams to implement the statewide education reform plans the State has proposed;

Create the Office of Education Innovation and Improvement (OEII)

To ensure that the State has adequate capacity, resources, and control to effectively manage and implement its Race to the Top (RTTT) plans, in collaboration with the LEAs, Wisconsin will establish an <u>Office of Education Innovation and Improvement</u> (OEII). Reporting to the State Superintendent, OEII will be responsible for overseeing the execution of Wisconsin's Race to the Top plans, awarding and managing external contracts (as specified throughout the State plan) and ensuring the State's and LEAs' compliance with the conditions outlined in the State's RTTT grant and LEAs' Final Work Plans.

Additionally, the OEII will be charged with providing statewide expertise and support to LEAs in order to advance the federal education reform agenda requirements in areas such as: standards and assessments, data system, great teachers and leaders, and turning around struggling schools.

The OEII will include project management and administration staff housed in Madison and project consultants working regionally with each Cooperative Educational Service Agency (CESA). OEII staff will be selected based on their ability to establish and maintain effective support structures for districts and schools. They will be hired based on their knowledge of school turnaround models, experience with struggling schools, and familiarity with research and data-driven methods.

	SET UP	OEII	
GOAL	KEY ACTIVITIES	TIMELINE	KEY PARTIES
	• Use state procedures to recruit, interview, and employ appropriate staff	• Within 60 days of grant award	Assistant State SuperintendentWDPI HR
	 Post positions 	 Within 10 days of grant award 	WDPI HR
Employ OEII director and staff	 Screen resumes 	 Within 25 days of grant award 	Assistant State Superintendent
	 Interview qualified candidates 	 Within 40 days of grant award 	Assistant State Superintendent
	 Offer qualified candidates positions 	• Within 60 days of grant award	Assistant State Superintendent
Provide training to OEII staff	Provide HR training to OEII staff	• Within 45 days of employment	WDPI HR
Provide team development training to OEII staff	Conduct series of team development training for OEII staff	• Within the first 10 days of full team employment	WDPI HR
Provide training related to OEII mission, Race to the Top, and WDPI efforts	Conduct series of training for OEII staff	• Within the first 10 days of full team employment	OEII Director
Implement the Common Core standards	• Involve educators in developing model curriculum and units of instruction for each grade level	• Year 1 – Year 4: different subjects and grade levels will be identified and relevant curricula and units developed	 OEII Stakeholders LEAs CESAs Educators
Provide professional development and online resources	Develop online resources for districts to use	• Year 1 – Year 4: different online resources will be developed	 OEII Stakeholders LEAs CESAs Educators
Provide professional development modules and trainers on data use to improve instruction	Work in collaboration with educational institutions, professional organizations, or non-profit organizations to develop and provide professional development modules, tools and administrator training in data literacy	Year 1 – Year 4: different modules, tools, and administrator training will be developed	 OEII CESAs Educational institutions, professional organizations, or non- profit organizations, and LEA staff
Through the LDS, expand access to	• Provide support to the Value-added data	• Year I – Year 4: Value-added data	• OEII

Table 21 – OEII implementation plan.

assessment reports that show student/group growth	partner to expand district participation in growth reporting	partner will be contracted to provide support to expand district participation.	CESAsValue-added data partner
Develop mentoring and coaching guidelines and best practices to improve effectiveness	Work in collaboration and/or contact with groups to build on existing efforts to develop and provide high quality mentoring and coaching guidelines as well as best practices for teachers and principals	• Year 1 – Year 4: OEII will work with groups to develop and provide high quality mentoring and coaching guidelines and best practices	 OEII External groups such as educational institutions, CESAs, professional organizations, and/or non-profit organizations
Provide high quality coaching and mentoring resources and tools for principal and teacher effectiveness	• Work in collaboration with internal and external providers to create and provide professional development modules, tools, and training	• Year 1 – Year 4: OEII will work in collaboration with groups to create and provide professional development modules, tools	 OEII External groups such as educational institutions, CESAs, professional organizations, and/or non-profit organizations
Provide mentor academies, training and support	• Work in collaboration with internal and external groups to provide mentor academies, training and support	• Year 1 – Year 4: OEII will work in collaboration with groups to create and provide professional development modules, tools	 OEII External groups such as educational institutions, CESAs, professional organizations, and/or non-profit organizations
Provide coach institutes, training and support	• Work in collaboration with internal and external groups to provide coaching institutes, training and support	• Year 1 – Year 4: OEII will work in collaboration with groups to create and provide professional development modules, tools	 OEII External groups such as educational institutions, CESAs, professional organizations, and/or non-profit organizations
Develop and pilot a model evaluation system	• Work in collaboration with internal and external groups to develop and pilot a model evaluation system	• Year 1 – Year 4: OEII will work in collaboration with groups to develop and pilot a model evaluation system	 OEII External groups such as educational institutions, CESAs, professional organizations, and/or non-profit organizations
Develop a preservice teacher performance assessment tool	• Work in collaboration with national partners and institutions of higher education to develop and pilot a model evaluation system	• Year 1 – Year 4: OEII will work in collaboration with groups to develop and pilot a model evaluation system.	 OEII External groups such as CCSSO and AACTE
Expand urban teacher training and recruitment programs	• Provide funding for the University of Wisconsin Institute for Urban Education to expand placement of preservice teachers in urban schools	• Year 1 – Year 4: OEII will provide funding to UW's Institute for Urban Education to expand their work	 OEII UW's Institute for Urban Education
Expand the statewide RtI Center	• Work in collaboration with statewide RtI center to expand its scope of work	• Year 1 – Year 4: OEII will work with the state RtI center	OEIIRtI center
Coordinate STEM efforts statewide	• Work in collaboration with WDPI staff and other stakeholders to create a working group to coordinate STEM efforts around Wisconsin	• Year 1 – Year 4: OEII will develop and work with the working group	OEIISTEM working group

Establish STEM academies	•	Work in collaboration with educational institutions, professional organizations, and non-profit organizations to provide STEM academies	•	Year 1 – Year 4: OEII will provide support to create and continue STEM academies	•	OEII and stakeholders
Oversee the effective management of the Race to the Top grant	•	Provide day to day management of grant Interact on a timely basis with the ED Submit reports to the ED as requested in a timely manner	•	Year 1 – Year 4: OEII staff will oversee, manage, and report on the effectiveness of the RTTT grant	•	OEII Assistant State Superintendent

Table 22 – Timeline for OEII implementation activities.

					SET	T UP OE	Ш									
KEY TASK		YE	AR 1			YE	AR 2			YEA	AR 3			YE	AR 4	
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Use state procedures to recruit, interview, and employ appropriate staff	•	•														
Post positions	•															
Screen resumes	•															
Interview qualified candidates	•	•														
Offer qualified candidates positions	•	•														
Provide HR training to OEII staff	•	•														
Conduct series of team development training for OEII staff		•														
Conduct series of training for OEII staff		•														
Involve educators in developing model curriculum and units of instruction for each grade level	٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Develop online resources for districts	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Work in collaboration with educational institutions, professional organizations, or non-profit organizations to develop and provide professional development modules, tools and administrator training in data literacy	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Provide support to the Value-added data partner to expand district participation in growth reporting	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Work in collaboration and/or contact with groups to build on existing efforts to	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•

develop and provide high quality																
mentoring and coaching guidelines as well																
as best practices for teachers and																
principals																
Collaborate with internal and external																
providers to provide professional	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
development modules, tools, and training																
Work in collaboration with internal and																
external groups to provide mentor	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
academies, training and support																
Work in collaboration with internal and																
external groups to provide coaching	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
institutes, training and support																
Work in collaboration with internal and																
external groups to develop and pilot a	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
model evaluation system																
Work in collaboration with national																
partners and institutions of higher																
education to develop and pilot a model	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
evaluation system																
Provide funding for the University of																
Wisconsin Institute for Urban Education																
to expand placement of preservice	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
teachers in urban schools																
Work in collaboration with statewide RtI																
center to expand its scope of work	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Work in collaboration with WDPI staff																
and other stakeholders to create a working	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
group to coordinate STEM efforts																
Provide STEM academies in collaboration																
with educational institutions, professional	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
organizations, and nonprofit organizations																
Provide day to day management of grant																
Interact on a timely basis with the ED																
Submit reports to the ED as requested in a	•	•	•		•	•			•		•	•		•	•	•
timely manner																

(A)(2)(i)(b) Supporting Participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) in successfully implementing the education reform plans the State has proposed, through such activities as identifying promising practices, evaluating these practices' effectiveness, ceasing ineffective practices, widely disseminating and replicating the effective practices statewide, holding Participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) accountable for progress and performance, and intervening where necessary;

Provide support for LEAs under Wisconsin's State Plan

In order to create the statewide systematic changes necessary to reduce the achievement and graduation gaps, the entire scope of the MOU is mandatory for Participating LEAs. The State focused the MOU on local and regional capacity-building work and placed a premium on quality implementation of each initiative. Wisconsin LEAs have already been working to advance in these reform areas, and implementing the MOU will drive higher levels of achievement and more rapid implementation of key intervention systems. While LEAs are not required to expend RTTT funds in each area, all aspects of the MOU's scope must be addressed in the Final Work Plans, which may include either current efforts in meeting the MOU appropriate quality parameters or reallocation of other resources to support MOU requirements. In order to achieve these ambitious goals, the State's plan provides substantial support and training in the following areas:

<u>Standards & Assessments</u>: The State will adopt the Common Core Standards for English Language Arts and Mathematics as well as develop a common statewide benchmark assessment accessible through a shared computer-based format to gauge student progress on the Common Core Standards throughout the school year. Additionally, the State will develop online resources to include model curriculum, model units of instruction, classroom assessment strategies, and video classroom vignettes. The State will also provide professional development which will occur through a combination of local and regional professional learning communities, summer institutes, and online training modules and networking.

<u>Data</u>: The WDPI will work in collaboration with and/or contract with educational institutions, regional Cooperative Educational Service Agencies (CESAs), professional organizations, or non-profit organizations to develop and provide professional development modules, tools,

and training in data literacy, student growth and value-added data reports in order to improve classroom instruction as well as drive regional expertise in data usage.

<u>Great Teachers and Leaders</u>: The WDPI will expand on existing partnerships and leverage new ones with national and state training organizations to establish high quality guidelines for teacher and principal mentoring and coaching, including guidelines for length and quality, strategies for recruitment and selection, and training materials. These guidelines and strategies will be translated into professional development modules, tools, and training sessions/academies around best practices and evaluations methods developed to increase principal and teacher effectiveness.

Participating LEAs must evaluate teachers and principals annually, including student growth as a significant factor. To support this effort, the WDPI will develop and pilot a model evaluation system for teachers and principals, which may include: growth models, classroom observations, supervisor evaluations, analysis of classroom or school artifacts, portfolios, self-reports of practice, and multiple student achievement measures. This evaluation system will be developed in conjunction with educational institutions, professional organizations, and other related education stakeholders and community groups.

Additionally, to drive quality in the teacher supply for hard to staff subjects and areas, the WDPI will participate in a national partnership to develop and pilot a preservice assessment to be used by educator preparation programs to endorse candidates for state licensure and provide funding to expand the placement of preservice teachers from across the state in urban centers for their student teaching clinical experience.

<u>Turning Around Struggling Schools</u>: The OEII will provide funding for internal and/or external highly specialized intervention teams to support local administrators in implementing turnaround strategies in struggling schools, with a goal of dramatically improving student achievement in a condensed timeframe. Support will initially be focused on the five lowest performing schools, which are all part of the Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS). Intervention support teams will be mutually agreed upon by the OEII and MPS.

Additionally, Participating LEAs are required to institute a Response to Intervention (RtI) system, which will be supported through the expansion of a statewide RtI Center. The RtI Center will provide technical assistance and professional development throughout the state, directly engaging districts and schools around their RtI efforts. The RtI Center also will produce publications and resources for districts and schools to use as they develop and refine their RtI programs. The RtI Center will also be involved in and support the RtI statewide summit and academies.

Finally, the State will provide funding for the Wisconsin Initiative for Neighborhoods and Schools that Work for Children (WINS), also known as the Milwaukee Children's Zone, to support the full scale creation and implementation of the full WINS plan, accelerating and driving urban renewal in Milwaukee that will further maximize and multiply the impact of the RTTT funds leveraged by MPS. As previously noted, WINS is a four-year project slated for two delineated geographical areas. All children, ages 0 to 25 that live or attend school in these zones will receive a range of family and community supports to help them achieve academic proficiency, gain access to social and economic opportunity, and transition to productive adulthood. WINS for Children takes a comprehensive approach, bringing together evidence-based best practices in education, human development, and community development to establish a pipeline of essential services. With the emphasis on providing high-quality prenatal health care to parents through high-quality preschool, WINS for Children will allow significant resources to be focused on early childhood, allowing disadvantaged students to start kindergarten with skills equal to their more privileged peers. This, in combination with the strategies for K-12 schools in the zone, will result in a closing of the achievement gap.

We are fortunate to have a State Superintendent of Public Instruction and a Governor who are committed to raising the bar for education in this state and help guide the State toward a more aggressive reform agenda. Their leadership is making it possible for Wisconsin to address the unacceptably large and persistent achievement gap, and our perceived low standards for proficiency on Wisconsin state tests.

<u>STEM</u>: The WDPI will create a working group to coordinate STEM efforts around the state, strengthen ties with regional economic development partners and higher education stakeholders to align STEM efforts around higher education and workforce need as well as to promote best practices within Wisconsin schools. The OEII will provide STEM teacher and learning academies onsite and via virtual

learning opportunities throughout the state, while working with national and state organizations to develop and provide STEM pilot projects, teacher development, and instructional materials.

(A)(2)(i)(c) Providing effective and efficient operations and processes for implementing its Race to the Top grant in such areas as grant administration and oversight, budget reporting and monitoring, performance measure tracking and reporting, and fund disbursement;

Secure external mechanisms to measure and report on RTTT progress

Wisconsin has received strong, positive feedback from business leaders, government officials, and the general public about the accountability and transparency of our Office of Recovery and Reinvestment (ORR) efforts to date. In particular, the decision to retain an independent, third party firm to audit programs funded by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) has bolstered public confidence, ensured accurate reporting and driven accountability for state agencies as well as vendors.

Modeled on that highly successful effort, the Wisconsin Department of Administration (WDOA) and the WDPI, in consultation with the ORR, will contract with an independent accountability/auditing/consulting firm or firms to externally measure and report on at least an annual basis the State's and LEAs' progress toward and compliance with the conditions and goals outlined in the State's RTTT grant and LEAs' Final Work Plans. This will include ongoing, periodic qualitative reviews of each LEA to ensure that RTTT funds are being used in a manner consistent with the LEA Final Work Plan and quantitative reviews of performance data to indicate what the outcomes achieved. Reviews will be conducted systemically in a transparent, standardized, organized and repetitive manner. Additionally, the firm(s) may help OEII with developing any tools, processes or strategies necessary to ensure high accuracy data reporting and analysis.

Outside entities may also be utilized during in the 90-day period to ensure that the correct resources, capacity, and capabilities are leveraged by the OEII in this critical period in order to guarantee that the Final Work Plans are specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and time bound and in line with the RTTT ethos of ambitious yet achievable plans for implementing coherent, compelling, and comprehensive education reform.

	OUTSIDE ACCOUNTABILIT	Y / AUDIT / CONSULTING FIRM				
GOAL	KEY ACTIVITIES	TIMELINE	KEY PARTIES			
	• Draft RFP for service providers to assist with efforts to track and report LEA and State RTTT progress and implementation	• Within 72 hours of notice of award	 WDPI OEII Governor's Office DOA 			
Hire outside accountability/audit/ consulting firm or firms to externally measure and report on an annual basis the State's and LEAs' progress toward and compliance with the conditions and goals outlined in the State's RTTT grant and LEAs' Final Work Plans.	Post and distribute RFP per State procurement regulations	• Within 72 hours of notice of award	 WDPI OEII Governor's Office DOA 			
	• OEII, WDPI and Governor's Office select accountability contractor	• Year 1 (Q1)	 WDPI OEII Governor's Office DOA 			
	Contract Negotiations	• Year 1 (Q1)	 WDPI OEII Governor's Office DOA 			
	• Kickoff meeting with contractor, OEII, WDPI and Governor's office to finalize PMO Work Plan	• Year 1 (Q2)	 WDPI OEII Governor's Office Contractor 			
	Develop template and process to assist WDPI / OEII and LEAs in formulating and agreeing their detailed RTTT Final Work Plans	• Year 1 (Q2)	Contractor			
Assist WDPI / OEII and LEAs in formulating and agreeing RTTT Final Work Plans	Initiate meetings between WDPI / OEII, the Governor's Office and Participating LEAs to discuss and agree details regarding their RTTT Final Work Plans and the broader RTTT State plan	• Year 1 (Q2)	 Contractor WDPI / OEII Governor's Office LEAs 			
	Submission of Final Work Plans and associated detailing to ED	• Within 90 days of the grant award	WDPI LEAs			
Track and report LEA & State Progress towards RTTT goals, requirements, Final Work Plans and	Contractor monitoring progress of LEAs in attaining the goals and activities outlined in their detailed RTTT Final Work Plan	• Annually (Q4)	Contractor			

Table 23 - Implementation plan for external accountability provisions.

budget spend to date	• Contractor monitoring progress of the State in attaining the goals and activities as outlined in their RTTT State plan.	• Annually (Q4)	Contractor				
•	Contractor review of LEA and State RTTT fund spending	• Annually (Q4)	ContractorDOAOEII				
	 Contractor report to WDPI / OEII and the Governor's Office on its findings (results will also be published publically). 	• Annually (Q4)	• Contractor				
	• Contractor assists WDPI / OEII and the Governor's Office in developing a plan to address any potential issues that are identified during the review.	• Annually (Q4)	• OEII, WDPI and the Governor's Office, Contractor				

Table 24 - Timeline for external accountability provisions.

OUTSIDE ACCOUNTABILITY / AUDIT / CONSULTING FIRM																
KEY TASK	YEAR 1			YEAR 2			YEAR 3				YEAR 4					
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Draft RFP for service providers to assist with																
efforts to track and report LEA and State	•															
RTTT progress and implementation																
Post and distribute RFP per State																
procurement regulations	•															
OEII, WDPI and Governor's Office select																
accountability contractor	•															
Contract Negotiations	•															
Kickoff meeting with contractor, OEII,																
WDPI and Governor's office to finalize PMO	•															
Work Plan																
Develop template and process to assist WDPI																
/ OEII and LEAs in formulating and agreeing	•															
their detailed RTTT Final Work Plans																
Initiate meetings between WDPI / OEII, the																
Governor's Office and Participating LEAs to																
discuss and agree details regarding their	•	•														
RTTT Final Work Plans and the broader																
RTTT State plan																
Submission of Final Work Plans and		•	•													
associated detailing to ED		•	•													
Contractor monitoring progress of LEAs in			•	•			•	•			•	•			•	•

attaining the goals and activities outlined in their detailed RTTT Final Work Plan												
Contractor monitoring progress of the State in attaining the goals and activities as outlined in their RTTT State plan.		٠	٠		٠	٠		٠	٠		٠	٠
Contractor review of LEA and State RTTT fund spending				•			•			•		•
Contractor report to WDPI / OEII and the Governor's Office on its findings (results will also be published publically).				•			•			•		•
Contractor assists WDPI / OEII and the Governor's Office in developing a plan to address any potential issues that are identified during the review.				•			•			•		•

(A)(2)(i)(d) Using the funds for this grant, as described in the State's budget and accompanying budget narrative, to accomplish the State's plans and meet its targets, including where feasible, by coordinating, reallocating, or repurposing education funds from other Federal, State, and local sources so that they align with the State's Race to the Top goals; and

Alignment and use of funds for Race to the Top goals

The Governor and State Superintendent's education agenda has been focused on closing the achievement and graduation-rate gaps among students of color and white students, particularly in the Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS). To address this challenge, ongoing efforts and the State's Race to the Top plan have been aligned to ensure our children are served with consistent, high quality research-based interventions. Notably, Milwaukee's philanthropic community has been a pivotal partner in providing leadership and funding to establish the WINS (Milwaukee Children's Zone), a powerful public-private partnership modeled on the successful Harlem Children's Zone. Additionally, Wisconsin has aligned federally and state-funded efforts to turnaround struggling schools, which work in concert with the State's corrective action plan for MPS. Finally, federal funding for the State's longitudinal data system has been aligned with State Fiscal Stabilization Fund and Race to the Top requirements, while also incorporating new powerful student growth reports and data set to support LEA instructional improvement efforts.

(A)(2)(i)(e) Using the fiscal, political, and human capital resources of the State to continue, after the period of funding has ended, those reforms funded under the grant for which there is evidence of success; and

Sustaining reform efforts

The Governor and State Superintendent are committed to the sustainability of effective interventions. The State plan is designed to leverage national partnerships and expertise to expand the State's capacity to support key Race to the Top interventions, including: teacher and principal mentoring and coaching, instructional improvement based on data, high-quality standards and assessments, and the alignment of school improvement strategies and funding. Some resources, such as 4K, will be sustainable because of the current school finance formula that rolls 4K students into the per pupil funding after two years. However, additional funds will be needed in the future to support some interventions, such as school-based coaches. To that end, the State Superintendent is committed to including support in his 2013-15 biennial state budget for highly-effective Race to the Top interventions that reasonably cannot be sustained through the reallocation of local resources.

(A)(2)(ii) Use support from a broad group of stakeholders to better implement its plans, as evidenced by the strength of the statements or actions of support from—

(A)(2)(ii)(a) The State's teachers and principals, which include the State's teachers' unions or statewide teacher associations; and

(A)(2)(ii)(b) Other critical stakeholders, such as the State's legislative leadership; charter school authorizers and State charter school membership associations (if applicable); other State and local leaders (e.g., business, community, civil rights, and education association leaders); Tribal schools; parent, student, and community organizations (e.g., parent-teacher associations, nonprofit organizations, local education foundations, and community-based organizations); and institutions of higher education.

Significant, widespread stakeholder support

Organizations across the State of Wisconsin have submitted letters in support of Wisconsin's Race to the Top application. Thirty-seven letters of support were collected from a broad group of stakeholders, including tribal nations, statewide education associations, STEM leaders, business alliances and higher education groups. These letters demonstrate the high levels of commitment from stakeholders with vastly different interests, coming together in support of Wisconsin's statewide reform agenda in the four core reform areas. These letters also reflect the level of commitment among these stakeholders to helping further accelerate the pace of reform in Wisconsin over the next four years.

Throughout the process, the Governor's office and the WDPI have worked to involve a broad group of stakeholders in the State's Race to the Top initiative. WDPI has used a multi-tiered approach with various platforms to inform stakeholders statewide.

WDPI conducted extensive outreach to provide information to stakeholders across the state. First, the State Superintendent shared information about Race to the Top at the August 16, October 6, and December 8, 2009 Collaborative Council meetings. The Collaborative Council represents key stakeholder groups from across Wisconsin. In addition, WDPI has presented RTTT information throughout the state using teleconferencing and onsite meetings to inform districts, especially rural districts. For example, presentations on RTTT were held with Cooperative Educational Service Agencies from September to December. WDPI staff also presented information to stakeholders at statewide meetings such as the State Superintendent's Educational Data Advisory Council. Finally, Governor Doyle and State Superintendent hosted a December 11, 2009, webcast in which they provided information about RTTT and previewed the district MOU.

At the local level, WDPI staff spent considerable time reaching out to the districts through meetings with administrators. WDPI met with the state's largest urban districts in a series of meetings to define their needs and how Wisconsin's Race to the Top initiative could be used to address those needs. Governor Jim Doyle, State Superintendent Tony Evers, and Mayor Tom Barrett convened the Milwaukee Public Schools *Innovation and Improvement Advisory Council*, a formal group that has focused on identifying areas of concern and ways to improve the school district for all of Milwaukee public school students. The Innovation and Improvement Advisory Council had three

standing committees. The Invest in Success Committee focused specifically on Race to the Top and how Race to the Top could support innovative reform in MPS with a report to the Innovation and Improvement Advisory Council.

In addition, WDPI staff and the Governor's office met with representatives of various stakeholder groups. The State Superintendent hosted a number of meetings with representatives of the following educational associations: Association of School District Administrators, Wisconsin Association of School Boards, Wisconsin Association of School Business Officials, Wisconsin Association of School District Administrators, Wisconsin Council of Administrators of Special Services, Wisconsin Education Association Council, and others to talk specifically about various elements of the Race to the Top application. Their input was informative and helpful in designing critical components such as the MOU. In addition, WDPI staff met with members of the University of Wisconsin System. Finally, the Governor's staff met with members of the Wisconsin Charter School Association, Wisconsin Association of School Boards, Wisconsin Association of School District Administrators and the Wisconsin Education Association Council to discuss various questions about Race to the Top and the exciting work that is underway regarding charter schools in Wisconsin.

The State Superintendent will use the upcoming February meeting of the Collaborative Council as a forum for gathering advice and input regarding the shaping and content of the Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant Program. The meeting will also serve to gather suggestions regarding the type of guidance and support that districts will need to complete the Final Scope of Work. This will ensure that the State is well-positioned to begin the identified work in the four core reform areas upon notice of a grant award. The Collaborative Council is a long-standing group of key education stakeholder groups representing:

- (a) American Federation of Teachers-Wisconsin
- (b) Association of Wisconsin School Administrators
- (c) Cooperative Educational Service Agencies
- (d) University of Wisconsin System
- (e) Wisconsin Association for Supervision and Curriculum
- (f) Wisconsin Association of Independent Colleges and Universities

- (g) Wisconsin Association of School Boards
- (h) Wisconsin Association of School Business Officials
- (i) Wisconsin Association of School District Administrators
- (j) Wisconsin Council of Administrators of Special Services
- (k) Wisconsin Education Association Council.

Upon notice of the Race to the Top Grant award, the State Superintendent will appoint the Wisconsin Race to the Top Implementation Advisory Council. The Council will be derived from the existing Collaborative Council, plus State legislators, parents, charter school representatives, and other education stakeholder groups.

These representatives will advise the State Superintendent on the implementation of Wisconsin's Race to the Top initiatives, provide input on program evaluation, and act as a "critical friend." The Council will be a significant asset in the implementation of the State's RTTT plan as members possess a broad perspective of PK-20 educators who are committed to Wisconsin's students and schools, and bring an incredible knowledge base of Wisconsin's PK-20 educational system; thus strengthening the linkage between the State's goals of increasing high school graduation rates and college enrollment rates; and, most importantly, bringing resources which will leverage scale and sustainability for the core reform areas. Please refer to Appendix 11: Wisconsin Stakeholder Letters of Support for additional information.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps (30 points)

The extent to which the State has demonstrated its ability to-

(i) Make progress over the past several years in each of the four education reform areas, and used its ARRA and other Federal and State funding to pursue such reforms; (5 points)

(ii) Improve student outcomes overall and by student subgroup since at least 2003, and explain the connections between the data and the

actions that have contributed to — (25 points)

- (a) Increasing student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics, both on the NAEP and on the assessments required under the ESEA;
- (b) Decreasing achievement gaps between subgroups in reading/language arts and mathematics, both on the NAEP and on the assessments required under the ESEA; and
- (c) Increasing high school graduation rates.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (A)(3)(ii):

• NAEP and ESEA results since at least 2003. Include in the Appendix all the data requested in the criterion as a resource for peer reviewers for each year in which a test was given or data was collected. Note that this data will be used for reference only and can be in raw format. In the narrative, provide the analysis of this data and any tables or graphs that best support the narrative.

Recommended maximum response length: Six pages
(A)(3)(i) Make progress over the past several years in each of the four education reform areas, and used its ARRA and other Federal and State funding to pursue such reforms

Substantial reform progress to date

By utilizing a combination of federal and state resources, the State of Wisconsin has made significant progress in each of the four reform areas over the past several years, including:

1. Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy: Wisconsin will adopt the Common Core Standards for English Language Arts and the Common Core Standards for Mathematics. Prior to the national standards movement, Wisconsin worked with the American Diploma Project (ADP) and teams of state experts. Through work with this organization, the State took the first step toward international comparison. Wisconsin's standards design and writing teams have created an overarching framework that will now serve to link the Common Core Standards' core skills and core concepts by grade level to curriculum development, teachers' lesson planning and instructional delivery.

Wisconsin was the lead state in developing an English language proficiency exam that is now used by over 50% of states nationally. In 2008, Wisconsin developed an alternative assessment for children with disabilities that is being used as a model by the U.S. Department of Education in assisting other states in developing similar assessments.

Most recently, Wisconsin began a thorough examination of the state assessment system in September 2008. The Next Generation Assessment Task Force began with a review of best practices in other states and embraced the notion of creating a more balanced assessment system in Wisconsin. The Task Force, with representatives from businesses and PK-16 education, concluded that a balanced system of formative, benchmark, and summative assessments is necessary to inform classroom teachers, to hold schools accountable, and to effectively report back to parents, community leaders, and students. As a result of the work of the Task Force, Wisconsin has started developing a new state assessment system that provides a summative assessment and a series of formative and

benchmark assessments. These formative and benchmark assessments will provide for computer-based testing and results that can impact individual student instruction quickly. Wisconsin is actively involved in partnerships with other states in the development of high quality summative and benchmark assessments. Wisconsin is leading the Multiple Opportunities for Student Assessment and Instruction Consortium (MOSAIC), a consortium of 26 states developing benchmark assessments. In addition, our major public research university, the University of Wisconsin, is the national leader in developing value added growth models for analysis at district, school, and classroom levels for use in improving instruction and turning around struggling schools.

- 2. Building data systems that measure student growth and success as well as inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction: Wisconsin's state data system has been greatly expanded over the last five years and plans are underway to increase both its breadth and scope further. Over the last several years, Wisconsin has built a new system to collect data and to display data in more meaningful ways, allowing users to drill down into the data to for instructional decision making. The previously noted student growth reports and multidimensional analytic tool enable districts, even those with more limited data systems and expertise, to leverage the State's longitudinal data system (LDS) to provide powerful, easy to understand and use data to improve instructional efforts. Additionally, WDPI and the Madison Metropolitan School District have developed a powerful, open architecture Student Intervention Monitoring System (SIMS), which includes the capability for the Core Standards to be input and tied to instructional strategies and interventions. The system also tracks individual student progress, behavior and attendance, flagging negative results. SIMS is freely available to all districts, with professional development and training available through the CESAs. Finally, Wisconsin currently is expanding its PK-12 longitudinal data system to enable postsecondary data exchange, following passage of a recent State law (2009 Wisconsin Act 59).
- 3. <u>Recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most</u>: Over the last several years, Wisconsin has implemented a major license reform initiative, moving to a tiered licensing system for teachers, administrators, and pupil services personnel that focuses on preservice preparation, mentorship, and career-long professional development. This work has produced a strong partnership with education organizations and universities. The State recently adopted

legislation that allows for the use of student test data and other factors in teacher evaluation (2009 Wisconsin Act 60). In addition, Wisconsin has been involved in a multi-year partnership with the Wallace Foundation to strengthen the instructional leadership of principals in our five largest cities, including Milwaukee. Additionally, MPS has been working with national organizations to improve human capital, including Teach for America, New Leaders for New Schools, and the New Teachers Project.

4. <u>Turning around our lowest-performing schools</u>: Federal resources have extensively assisted the State in turning around struggling schools in Wisconsin. The State has prioritized federal and State aid, and services to struggling districts and schools. A Statewide System of Support (SSOS) was developed to provide technical assistance to districts with Title I schools identified for improvement (SIFI), Title I schools that have missed Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), and other Title I high priority schools. SSOS processes and tools are designed to enhance a district's ability to improve the effectiveness of its programs and strategies for providing support to low-performing schools. The system also includes tools and strategies to build capacity at the local level for district-focused school improvement.

MPS is now in its third year under federally-required corrective action and under State direction has restructured the district by creating nine School Support clusters. Each cluster is staffed by a school improvement supervisor. These supervisors are administrative positions. The supervisors provide school-level oversight to ensure implementation of all improvement strategies required under corrective action. Examples of improvement strategies currently required of Title I SIFI include: extended learning time in reading and mathematics K-8, reading intervention courses in all high schools, summer school, after school and/or before school tutoring by highly qualified teachers, and implementation of Response to Intervention (RtI). Two SIFI will be required to implement extended calendar in the 2010-11 school year. The school improvement supervisors also arrange for internal or external technical assistance to improve implementation of school Improvement. The school improvement supervisors work with SIFI principals and staff and Central Office personnel to review achievement data on a monthly basis to determine if the improvement efforts are resulting in improved student achievement.

In the fall of 2009, Wisconsin developed a statewide Response to Intervention (RtI) Center to provide training and support and further expand statewide RtI efforts. Currently in the implementation stage, the Center, through a Train-the-Trainers model, will empower teachers and educators to use systems change processes, data for instructional decision making, best practices in reading and mathematics, and best practices in social and emotional wellness programming.

In addition to other state and federal resources, school districts in Wisconsin have used ARRA funds to advance strategies that have been shown to make a critical contribution to student results, including: Adopting rigorous college- and career-ready standards and high-quality assessments; establishing data systems and using data for improvement; increasing teacher effectiveness and equitable distribution of effective teachers; turning around the lowest-performing schools; and improving results for all students, including early learning, extended learning time, use of technology, preparation for college, and school modernization.

Specifically, districts have implemented one or more of the following strategies:

Adopting rigorous college- and career-ready standards and high-quality assessments

- Develop common formative and benchmark assessments.
- Provide Title I services to eligible students in all grades and in additional subjects.
- Hire transition coaches to help graduating seniors with disabilities find employment or get post-secondary training.
- Implement an online Individualized Education Program (IEP) aligned with state academic standards that can be used by parents, teachers, and principals to create content-rich IEP's aligned to the general education curriculum.
- Use framework for 21st Century Skills to assess student readiness for career, college, and citizenship.
- Assess technological literacy of all students by 8th grade.

Establishing data systems and using data for improvement

- Add on to existing, online progress monitoring and assessment systems to track progress of at-risk students, students who receive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS) or Title I services.
- Implement data systems that track disciplinary referrals, support instruction, and improve school climate.

Increasing teacher effectiveness

- Establish intensive, year-long training on effective interventions for improving achievement in reading and mathematics.
- Provide training for instruction for early intervening services such as Response to Intervention (RtI) and Responsive Education for All Children (REACh) services.
- Provide professional development in Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PBIS).
- Establish a system for identifying and training highly effective teachers to serve as instructional leaders and modify the school schedule to allow for collaboration among the instructional staff.
- Provide professional development to teachers on the use of data to inform and improve instruction for students, particularly Title I students and students with disabilities.
- Provide professional development to teachers of students with disabilities on the appropriate use of assistive technology to enhance instruction.
- Provide professional development on culturally responsive classroom practices and/or district equity work.

Turning around the lowest-performing schools

- Implement a RtI model that provides support to students who are at-risk, evaluates how effectively students are progressing, and creates opportunities for collaboration among staff.
- Implement Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PBIS) and modify the school schedule to allow for collaboration among the instructional staff.
- Extend Title I services to support middle and high schools.

- Provide new opportunities for secondary school students to use high-quality, online courseware as supplemental learning materials for meeting mathematics and science requirements.
- Hire personnel, contract with CESAs, or contract with community programs to expand the provision of parent education and involvement.

	Wisconsin ARRA K-12 Education Funding Summary						
Program	ARRA funding amount	Comments					
1. Enhancing Education Through	Formula allocations to LEAs: \$4,344,532	Competitive grants were awarded to districts in November. The					
Technology (ESEA Title II, Part D)	Competitive grants to LEAs: \$4 344 532	focus for both portions of funding is to raise student achievement					
		through the use of technology and raise educator proficiency in					
		using technology as a tool within the classroom and in online					
		learning.					
2. Education for Homeless Children and	\$900,000 distributed to LEAs through a	24 LEAs received funding to ensure that each homeless child and					
Youth	competitive grant application process	youth has equal access to a free, appropriate public education,					
		including a public pre-school education.					
3. Individuals with Disabilities Education	IDEA flow-through: \$208,200,108	Funding distributed according to a formula established in IDEA to					
Act Part B, sections 611 flow-through	IDEA preschool: \$9,827,791	assist in providing special education and related services to children					
grants and 619 preschool grants		with disabilities to include children age 3 to 5.					
4. National School Lunch Program-	WI allocation: \$1,316,711, competitive	79 school districts, 28 private schools, 3 residential child care					
Equipment Grants	grant administered by WDPI	institutions, and 4 charter schools received funding in June 2009 to					
		assist in the purchase of equipment for School Food Authorities					
		(SFA) participating in the National School Lunch Program (NSLP).					
		Priority was given to SFAs in which at least 50% of the students					
		were eligible for free or reduced price meals					
5. State Fiscal Stabilization Fund	Education Fund: \$717.3 million (100%	\$552.3 million of SFSF was paid to school districts in June 2009					

Table 25 - Wisconsin ARRA K-12 Education Funding Summary.

	for K-12 education) Government Services Fund: \$159.6 million (\$71.7 million for K-12 education)	(\$480.6 million of the education fund and \$71.7 million of the government services fund) to support public elementary, secondary and post secondary education and, as applicable, early childhood education programs and services. SFSF funds were primarily used to pay for teacher salaries. \$236.7 million (the remaining 1/3) of the education fund will be paid to school districts in June 2010.
6. ESEA Title I, Part A	Total WI allocation: \$147,729,443 Title I formula grants: \$134,433,794	LEAs may not use Title I, Part A funds for activities that they would have carried out in the absence of Title I, Part A funds. Funds are used to improve teaching and learning for students most at risk of failing to meet state academic achievement standards.
7. Qualified School Construction Bonds (QSCBs)	MPS: \$72,118,000 Balance of State: \$98,589,000	Provides tax credits in lieu of interest to lenders who issue bonds to eligible districts. 42 districts in addition to MPS received QSCB authorizations.
8. Qualified Zone Academy Bonds (QZABs)	\$26,874,000	15 districts received QZAB authorizations.

(A)(3)(ii) Improve student outcomes overall and by student subgroup since at least 2003, and explain the connections between the data and the actions that have contributed

(A)(3)(ii)(a) Increasing student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics, both on the NAEP and on the assessments required under the ESEA;

(A)(3)(ii)(b) Decreasing achievement gaps between subgroups in reading/language arts and mathematics, both on the NAEP and on the assessments required under the ESEA; and

Wisconsin has set and maintained high levels of student achievement in both reading and mathematics. Wisconsin students as a whole have scored above the national average on the reading and mathematics portions of NAEP since 2003, with a difference of 3 to 8 percent between Wisconsin and national public schools. Wisconsin does well not only on the nationally-normed NAEP, but also on state measures of student achievement. More than 81% of students have scored proficient or advanced on the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examination (WKCE) reading portion since the 2005-06 school year, and 74% or more of all students have scored proficient or advanced on the mathematics portion of the WKCE in the same period.

While students in Wisconsin overall are achieving at high levels, the State also acknowledges that not all subgroups show equally high levels of achievement, and we have identified specific subgroups that may benefit from targeted interventions. Of the ESEA subgroups, the following show lower academic achievement than all students as a whole: Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, Economically Disadvantaged, Black, and Hispanic. See Table 1 and Table 2 for details of Wisconsin students' academic achievement on the WKCE and Table 3 and Table 4 for similar details on the NAEP.

School Year	All Students	Students with Disabilities	English Language Learners	Economically Disadvantaged	Black	Hispanic
2005-06	81.70%	46.60%	53.40%	66.70%	55.00%	65.00%
2006-07	82.10%	47.90%	53.20%	67.30%	57.40%	63.70%
2007-08	81.90%	47.40%	54.70%	67.30%	56.50%	64.70%
2008-09	81.40%	46.40%	53.70%	67.10%	56.90%	64.80%

Table 26 - Percent of WI students scoring proficient and advanced on the reading WKCE.

School Year	All Students	Students with Disabilities	English Language Learners	Economically Disadvantaged	Black	Hispanic
2005-06	72.80%	39.20%	50.10%	53.50%	35.70%	53.20%
2006-07	75.10%	42.80%	53.90%	57.00%	39.60%	56.50%
2007-08	74.70%	42.00%	52.50%	56.80%	39.70%	55.70%
2008-09	76.70%	44.40%	55.40%	60.40%	44.40%	59.90%

Table 27 - Percent of WI students scoring proficient and advanced on the mathematics WKCE.

Table 28 - Percent of WI students scoring proficient and above on the reading NAEP. * Indicates reporting standards were not met.

Grade	School Year	All Students	Students with Disabilities	English Language Learners	Economically Disadvantaged	Black	Hispanic
4	2002-03	33%	7%	10%	18%	13%	20%
	2004-05	33%	9%	14%	16%	10%	20%
	2006-07	36%	14%	10%	18%	11%	17%
8	2002-03	37%	4%	*	17%	8%	17%
	2004-05	35%	6%	*	19%	9%	18%
	2006-07	33%	3%	11%	16%	8%	17%

Grade	School Year	All Students	Students with	English	Economically	Black	Hispanic
			Disabilities	Language	Disadvantaged		
				Learners			
4	2002-03	35%	9%	10%	17%	8%	13%
	2004-05	40%	17%	19%	19%	7%	16%
	2006-07	47%	21%	22%	25%	10%	27%
	2008-09	45%	18%	15%	24%	11%	22%
8	2002-03	35%	7%	*	12%	5%	16%
	2004-05	36%	9%	19%	15%	5%	16%
	2006-07	37%	8%	12%	18%	6%	18%
	2008-09	39%	10%	9%	20%	11%	20%

Table 29 - Percent of WI students scoring proficient and above on the mathematics NAEP. * Indicates reporting standards were not met.

Wisconsin's largest district). From the 2005-06 to the 2008-09 school year, the percent of all students in Wisconsin scoring proficient and advanced on the WKCE went from 72.8% to 76.7%, while from 2002-03 to 2008-09 the percent of students proficient and above on NAEP went from 35% to 45% (4th grade) and from 35% to 39% (8th grade). The gains in mathematics achievement are especially noticeable and notable in MPS, where representative gains in mathematics achievement on the WKCE from 2005-06 to 2008-09 include 9.2% for Black students and 9.6% for Hispanic students. If we exclude MPS data from the statewide results, we find that the gains in mathematics achievement are largely driven by the gains in MPS. For example, the statewide gain for mathematics from 2005-06 to 2008-09 excluding MPS data is 2.9%, compared to 3.9% when MPS is included.

Recent improvements in MPS mathematics scores can be attributed to a district-wide program instituted in 2008 that has focused specifically on supporting mathematics instruction through intensive professional development and a pool of mathematics coaches that

works directly with classroom teachers. This professional development utilizes evidence-based "best practices" with its focus on in-classroom, ongoing coaching for math teachers. While we cannot make causal inferences about effects from observational data, it is worth noting that since the program's inception, there have been notable improvements in math achievement, as well as a reduction of racial achievement gaps. For example, between the 2007-08 and 2008-09 school years, the percentage of proficient 4th graders increased from 50% to 59%. Moreover, the Black-white gap in 4th grade math achievement shrunk from 31 to 29 percentage points, while the Hispanics-whites gap shrunk from 20 to 17 percentage points. Meanwhile, the percentage of proficient 8th graders increased from 38% to 48%, while the Black-white gap for 8th graders shrunk from 38 to 29 percentage points and the Hispanic-white gap shrunk from 22 to 14 percentage points.

Additionally, MPS' commitment to improvement is reflected in their participation in the 2009 Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA) for NAEP. As a baseline measurement, MPS' TUDA results for all students are 15% at or above proficient in grade 4 and 7% at or above proficient in grade 8.

While Wisconsin has been making steady, and in some cases substantial, gains in reading and mathematics achievement for all students and subgroups, there remains significant achievement gaps between subgroups. Reducing these achievement gaps is a top priority for the State and there is some evidence current programs have been making some headway in reducing these gaps. Achievement gaps in reading and mathematics are particularly evident between the Black (Not of Hispanic Origin) and White (Not of Hispanic Origin) subgroups and between the Economically Disadvantaged and Not Economically Disadvantaged subgroups. In many cases, these gaps are decreasing, especially in mathematics where the Black-White achievement gap has narrowed by 5.5 percentage points in four years. A similar trend is evident in the NAEP results, where we see a slight decrease in the Black-White mathematics achievement gap from 2003 to 2009.

The following tables show the progress Wisconsin has made on narrowing the achievement gaps:

Table 30 - Mathematics Racial/Ethnicity achievement gap, all grades combined. Data are percent of students scoring proficient and advanced on the WKCE or Wisconsin Alternate Assessment (WAA). Note: The Gap Change from 2005-06 to 2008-09 refers to the change in the achievement gap between white students and students from other racial/ethnic groups. A negative number indicates a gap reduction.

School Year	White	American Indian	Asian	Black	Hispanic
2005-06	80.0	57.7	69.3	35.7	53.2
2006-07	82.1	61.9	72.3	39.6	56.5
2007-08	81.7	61.5	73.5	39.7	55.7
2008-09	83.2	62.4	76.2	44.4	59.9
Gap Change from 2005-06 to 2008-09	Reference	-1.5	-3.7	-5.5	-3.5

Table 31 - Reading Racial/Ethnicity achievement gap, all grades combined. Data are percent of students scoring proficient and advanced on the WKCE or WAA. Note: The Gap Change from 2005-06 to 2008-09 refers to the change in the achievement gap between white students and students from other racial/ethnic groups. A negative number indicates a gap reduction.

		American			
School Year	White	Indian	Asian	Black	Hispanic
2005-06	87.3	72.9	72.1	55.0	65.0
2006-07	87.7	73.1	72.1	57.4	63.7
2007-08	87.6	73.2	73.8	56.5	64.7
2008-09	86.9	70.9	73.9	56.9	64.8
Gap Change from 2005-06 to 2008-09	Reference	1.6	-2.2	-2.3	-0.2

Table 32 - Mathematics Economically Disadvantaged achievement gap, all grades combined. Data are percent of students scoring proficient and advanced on the WKCE or WAA. Note: The Gap Change from 2005-06 to 2008-09 refers to the change in the achievement gap between students not economically disadvantaged and economically disadvantaged students. A negative number indicates a gap reduction.

School Year	Not Disadvantaged	Economically Disadvantaged
2005-06	81.5	53.5
2006-07	83.8	57.0
2007-08	83.5	56.8
2008-09	85.4	60.4
Gap Change from 2005-06 to 2008-09	Reference	-3.0

Table 33 - Reading Economically Disadvantaged achievement gap, all grades combined. Data are percent of students scoring proficient and advanced on the WKCE or WAA. Note: The Gap Change from 2005-06 to 2008-09 refers to the change in the achievement gap between students not economically disadvantaged and economically disadvantaged students. A negative number indicates a gap reduction.

School Year	Not Disadvantaged	Economically Disadvantaged
2005-06	88.4	66.7
2006-07	89.1	67.3
2007-08	89.1	67.3
2008-09	88.9	67.1
Gap Change from 2005-06 to 2008-09	Reference	0.1



Figure 2 - NAEP mathematics results for Black and White students in Wisconsin and the nation.

(A)(3)(ii)(c) Increasing high school graduation rates

Increases in high school graduation

Increasing high school graduation rates is also a top priority for Wisconsin and is a cornerstone of State Superintendent Evers' *Every Child a Graduate* initiative (please refer to Appendix 9). The State recognizes that not all subgroups have equal graduation rates and we seek to address this issue.

Wisconsin is currently planning a Graduation Summit, which will focus on strategies to increase graduation rates. The target audience includes the districts which have the lowest graduation rates. These districts have been strongly urged to attend with a team of individuals so that conversations and planning can continue well beyond the day of the Summit.

	American Indian	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White
2000-01	73.1%	88.6%	55.2%	70.5%	94.2%
2001-02	76.8%	91.1%	59.9%	75.0%	94.6%
2002-03	78.5%	91.4%	62.9%	76.2%	95.2%
2003-04	79.4%	92.2%	65.7%	77.1%	94.7%
2004-05	70.4%	88.5%	62.9%	72.4%	92.6%
2005-06	74.6%	89.3%	65.0%	76.2%	92.9%
2006-07	74.8%	91.0%	68.0%	75.4%	93.0%
2007-08	74.9%	89.6%	66.6%	74.9%	92.9%

Table 34 - Wisconsin High School Graduation Rate, by subgroup

(B) Standards and Assessments (70 total points)

State Reform Conditions Criteria

(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards (40 points)

The extent to which the State has demonstrated its commitment to adopting a common set of high-quality standards, evidenced by (as set forth in Appendix B)—

(i) The State's participation in a consortium of States that—(20 points)

- (a) Is working toward jointly developing and adopting a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) that are supported by evidence that they are internationally benchmarked and build toward college and career readiness by the time of high school graduation; and
- (b) Includes a significant number of States; and

(ii) — (20 points)

- (a) For Phase 1 applications, the State's high-quality plan demonstrating its commitment to and progress toward adopting a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) by August 2, 2010, or, at a minimum, by a later date in 2010 specified by the State, and to implementing the standards thereafter in a well-planned way; or
- (b) For Phase 2 applications, the State's adoption of a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) by August 2, 2010, or, at a minimum, by a later date in 2010 specified by the State in a high-quality plan toward which the State has made significant progress, and its commitment to implementing the standards thereafter in a well-planned way.¹⁰

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For

¹⁰ Phase 2 applicants addressing selection criterion (B)(1)(ii) may amend their June 1, 2010 application submission through August 2, 2010 by submitting evidence of adopting common standards after June 1, 2010.

attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (B)(1)(i):

- A copy of the Memorandum of Agreement, executed by the State, showing that it is part of a standards consortium.
- A copy of the final standards or, if the standards are not yet final, a copy of the draft standards and anticipated date for completing the standards.
- Documentation that the standards are or will be internationally benchmarked and that, when well-implemented, will help to ensure that students are prepared for college and careers.
- The number of States participating in the standards consortium and the list of these States.

Evidence for (B)(1)(ii):

For Phase 1 applicants:

• A description of the legal process in the State for adopting standards, and the State's plan, current progress, and timeframe for adoption.

For Phase 2 applicants:

• Evidence that the State has adopted the standards. Or, if the State has not yet adopted the standards, a description of the legal process in the State for adopting standards and the State's plan, current progress, and timeframe for adoption.

Recommended maximum response length: Two pages

(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards

The extent to which the State has demonstrated its commitment to adopting a common set of high-quality standards, evidenced by (as set forth in Appendix B)—

(B)(1)(i) The State's participation in a consortium of States that—

(B)(1)(i)(a) Is working toward jointly developing and adopting a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) that are supported by evidence that they are internationally benchmarked and build toward college and career readiness by the time of high school graduation; and

(B)(1)(i)(b) Includes a significant number of States; and

Adopt the Common Core Standards in English language arts and mathematics.

Wisconsin's State Superintendent signed a Memorandum of Agreement with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and the National Governors Association (NGA) in April 2009 (refer to Appendix 12 - Signed Common Core Standards MOA), to commit to the Common Core Standards Initiative. The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) reviewed draft documents and provided feedback to the Common Core Standards writing teams during the development period. The comments were based on Wisconsin's experience and knowledge gained through a two-year project to revise State standards in English language arts and mathematics. This project began prior to the national initiative on Common Core Standards. WDPI has connected the State's process and timeline for revising standards to the Common Core initiative (most current public drafts attached as Appendix 13 - draft standards of the Common Core College and Career Readiness Standards for English language arts and mathematics), and is ready to fully adopt the Common Core Standards when they are released.

Wisconsin standards are internationally benchmarked and will ensure students are prepared for college and careers

<u>Internationally Benchmarked</u>: The Common Core Standards Initiative has reviewed the language arts curriculum documents in place in Australia (Victoria), Canada (Alberta, British Columbia, Ontario), England, Finland, Hong Kong, Ireland, and Singapore. The Initiative has reviewed the mathematics curriculum documents in place in Canada (Alberta), Belgium, China, Chinese Taipei, England, Finland, Hong Kong, India, Ireland, Japan, Korea, and Singapore. This comparison shaped the specific level of rigor of the standards.

Through the standards revision project which began prior to the Common Core Initiative, Wisconsin worked with both the American Diploma Project (ADP) and the Partnership for 21st Century Skills (P21) to ensure that the standards revisions would stand up to international comparison. Working with ADP and P21 prepared Wisconsin to be ready for the Core Standards Initiative.

<u>College-ready</u>: In partnership with all of Wisconsin's postsecondary institutions, through the collaboration of the Wisconsin Technical College System, the University of Wisconsin System, and the Wisconsin Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, WDPI has convened faculty in mathematics to identify the common competencies that represent what students need to know and be able to do in order to enter the first credit-bearing college coursework in any of Wisconsin's postsecondary institutions. Once the Common Core Standards are finalized, the common competencies in mathematics will be used to identify the same competencies in the Common Core document. WDPI will lead a similar process to identify the common competencies in English language arts. These documents will make transparent to students, parents, and teachers what students need in English language arts and mathematics to avoid being placed in remedial (developmental) courses on entering any Wisconsin postsecondary institutions.

<u>Career-ready</u>: To ensure that Wisconsin's standards can be identified as career-ready, WDPI will convene regional economic workforce development groups (from existing regional partnerships) to revise Wisconsin's Employability Skills competencies, to guarantee they reflect contemporary workforce needs and connect with the Common Core Standards in English language arts and mathematics. In selected districts, Wisconsin will pilot the Employability Skills competencies and the process of including employers' feedback in order to evaluate and refine the instrument's ability to provide evidence of students' preparation in English language arts and mathematics.

Evidence

The following are the 48 states and 3 territories involved in the Common Core Standards Initiative: Alabama; Arizona; Arkansas; California; Colorado; Connecticut; Delaware; District of Columbia; Florida; Georgia; Hawaii; Idaho; Illinois; Indiana; Iowa; Kansas; Kentucky; Louisiana; Maine; Maryland; Massachusetts; Michigan; Minnesota; Mississippi; Missouri; Montana; Nebraska; Nevada; New Hampshire; New Jersey; New Mexico; New York; North Carolina; North Dakota; Ohio; Oklahoma; Oregon; Pennsylvania; Puerto Rico; Rhode Island; South Carolina; South Dakota; Tennessee; Utah; Vermont; Virgin Islands; Virginia; Washington; West Virginia; Wisconsin; Wyoming.

(B)(1)(ii)(a) For Phase 1 applications, the State's high-quality plan demonstrating its commitment to and progress toward adopting a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) by August 2, 2010, or, at a minimum, by a later date in 2010 specified by the State, and to implementing the standards thereafter in a well-planned way; or

The State's plan, current progress, and timeframe for adoption:

Under Article X, section 1 of the Wisconsin Constitution, the supervision of public instruction is vested in the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Under Wis. Stat. § 115.28(10), the State Superintendent of Public Instruction must "develop an educational assessment program to measure objectively the adequacy and efficiency of educational programs offered by public schools in this state. The program shall include methods by which pupil achievement in reading, mathematics, writing, science, social science and other areas of instruction commonly offered by public schools will be measured each year." The assessment system is based upon and aligned with academic standards. The power and duty to establish those academic standards is necessarily implied to permit the State Superintendent to carry out his constitutional and statutory duties. Those academic standards in turn form the basis for the curriculum required in each public school district. The State Superintendent convenes task forces to develop academic standards, representing the balance of several indicators. The State Superintendent consults with the Wisconsin legislature's education committees and the Office of the Governor. Following this process, the State Superintendent officially adopts the academic standards.

Wisconsin is primed to adopt the Common Core Standards in English language arts and mathematics by July 2010.

Prior to the national standards movement, the WDPI began the revision of State standards in English language arts and mathematics by joining the American Diploma Project and the Partnership for 21st Century Skills in January 2007. In March 2007, WDPI convened a summit on education attended by 200 representatives of business, industry, labor, city and county government, State workforce development entities, and community-based organizations. The consensus was to embed in each subject area skills essential for 21st century citizens, such as critical thinking and problem solving, collaborative communication skills, contextual learning skills, responsibility, ethics, and adaptability.

In May 2007, Standards Design Teams of K-16 educators were convened for English language arts and mathematics. The teams conducted the alignment process through the American Diploma Project while simultaneously soliciting feedback from the Partnership for 21st Century Skills. In addition, a statewide Standards Leadership Team was convened, augmenting the State Superintendent's Collaborative Council with additional business and parent representatives. The Leadership Team provided a policy perspective, responding to issues raised by the American Diploma Project, Partnership for 21st Century Skills, and the standards design teams. The State Superintendent received the recommendations for revising the Wisconsin standards in June 2008, providing a blueprint for developing specific draft revisions combining rigor and relevance. Standards Writing Teams were convened in November 2008. Two rounds of input and broad review led to the revisions, which completed the official alignment process through the American Diploma Project.

Wisconsin involved the standards writing teams in review of the draft Common Core Standards (K-12) and the College and Career Readiness Standards. Wisconsin is ready to adopt the Common Core Standards by July 2010.

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments (10 points)

The extent to which the State has demonstrated its commitment to improving the quality of its assessments, evidenced by (as set forth in Appendix B) the State's participation in a consortium of States that—

(i) Is working toward jointly developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments (as defined in this notice) aligned with the consortium's common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice); and

(ii) Includes a significant number of States.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (B)(2):

- A copy of the Memorandum of Agreement, executed by the State, showing that it is part of a consortium that intends to develop high-quality assessments (as defined in this notice) aligned with the consortium's common set of K-12 standards; or documentation that the State's consortium has applied, or intends to apply, for a grant through the separate Race to the Top Assessment Program (to be described in a subsequent notice); or other evidence of the State's plan to develop and adopt common, high-quality assessments (as defined in this notice).
- The number of States participating in the assessment consortium and the list of these States.

Recommended maximum response length: One page

(B)(2): Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments

The extent to which the State has demonstrated its commitment to improving the quality of its assessments, evidenced by (as set forth in Appendix B) the State's participation in a consortium of States that—

- (i) Is working toward jointly developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments (as defined in this notice) aligned with the consortium's common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice);
- (ii) Includes a significant number of States.

Participate in the Multiple Options for Student Assessment and Instruction Consortium (MOSAIC), a multi-state consortium to develop and disseminate formative, diagnostic, and benchmark assessments for district use to gauge student progress on the Common Core Standards throughout the school year.

Wisconsin began a thorough examination of the state assessment system in September 2008. The Next Generation Assessment Task Force began with a review of best practices in other states and embraced the notion of creating a more balanced assessment system. The task force with representatives from business and PK-16 education concluded that a balanced system of formative, benchmark, and summative assessment is necessary to inform classroom teachers, to hold schools accountable, and to effectively report back to parents, community leaders, and students (see full task force report in Appendix 14). In response, the WDPI began discussion with other states to implement the task force recommendations. Wisconsin and Nebraska have taken the lead in developing the Multiple Options for Student Assessment and Instruction Consortium (MOSAIC), a 26-state consortium focused on development and sharing of instructional support materials, common curriculum, and shared benchmark assessments. (Please see Appendix 15 for a copy of the MOSAIC MOU as well as a list of the 26 state participants).

The states in MOSAIC fully intend to integrate MOSAIC into a comprehensive nationwide balanced assessment system. This integration will occur through the participation of Wisconsin and many of the other MOSAIC states in the Summative Multi-State Assessment Resources for Teachers and Educational Researchers (SMARTER) and Balanced Assessment Consortia. As a lead state for both MOSAIC

and SMARTER, Wisconsin is poised to develop one seamless system of assessment with one summative assessment shared across states. The goal is to build a curriculum and assessment system that provides students, educators, and parents with ongoing information about student progress on the Common Core Standards, and that provides meaningful ways for students to demonstrate application of their knowledge and skills through performance tasks, computer-based assessment scenarios, and other strategies that allow for rich demonstration of learning.

For additional information on the various assessment consortia Wisconsin is participating in, please refer to the following Appendices:

Appendix 15 - MOSAIC Consortium MOU and State Participants Appendix 16 - SMARTER Consortium MOU and Participant Summary Appendix 17 - Balanced Assessment Consortium MOU and Participant Summary Appendix 18 - PALS Balanced Assessment list of participating states Appendix 19 - ACHIEVE MOU Common Assessment Principles

A key element in the development of the assessment system is teacher involvement to build their assessment literacy. Teachers will need to learn formative assessment processes, how to use them, and how to use the data collected from those processes. Teacher involvement in the development of assessment items and tasks will deepen their understanding of the Common Core Standards and of effective means to evaluate student progress toward achieving the standards.

MOSAIC will develop a common item bank used to generate common benchmark tests across the consortium. The items and tasks will be stored in a software platform that will support both computer scored items and teacher scored tasks. The software will support the administration of adaptive tasks so that students will be able to participate at the appropriate level. Through adaptive testing, appropriate diagnosis can occur pinpointing "where students are" in their mastery level of the Common Core Standards. Each state will contribute formative/local assessment tasks, items, and instructional materials including performance assessments aligned with the Common Core. Participating states will agree to standardized administration of these common assessments on a quarterly basis, with shared agreement on

performance expectations. Within the consortium, student-, building-, and district-level reports of student performance on the Common Core will be generated. Emphasis will be placed upon growth and improvement throughout a school year.

This alignment of standards work will be conducted in parallel with the development of best practices in STEM fields and provide educators with a more focused, research-driven curricula to reach students.

FORMATIVE / BENCHMARK ASSESSMENT						
GOAL	KEY ACTIVITIES	TIMELINE	KEY PARTIES			
Identify key yendors and	Work with MOSAIC state representatives to define critical requirements for assessment system.	• Year 1(Q2) - April	WDPIMOSAIC state partners			
research centers to coordinate MOSAIC assessment item	Draft a Request for Proposals that defines vendor requirements	• Year 1(Q2) - May	WDPIMOSAIC state partners			
bank, assessment development process, and	Solicit vendor bids	• Year 1(Q2) - June	WDPI MOSAIC state partners			
technology platform for sharing assessment resources	• Select vendor(s)	• Year 1(Q3) - July	WDPI MOSAIC state partners			
across states.	• Begin working with vendor(s) to clarify critical requirements and expectations/timelines.	• Year 1(Q4) - September	WDPI MOSAIC state partners			
Develop computer-based platform for assessment components: item bank format, open-source code, technology requirements	• Develop definitions/components for banking assessment items	• Year 1(Q4) - November	WDPIMOSAIC state partners			
	Define open-source code for shared common platform	• Year 1(Q4) - December	WDPIMOSAIC state partners			
Develop formative assessment strategies embedded in model units of instruction around the Common Core Standards	Using established regional Professional Learning Communities and lesson study, develop classroom assessment strategies to gauge student progress that are embedded in instructional units: quarterly three-day regional meetings	• Year 1(Q4) – Year 4	LEA vertical teamsWDPI			
Develop performance assessment tasks, scoring rubrics, and student exemplars representing points along the learning progression	Using established regional Professional Learning Communities and lesson study, develop performance tasks and related components via quarterly three-day regional meetings	• Year 2 (Q3) – Year 4	 LEA regional vertical teams WDPI 			
Provide in-depth summer	 Develop process to identify institute 	• Year 1 (Q3)	• WDPI			

Table 35 – Implementation plan for formative and benchmark assessments.

			-
institutes to facilitate	participants		• LEAs
development of benchmark assessment item bank,	• Work with higher education to integrate	• Year 1 (Q3 – Q4)	• WDPI
	institute into credit-bearing graduate		Wisconsin Universities/Colleges
aligned to Common Core	course work as an option for participants		
Standards.	Work with MOSAIC consortium states	• Year 1 (Q3 – Q4)	MOSAIC partner states
	to collaborate on and define		• WDPI
	requirements for approval of assessment		LEA representatives
	items/modules for multi-state sharing.		
	• Provide two five-day summer institutes	• Year 2 (Q2 - Q3)	• WDPI
	focusing on item/module development	• Continue annually through Year 4 (Q4)	LEA selected staff
	with a focus on student demonstration of		MOSAIC contracted vendor
	skills via computer-delivered		
	Work with MOSAIC concertium states	• $V_{00} = 1 (02) = V_{00} = 2 (01)$	• WDDI
	work with MOSAIC consolution states to develop web component for multi	• $fear 1 (Q2) - fear 2 (Q1)$	WDPI MOSAIC portport states
	state sharing of formative assessment		 MOSAIC partner states MOSAIC contracted vendor
	components.		MOSAIC contracted vendor
	Pilot the use of MOSAIC assessment	• Year $2(02) - $ Year $2(04)$	• WDPI
	resources with selected district, gather		Selected LEAs
	feedback and modify as needed		MOSAIC partner states
Provide educators with a			MOSAIC contracted vendor
web-based bank of formative	Provide access to MOSAIC instructional	• Year 3 (Q2)	• WDPI
assessment components for	resources state-wide		MOSAIC partner states
use with classroom			MOSAIC contracted vendor
instructional units designed	Provide ongoing professional	• Year 2 – Year 4	• WDPI
Standards	development on use of MOSAIC		MOSAIC partner states
Standards.	assessment resources, via web-based		MOSAIC contracted vendor
	modules and other venues		RtI Centers
	Continue to add resources to MOSAIC	• Year 2 – Year 4	• WDPI
	assessment components, building a		Selected LEAs
	flexible bank of classroom assessment		MOSAIC partner states
	tasks across MOSAIC states		MOSAIC contracted vendor
	Using items from summer institute	• Year 3 – Year 4	• WDPI
	development and from MOSAIC state		Selected LEA staff
Develop online, adaptive	item bank contributions, develop		MOSAIC partner states
defined quarterly benchmark	quarterly benchmark assessments		MOSAIC contracted vendor
assessments – gauging	gauging progress on defined learning		
progress on Common Core	content area (reading/mathematics)		
Stanualus	Define report formats that facilitate	• Vear 3	• WDPI
	documentation of student growth over		Selected L FA staff
			Selected EEA Stuff

	time, with teacher- and parent-friendly feedback on next steps to move a student to the next level of learning		MOSAIC partner statesMOSAIC contracted vendor
	• Pilot assessments in selected districts and grade levels, integrate feedback into assessments	• Year 4 (Q1)	 Selected LEAs WDPI MOSAIC partner states MOSAIC contracted vendor
	• Set standard for performance expectations consistent in definition across all participating MOSAIC states	• Year 4 (Q2)	 LEAs WDPI MOSAIC partner states MOSAIC contracted vendor
	• Assessments available statewide and to other MOSAIC states	• Year 4 (Q3)	 LEAs WDPI MOSAIC partner states MOSAIC contracted vendor
Provide ongoing professional development on use of MOSAIC benchmark assessments, via web-based modules and other venues	Provide ongoing support	• Year 4	 WDPI Selected LEAs MOSAIC partner states MOSAIC contracted vendor

Educational Consultants at WDPI will provide the overall organization for the formative/benchmark assessment system key activities, under the direction of the Assistant Director and Director of Educational Accountability. These staff will divide oversight responsibilities by content area and grade-level, collectively developing a broad bank of classroom assessment resource materials K-12, and defined benchmark assessments in grades 3-8 and high school, in both mathematics and reading/language arts. Consultants will work with regional CESA staff and LEAs, and will collaborate with other MOSAIC states to assure that assessment materials developed across states fit with defined learning progressions and meet the same high quality standards.

MOSAIC will contract with vendors to provide the computer platform, and to provide expertise in assessment development, computer-based assessment delivery, and to support regional workshops and summer institutes.

Activities will build on the known successful model of professional learning communities and lesson study, with ongoing learning groups learning and sharing across districts within each state region. Extended learning opportunities during the summer will complement the

regional work during the school year and provide opportunities for university credit and completion of Professional Development Plans (PDPs) for license renewal. Workshops and summer institutes will integrate curriculum and assessment work, while allowing opportunities for educators to participate in the components that fit best with their professional expertise.

By the end of the grant period, a significant body of assessment materials will be available to Wisconsin educators, and to other participating MOSAIC states. States will continue to add resources; although the pace may decrease somewhat once a strong base is built into the system.

FORMATIVE / BENCHMARK ASSESSMENT																
KEY TASK	YEAR 1				YEAR 2				YEAR 3				YE/	AR 4		
	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Work with MOSAIC state representatives to define critical requirements		•														
Draft a Request for Proposals that defines vendor requirements		•														
Solicit vendor bids		•														
Select vendor(s)			•													
Begin working with vendor(s) to clarify critical requirements and expectations/timelines.				•												
Develop definitions/components for banking assessment items				•												
Define open-source code for shared common platform				•												
Use established regional Professional Learning Communities and lesson study, to develop																
classroom assessment strategies to gauge student progress that are embedded in				•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
instructional units: quarterly 3-day regional meetings																
Use established regional Professional Learning Communities and lesson study, to develop																
performance tasks and related components via quarterly 3-day regional meetings							•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Develop process to identify institute participants			•													
Work with higher education to integrate institute into credit-bearing graduate course work																
as an option for participants			•	•												
Work with MOSAIC consortium states to collaborate on and define requirements for																
approval of assessment items/modules for multi-state sharing			•	•												
Provide two five-day summer institutes focusing on item/module development with a focus																
on student demonstration of skills via computer-delivered assessments						•	•					•				•
Work with MOSAIC consortium states to develop web component for multi-state sharing		•														
of formative assessment components		•	•	•	•								<u> </u>	L		<u> </u>
Pilot the use of MOSAIC assessment resources with selected district, gather feedback and																
modify as needed		<u> </u>			•	•	•			L			<u> </u>	\square		L
Provide access to MOSAIC instructional resources state-wide									1	•	•		1			1

Table 36 – Timeline for formative and benchmark assessment process.

Provide ongoing professional development on use of MOSAIC assessment resources, via			٠			•			•		•			
web-based modules and other venues			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Continue to add resources to MOSAIC assessment components, building a flexible bank of														
classroom assessment tasks across MOSAIC states			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Use items from summer institute development and from MOSAIC state item bank														
contributions, to develop quarterly benchmark assessments gauging progress on defined							•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
learning progression within each grade level and content area (reading/mathematics)														
Define report formats that facilitate documentation of student growth over time, with														
teacher- and parent-friendly feedback on next steps to move a student to the next level of							•	•	•	•				
learning														
Pilot assessments in selected districts and grade levels, integrate feedback into assessments											•			
Set standard for performance expectations consistent in definition across all participating														
MOSAIC states												•		
Make assessments available statewide and to other MOSAIC states													•	
Provide ongoing support											•	•	•	•

Table 37 – Summary of Wisconsin standards and assessment reform plan.

Wisconsin Standards and Assessment Reform Plan - Summary									
Component	From	То							
Content Standards	• Wisconsin standards defined at grades 4, 8 and 12 only	Common Core defined with grade-level specificity							
Curriculum Support	State general curriculum planning guides	Specific learning progressions defined							
	• Districts plan own curriculum based on state standards	• Electronic bank of model units of instruction provided							
		• Electronic bank of exemplars of student work							
Formative Assessment Strategies	None provided	• Embedded into electronic bank of instructional units							
Benchmark/Diagnostic Tests	None provided	Electronic diagnostic/benchmark tests aligned to							
		common core for use during the year							
Summative Tests	• 3-8 and 10	• Via separate summative consortia participation, will							
	• Fall testing	work toward one multi-state summative test:							
	Paper/pencil	 Online 							
	• 80% multiple choice, 20% constructed response	 Adaptive 							
		 Multiple opportunities to test 							
		 High school college/career readiness 							
Performance Tasks	None provided	• Integrated into electronic bank of instructional units							

		•	Integrated into summative testing
Student/School/District	• 10-12 week turn-around	٠	Immediate benchmark reports; fast turn-around of
Assessment Reports			summative reports
Growth Reports	None provided	٠	Student/group progress growth reports
		•	Value-added analyses
Professional Development	Limited PD from state, most is local or CESA provided	٠	Organized PD from the state, supported with online
			networking and regional or local professional
			learning communities: curriculum, instruction,
			assessment, and data use

For additional information, see the following Appendices:

- Appendix 14 Final report from Wisconsin's Next Generation Assessment Task Force
- Appendix 15 Memorandum of Agreement with MOSAIC multi-state partners
- Appendix 16 Memorandum of Agreement for SMARTER Consortium
- Appendix 17 Memorandum of Agreement for Balanced Assessment System Consortium
- Appendix 18 PALS Balanced Assessment list of participating states
- Appendix 19 ACHIEVE MOU Common Assessment Principles

Reform Plan Criteria

(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments (20 points)

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its Participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan for supporting a statewide transition to and implementation of internationally benchmarked K-12 standards that build toward college and career readiness by the time of high school graduation, and high-quality assessments (as defined in this notice) tied to these standards. State or LEA activities might, for example, include: developing a rollout plan for the standards together with all of their supporting components; in cooperation with the State's institutions of higher education, aligning high school exit criteria and college entrance requirements with the new standards and assessments; developing or acquiring, disseminating, and implementing high-quality instructional materials and assessments (including, for example, formative and interim assessments (both as defined in this notice)); developing or acquiring and delivering high-quality professional development to support the transition to new standards and assessments; and engaging in other strategies that translate the standards and information from assessments into classroom practice for all students, including high-need students (as defined in this notice).

The State shall provide its plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: Eight pages

(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments

Transitioning to the next generation assessment system

Wisconsin's reform plan to ensure that all students in the state are provided with the instruction they need to enable success in their ongoing education, careers, and citizenship centers on using the adopted Common Core Standards to transform curriculum, instruction, and assessment. The goal of this plan is to develop assessment literate teachers who have embraced the standards, taught to the standards, learned to appropriately measure the standards, and who have learned strategies to intervene if students have not measured up to the standards. The goal is also to empower students to be fully active partners in their learning plan.

Ensure that Wisconsin's standards are college and career ready: The first step is to identify the common competencies that represent what students need to know and be able to do in order to enter the first credit-bearing college coursework in any of Wisconsin's postsecondary institutions. The process is described in the following timeline:

- March 2010: Convene faculty teams in English language arts and mathematics (high school and postsecondary) to examine course content in entry-level college credit-bearing courses and identify common prerequisite elements in the adopted Common Core Standards.
- June 2010: Faculty teams complete the identification of common competencies.

July 2010:Confirmation of common competencies through dissemination, discussion, and feedback sessions with high school
and postsecondary faculty across Wisconsin.

September 2010: Finalize report of the common competencies, making transparent to students, parents, and teachers the actual concepts and skills that students need in English language arts and mathematics in order to avoid being placed in

remedial (developmental) courses on entering postsecondary institutions.

The second step is to validate the level of career-readiness represented in the adopted Common Core Standards. The process is to revise Wisconsin's Employability Skills competencies to guarantee they reflect contemporary workforce needs and connect with the Common Core Standards in English language arts and mathematics. The process is outlined in the following timeline:

- April 2010:Convene regional economic workforce development groups to provide input to the revision of Employability Skills
competencies, to guarantee the Employability Skills reflect contemporary workforce needs and connect with the
Common Core Standards in English language arts and mathematics
- September 2010 Pilot the revised Employability Skills assessment/feedback mechanism in selected districts including employers' - June 2011: feedback in order to evaluate students using this instrument.
- June 2011 Revise the identified skills and refine the tool.

December 2011:

January 2012: Implement statewide.

<u>Develop Professional Learning Communities to engage in lesson study, supported regionally</u>: A key component of Wisconsin's reform plan is to involve teachers in collegial examination of standards, curriculum, assessment, and instruction supported locally and regionally. This is at the heart of Wisconsin's implementation of the assessments to be developed through the MOSAIC initiative, as well as, the means for impacting student learning.

The WDPI will create pilot sites for PK-12 teachers to have subject-area specific vertical teaming that focuses on what students need to learn, how they learn best, and how to track students' learning. Using a Professional Learning Community model, teams of teachers will craft effective standards-based lessons and assessments, observe and critique teaching of the lessons, analyze results of the formative assessments, and revise and re-teach the lessons to improve each teacher's use of the most effective strategies. The next step in this shared learning is to jointly analyze student work, develop and review local data on student progress, and create and review learning progressions to understand how to scaffold students to the next level of understanding related to each standard.

This effort builds on Wisconsin's Advanced Placement Incentive Grant through the U. S. Department of Education (ED) and is an effective means to implement the Quality Educator Initiative's Professional Development Plan process for license renewal. Additional support and guidance for participating teachers will come from regional mentoring teams organized through the statewide Response to Intervention (RtI) Center, housed at the Cooperative Educational Services Agency (CESA) #5.

<u>Create professional development modules on effective use of data</u>: Educators need training and support on using a range of data to make educational decisions. Working with the Multiple Options for Student Assessment and Instruction Consortium (MOSAIC) states, WDPI will develop hands-on training and workshop sessions for teachers and administrators. WDPI will link this work with the statewide RtI initiatives. Additional information regarding Wisconsin's professional development plan related to data use is discussed in Section C3.

Involve educators in development and piloting of an assessment system containing formative, diagnostic, and benchmark assessments: WDPI will involve pilot sites in the development of the MOSAIC assessment items, including development of timely and teacher-friendly student/classroom reports that track progress over time. The purpose is to make better decisions for students with immediacy to tailor their learning progression throughout the school year. Selected sites will pilot the implementation of this system as a data-analysis tool to help make ongoing decisions about student needs. Through participation, teachers will learn the formative, day-to-day instructional strategies that can be used to extend learning of the standards and how to both formally and informally gather and use information from formative assessment processes. Each participating MOSAIC state will load the shared computer-based system with formative/local assessment tasks,

including performance assessments, and instructional support materials designed around common curriculum. This aspect of the MOSAIC system is designed to support teacher's daily work in the classroom, and is meant to be a resource that can be tailored for specific use depending on the needs of individual states or LEAs. All instructional support materials will be aligned with the Common Core. Each MOSAIC state will also contribute to the development of a benchmark assessment item bank with the capabilities for adaptive testing. From this item bank, common diagnostic/benchmark tests will be developed across the consortia states through a bid process. Each state will contribute field-tested items to the bank. This bank will be used to diagnose student strengths and deficiencies and serve as an "early warning" system. These assessments will be available electronically to students and teachers with timely turn-around of reports. Common performance standards and cut scores for these diagnostic/benchmark tests will be set across the consortium of states. The common tests will be available to districts and schools within each state as defined by that state. Varying levels of participation will require a different cost to each state to implement, most likely on a per-pupil basis. States participating at the Partner or Associate level may access items in the bank, for example, but may not have access to the consortia-developed common assessments.

<u>Develop model common curriculum</u>: WDPI will involve educators within Wisconsin and across the MOSAIC consortium of states in developing a model common curriculum for each grade level reflecting a learning progression for the Common Core Standards, showing cross-curricular connections, 21st century skills, and a balance of formative and summative assessment strategies and tools. Educators will be able to access the model common curriculum through an online resource tool.

In addition, WDPI will use the development process and results of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) EdSteps project to build teachers' repertoire in unwrapping standards, creating formative and summative assessments, and benchmarking results based on real student work. The EdSteps project is identifying expected competencies and critical benchmarks in the areas of writing, global competency, creativity and curiosity, and information technology literacy.

COMMON CORE CURRICULUM								
GOAL	KEY ACTIVITIES	TIMELINE	KEY PARTIES					
Adopt the Common Core Standards: Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts	• State Superintendent signature	• Year 1 (Q1)	WDPIState Superintendent					
	• Higher education faculty teams examine entry-level credit-bearing courses and identify related competencies needed in Common Core curriculum	• Year 1 (Q1 – Q2)	University of WisconsinWisconsin Private CollegesWDPI					
Ensure that Common Core Standards are aligned with Wisconsin college and career readiness expectations.	 Regional economic workforce groups identifies work competencies needed as reflected in the Common Core 	• Year 1 (Q2)	Workforce Development TeamsWDPI					
	Confirmation/revisions of common competencies via feedback sessions	• Year 1 (Q3)	 LEAs Wisconsin Colleges Workforce Development Team WDPI 					
	• Finalize report – actual concepts and skills needed in high school to enter credit- bearing courses; work force competencies and employability skills needed	• Year 1 (Q3)	LEAsWDPI					
	• Pilot documents, revise as needed	• Year 1 (Q3) – Year 1 (Q1)	Selected LEAsWDPI					
	Implement statewide	• Year 3 (Q1)	• LEAs					
Implement regional professional learning communities (PLC) to	 Establish regional subject-based PLC vertical teams across districts (in 4-6 state regions) 	• Year 1 (Q3)	LEAsWDPI					
engage in lesson study around integration of Common Core standards into instruction.	 Conduct quarterly three-day regional PLC meetings to define learning progressions, create standards-based instructional units, observe and critique teaching of lessons, and jointly analyze student work 	• Year 1 (Q3) – Year 4	LEA regional vertical teamsWDPI					
Provide in-depth summer institutes to	 Develop process to identify institute participants 	• Year 1 (Q3)	WDPI LEAs					
facilitate development of model units of instruction around	 Work with higher education to integrate institute into credit-bearing graduate course work as an option for participants 	• Year 1 (Q3 – Q4)	 WDPI Wisconsin Universities/Colleges 					

Table 38 – Common Core curriculum implementation plan.
Common Core standards.	• Work with MOSAIC consortium states to collaborate on and define requirements for approval of model units of instruction for multi-state sharing	• Year 1 (Q3 – Q4)	 MOSAIC partner states WDPI LEA representatives
	• Provide two five-day summer institutes	 Year 2 (Q1 – Q2) Continue annually (Q4) through Year 4 	 WDPI LEA selected staff MOSAIC contracted vendor
	• Work with MOSAIC consortium states to develop web component for multi-state sharing of instructional units and exemplars of student work.	• Year 1 (Q2) - Year 2 (Q1)	 WDPI MOSAIC partner states MOSAIC contracted vendor
Provide educators with	• Pilot the use of MOSAIC instructional resources with selected district, gather feedback and modify as needed	• Year 2 (Q3) - Year 3 (Q1)	 WDPI Selected LEAs MOSAIC partner states MOSAIC contracted vendor
a web-based bank of instructional units with exemplars of student	• Provide access to MOSAIC instructional resources state-wide	• Year 3 (Q3)	WDPIMOSAIC partner statesMOSAIC contracted vendor
work.	• Provide ongoing professional development on use of MOSAIC instructional resources, via web-based modules and other venues	• Year 2 – Year 4	 WDPI MOSAIC partner states MOSAIC contracted vendor RtI Centers
	• Continue to add resources to MOSAIC instructional support component, building a bank of units across MOSAIC states	• Year 2 – Year 4	 WDPI Selected LEAs MOSAIC partner states MOSAIC contracted vendor

Educational Consultants at WDPI will provide the overall organization for the integration of Common Core Standards key activities, under the direction of the Assistant Director and Director of Educational Accountability. These staff will divide oversight responsibilities by content area and grade-level, collectively developing a broad bank of instructional resource support materials in grades K-12, in both mathematics and reading/language arts. Consultants will work with regional CESA staff and LEAs, and will collaborate with other MOSAIC states to assure that resources developed across states fit with defined learning progressions and meet the same high quality standards.

MOSAIC will contract with vendors to provide the computer platform, and to provide expertise in learning progressions and development of curricular units to support regional workshops and summer institutes.

Educators will be reimbursed for travel and/or receive stipends or compensation from LEA RTTT funds, as part of their commitment to work collaboratively to develop common curriculum.

Activities will build on the known successful model of professional learning communities and lesson study, with ongoing learning groups learning and sharing across districts within each state region. Extended learning opportunities during the summer complement the regional work during the school and provide opportunities for university credit and completion of Professional Development Plans (PDPs) for license renewal. By the end of the grant period, a significant body of instructional support materials will be available to Wisconsin educators and participating MOSAIC states. States will continue to add resources; although the need should decrease once a basic system is established.

			C	OMMC	ON COR	E CUR	RICULU	UM								
KEY TASK		YE	AR 1			YEA	AR 2			YEA	AR 3			YEA	AR 4	
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
State Superintendent adopts Common Core standards	•															
Higher education faculty teams examine entry-level credit-bearing courses and identify related competencies needed in Common Core curriculum		•	•													
Regional economic workforce groups identifies work competencies needed as reflected in the Common Core		•														
Confirmation/revisions of common competencies via feedback sessions			•													
Finalize report – actual concepts and skills needed in high school to enter credit-bearing courses; work force competencies and employability skills needed			•													
Pilot documents, revise as needed			•	•	•											
Implement statewide									•							
Establish regional subject-based PLC vertical teams across districts (in 4-6 state regions)			•													

Table 39 – Timeline for Common Core curriculum implementation.

Conduct quarterly three-day regional PLC meetings to define learning progressions, create standards-based instructional units, observe and critique teaching of lessons, and jointly analyze student work		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Develop process to identify institute participants		•													
Work with higher education to integrate institute into credit-bearing graduate course work as an option for participants		•	٠												
Work with MOSAIC consortium states to collaborate on and define requirements for approval of model units of instruction for multi-state sharing		•	•												
Provide two five-day summer institutes				•	•		•				•				•
Work with MOSAIC consortium states to develop web component for multi-state sharing of instructional units and exemplars of student work.	•	•	•	•											
Pilot the use of MOSAIC instructional resources with selected district, gather feedback and modify as needed						•	•	•							
Provide access to MOSAIC instructional resources state-wide										•					
Provide ongoing professional development on use of MOSAIC instructional resources, via web-based modules and other venues				•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Continue to add resources to MOSAIC instructional support component, building a bank of units across MOSAIC states				•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•

<u>Build an online resource to provide common support to educators:</u> A common online resource is essential for implementing Common Core Standards across MOSAIC states, demonstrating how to embed the standards in instruction through sample units, common assessments, and video vignettes of classroom lessons and learning strategies. This will be a cross-state collaborative that integrates instructional resources into a user-friendly teacher interface. This online resource will provide innovative instructional approaches using educational-management tools that allow for a fully integrated range of Web 2.0 tools, putting information at the teacher's fingertips. Implementation of revised standards and a balanced system of assessments requires coordinated professional development. A critical component is the inclusion of

processes, practices, and policies that shift educators from focusing on "What am I supposed to teach?" and moves them to constantly ask "What do I do next to make sure that this student improves and learns?" Wisconsin's teacher preparation and license renewal processes (the Quality Educator Initiative) are based on this shift in emphasis, developing reflective practitioners.

Candidates now base their certification on a portfolio showcasing competency in 10 areas. For license renewal, teachers implement their own professional development plan (PDP) focused on areas of knowledge and skill that will improve student achievement. Wisconsin's contribution to develop the online resource will be a collaborative effort of WDPI, CESAs, institutions of higher education, PK-12 educators, and partners from business and industry (especially for the technology components). Development will parallel and follow sequentially the completion of the common standards in a subject area and the completion of the model curriculum in that subject area.

The online resources will include elements such as suggested units of instruction within each grade level and content area, organized around deep understanding of a defined set of big ideas; exemplars of student work that teachers collectively rate, use to help establish evaluation criteria for demonstrations of learning, and identify benchmarks for growth PK-12, similar to the model used to develop the CCSSO EdSteps project; and model assessment strategies embedded in each instructional unit, including learning checks, formative, and summative assessments for the unit. Also envisioned are video vignettes from classrooms to be available online, demonstrating teaching strategies and student learning.

Revise standards in subject areas other than English language arts and mathematics: Following the completion of the current Common Core Standards initiative, Wisconsin will work with members of the consortium to begin a common development process for common standards in science and social studies. Already under discussion among various partners through CCSSO, science appears to be ready to launch this project and Wisconsin has already conducted a deep analysis of its current standards and developed a document to identify grade level learning targets and strategies. As a participating member of the Science Education Assessment consortium of CCSSO, Wisconsin is positioning itself for a leadership role in the development of common core science standards. The process for developing standards in other subject areas would begin in a multi-state approach for science and social studies. In all cases, the writing teams will include broad representation of PK-16 education, professional organizations, and communities. The process will involve embedding 21st century skills

with the rigor of the discipline. This initiative includes development and piloting of a student eLearning Portfolio, which will help students take ownership in the planning and progress of their own learning and career plans. This is discussed further in section (C)(3).

Connect Wisconsin's standards to career pathways: Evidence of achievement of the adopted Common Core Standards does not only come from the discipline's classroom. Wisconsin's reform plan includes a process to link the Wisconsin Career Pathways system to the adopted Common Core Standards. WDPI will involve representatives from education and business and industry to develop assessments to identify if students have the foundational career awareness, exploration, development and management skills and the employability skills needed to be career ready. Wisconsin's new requirements to measure technical skill attainment upon completion of Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs will be embedded into a balanced assessment system. Assessments designed to provide evidence of standards such as English language arts and mathematics through Career and Technical Education and other coursework will give students accurate data as to their preparation to achieve the college and career readiness which is the target of the standards. Linked to the area of their career interest (career cluster), students will take science, mathematics, and English language arts courses, among others, not as ends in themselves, but as means to deepen their preparation for a wide variety of potential careers within the career cluster. Rather than identifying a specific career, such as carpentry, dentistry, or real estate sales, students will keep the career cluster broad and link their preparation to keep their options open rather than narrowed. The idea of "academic" will disappear as all subject areas will provide potential evidence of the critical skills students need in the variety of careers they will experience in their world of work.

In Priority #2, WDPI describes the development of four regional Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Academies. Academy staff will develop model curriculum collaboratively with teachers across the state, creating STEM courses, curriculum, and units of instruction focused on advanced coursework to help students transition from high school to postsecondary education. In addition, this group of networked teachers will design these assessments to link standards with students' career pathways.

Enact policies to enable awarding of graduation credit through demonstration of competency: In order to support the movement away from seat time toward awarding credit based on a student's proficiency or competency, Wisconsin will enact policies to facilitate learning through

demonstration, as other states have done. This will help support the movement toward blended instruction, combining learning via technology (online, virtual communities, distance learning) as well as face-to-face experiences.

This effort will build on the existing process to award equivalency credit in science for courses in agriculture or technology education that have proven a close correlation to the science standards. Wisconsin will develop the appropriate policies to increase the number of courses and disciplines that can be linked through this process. Such a move will support the State's interest in increasing the number of science and mathematics credits required for high school graduation from the current two to at least three in both science and mathematics. Expanding to require three credits of science and mathematics for high school graduation is identified as a reform strategy under the Exhibit II high leverage strategies, required in Beloit, Green Bay, Kenosha, Madison, Milwaukee, Racine school districts and one of the options that may be selected in all other LEAs. Rather than only providing a single option, such as Algebra II or Advanced Chemistry, by providing a variety of routes to earn science and mathematics credits, students are more likely to be successful, linking this learning with their career pathways.

<u>Support initiatives to drive STEM best practices</u>: A STEM strategy across the four goal areas is establishing four STEM Academies in the state, implementing standards and assessments to prepare students to succeed in college and the work place. Academy staff will develop model curriculum collaboratively with teachers across the state, creating STEM courses, curriculum, and units of instruction focused on advanced coursework to help students transition from high school to postsecondary education. Teachers both onsite and virtually connected will be engaged in unwrapping the standards, observing and teaching common lessons, reflecting on the resulting student learning, and improving the impact through statewide networking.

Table 40 - Performance Measures (B)(3) Performance measures for this criterion are optional. If the State wishes to include performance measures, please enter them as rows in this table and, for each measure, provide annual targets in the columns provided.	or most recent)	(Current school year	Actual Data: Baseline	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of S Y 2013-2014
LEAs involved in regional Professional Learning Communities (piloting the process in the first year and inviting additional districts to participate in subsequent years, until all districts are involved in this activity by the end of SY 2013-14); this provides evidence of completion of and use of the online resource tool.	20)		90	190	290	425
LEAs involved in the development of assessment tools through the MOSAIC consortium, used to measure students' progress in achieving Common Core Standards.	20)		90	190	290	425

(C) Data Systems to Support Instruction (47 total points)

State Reform Conditions Criteria

(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system (24 points – 2 points per America COMPETES element)

The extent to which the State has a statewide longitudinal data system that includes all of the America COMPETES Act elements (as defined in this notice).

In the text box below, the State shall describe which elements of the America COMPETES Act (as defined in this notice) are currently included in its statewide longitudinal data system.

Evidence:

• Documentation for each of the America COMPETES Act elements (as defined in this notice) that is included in the State's statewide longitudinal data system.

Recommended maximum response length: Two pages

(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system (LDS)

Progress to date on America COMPETES Act requirements

Significant progress has been made in the accumulation and use of PK12 data. Today the Wisconsin Longitudinal Data System (LDS) supports numerous research and reporting efforts along with six of the 12 elements of the America COMPETES Act. Efforts are already underway to complete the remaining six additional items by 2011. A limited set of pre-kindergarten data are collected and maintained, specifically the data associated with the strong Wisconsin 4-year-old kindergarten programs. At this time there is limited ability to align secondary education data with post secondary education systems as defined by items 11 and 12. Wisconsin recognizes the need for a comprehensive PK-16 data system and under the leadership of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Governor, Presidents of University of Wisconsin System, and Wisconsin Association of Independent Colleges and Universities; resources are being allocated to improve the collection and use of PK-16 data. The foundation for this system will be funded by the current LDS grant received by WDPI in May 2009.

Below is the checklist from Wisconsin's reporting on America COMPETES Act compliance for the State Fiscal Stabilization Funds. In the interest of space we insert a brief description of evidence of the State's compliance under each component of the act where there is compliance.

For pre-K through postsecondary education, does the State's statewide longitudinal data system include the following elements:

- 1) Wisconsin's LDS does not currently include the functionality to prevent students to be individually identified by users on the system via the use of a unique student identifier
- Wisconsin's LDS does not have the functionality to provide information on student-level enrollment, demographic, and program participation.

- 3) Wisconsin's LDS does not have the functionality to provide student-level information about the points at which students exit, transfer in, transfer out, drop out, or complete pre-K through postsecondary education programs.
- 4) Wisconsin's LDS has the capacity to communicate with higher education data systems.

<u>Evidence</u>: The capacity to communicate with higher education systems is interpreted to mean technologies are in place, data definitions are understood, necessary agreements are signed and these organizations are collaborating to perform necessary and valuable work. The technical functionality is the result of work done with the LDS grant received in 2006 from U.S. Department of Education. Specific data exchange efforts include but are not limited to:

- An annual exchange of WKCE data with the University of Wisconsin and the Value Added Research Center in support of their effort to rollout a value added model.
- An MOU and work in progress with the University of Wisconsin and the Wisconsin Department of Health Services to support research on the effects on educational outcomes of an early exposure to lead.
- 5) Wisconsin's LDS has an audit system assessing data quality, validity, and reliability.

Evidence: The systems in place to audit and assess data quality and validity include:

- Progress and summary reports for each student level data collection. These on-line, reports enable the reporting LEA to monitor their data submissions real time and respond accordingly.
- WDPI staff monitoring the collection progress and data submission; and working with LEA staff to complete the collection in a high quality manner.
- Edits built into student level data collections that warn school districts of possible data discrepancies and require the LEA to acknowledge the discrepancy before proceeding.

- Editing and validation routines executed against all student level data sets before the data is moved to the WDPI data warehouse.
- Data moved to the data warehouse undergo significant cleansing and records that are not clean, consistent and compatible with the rules of the data warehouse are rejected or flagged with and error.
- Continual monitoring by program area representatives on the quality and consistency of data required for state or federal reporting.
- Routine training opportunities for LEA to learn about the collection and uses of data at WDPI.

For pre-K through grade 12 education, does the State's statewide longitudinal data system include the following elements:

6) Wisconsin's LDS does currently have the ability to provide yearly state assessment records of individual students.

<u>Evidence</u>: The annual Wisconsin Knowledge and Concept Examination (WKCE) is administered annually to students in grades 3-8 and 10. The Wisconsin Alternate Assessment (WAA) is administered to children with special needs. All assessment results are stored in the WDPI data warehouse. This data set today includes 1,760,475 rows and all assessments results from the 2005-06 school years to date.

7) Wisconsin's LDS does provide information on students not tested, by grade and subject.

Evidence: Data on students not taking the WKCE or WAA is maintained in the data warehouse along with the assessment scores of students that did participate.

- 8) Wisconsin's LDS does not currently have a teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students.
- Wisconsin's LDS does not currently have student-level transcript information that includes courses completed and grades earned.

10) Wisconsin's LDS does have the functionality to provide student-level college readiness test scores.

Evidence: Student level college readiness data is available in the WDPI data warehouse today with plans and funding available from USED to enhance these data sets further in 2010. Data available today include 3 years of Advanced Placement exam results and ACT data and over 65% of all graduating seniors in Wisconsin take the ACT exam.

For postsecondary education, does the State's statewide longitudinal data system include the following elements:

- 11) Wisconsin's LDS does not currently provide information regarding the extent to which students transition successfully from secondary school to postsecondary education or if the students enroll in remedial coursework.
- 12) Wisconsin's LDS does provide other information determined necessary to address alignment and adequate preparation for success in postsecondary education.

<u>Evidence</u>: Additional LDS data sets supporting high school graduation and preparation for postsecondary education include English Language Acquisition data, attendance data, incidents of discipline, and graduation.

Reform Plan Criteria

(C)(2) Accessing and using State data (5 points)

The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan to ensure that data from the State's statewide longitudinal data system are accessible to, and used to inform and engage, as appropriate, key stakeholders (*e.g.*, parents, students, teachers, principals, LEA leaders, community

members, unions, researchers, and policymakers); and that the data support decision-makers in the continuous improvement of efforts in such areas as policy, instruction, operations, management, resource allocation, and overall effectiveness.¹¹

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: Two pages

(C)(2) Accessing and using State data

Accessing and using the LDS

Central to Wisconsin's efforts to use State data for public reporting, federal reporting, research efforts as well as informing policy, is the LDS student-level data warehouse. With over twelve million records of detailed student level data, this data store provides the new "gold" standard for education data in Wisconsin. Access to this data is varied but Wisconsin has defined an access model that has three distinct levels and characteristics.

The first level of access to the LDS is public access. This public access is open, published, and does not require any specific security to access. All reports are accessible online through the state's online education reporting portal described below in more detail. This level of

¹¹ Successful applicants that receive Race to the Top grant awards will need to comply with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), including 34 CFR Part 99, as well as State and local requirements regarding privacy.

access provides predefined, simple to use, and redacted data. These reports provide snapshots of performance on the WKCE exam at the district and school level and student performance can be broken down by subgroup where applicable. The data is suppressed in accordance with Wisconsin's state rules for redacted data to prevent individual student identities from being revealed.

These reports are served through the Wisconsin Information Network for Successful Schools (WINSS) - the public portal primarily used to make data available to the public. The WINSS system has been highly successful; in 2007 and 2008 this website received 14,7000,000 views with a single day high of 265,000 views.

The second level of access to the state's LDS is for authorized users such as teachers, administrators, and district personnel, who have access to individual student-level data. The LDS provides these users with more detailed reports and sophisticated security protocols to ensure student privacy.

The LDS' Multidimensional Analytic Tool (MDAT) functionality is currently being rolled out to Wisconsin LEAs and enables authorized users to explore one year growth in WKCE mathematics and reading results. By leveraging the LDS data warehouse, MDAT enables teachers and administrators to review these results in combination with previously independent data sets e.g., attendance or discipline. As required by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), all access to student level data is logged with the ability to create reports against this log that enable Wisconsin to easily determine who has had access to this data and when.

The third level of access is much more powerful and is intended for sophisticated users with skills at analyzing and accessing large data sets. This access level provides researchers at various organizations a more comprehensive interface for analyzing LDS data in a detailed and sophisticated way. This level is intended for access by members of the education research community, internal WDPI staff, and other partners who are savvy at accessing and managing education data. Going forward the state is poised to dramatically increase access to and the utility of the data in the statewide LDS. In addition to work already under way and supported through our existing federal state longitudinal data system grants, the state is gaining momentum with key stakeholders in improving the LDS.

Starting in 2010, the state will leverage the relationship with the Value-Added Research Center (VARC) to provide growth model valueadded analysis for student achievement on the statewide summative assessment—the WKCE. The proposal for this expansion, detailed under section C(3)(ii) supports the existing work done by VARC in calculating statewide value-added results and interested districts will be given the tools and reports necessary to use this analysis to drive change. While budgeted RTTT funds will not fully support the delivery of value-added results to every district in the state for the next four years, they do provide a critical level of consistent support for the ongoing work and will be leveraged to generate additional foundation and research support for the work. VARC is uniquely positioned in the field of value-added analysis, value-added reporting, and training in the usage of value-added data for evaluation and improvement.

Due to this strong position VARC has a proven record in securing external funding for current work at the district-level in Milwaukee, Chicago, and New York. It also has experience in conducting statewide analyses for states such as Wisconsin, Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota. VARC's prominence as a center of research and applied analysis will ensure that future state spending on this project will provide strong returns and may be supplemented by external funding from other financial supporters. The state of Wisconsin is committed to providing stakeholders with a flexible array of analysis and tools to meet their differing needs. In addition to the expansion of value-added reporting, the state is committed to providing two additional tools to enable reporting and analysis on student growth. First, the state is continuing to work on the next generation of MDAT, which will provide more detailed comparison groups and contextual data to paint a more complete picture of student performance. This tool, MDAT2, should be available in early 2011. The second tool, currently called "Blue Mountain," provides educators with reports that compare the growth of a particular student both to similar students and to a relative target proficiency level. This information is provided in an easy to interpret graphical manner that gives educators at the LEA level.

Using this in concert with other tools, LEA administrators and educators will be able to identify students, classrooms, grades, schools, and even whole districts that are struggling to make year to year growth as compared to peer groups across the state. This type of work will allow stakeholders to track their progress toward achieving the state's goals for increasing student performance and better allocate resources

to manage progress toward these goals. In addition to providing new tools and better access to the LDS, the state is continuing efforts to expand the data incorporated into the LDS. Work is in progress to add the following data sets to the LDS by the first quarter of 2011:

- Annual National Student Clearinghouse data sets enabling Wisconsin to track successful transition from high school to higher education.
- Mobility data enabling WDPI to support VARC and value added analysis.
- Significantly enhanced teacher data sets enabling Wisconsin to explore teacher preparedness.
- Student transcript data, including the teacher(s) who taught the course enabling Wisconsin to identify the characteristics of the successful high school preparation for college or the work forces.
- Financial data enabling new facets of research.
- Vocational Educational Enrollment and Reporting (Perkins) data enabling.

The State recognizes that improved data analysis tools and expanded datasets in the LDS do not themselves lead to change. In order for Wisconsin to fully take advantage of these expanding LDS datasets and reports, LEAs need to know how to use data meaningfully to inform instructional improvement and use classroom assessment and benchmark assessment data. With this goal in mind, Wisconsin will embark on a significant professional development effort to provide modules, tools, and administrator training in data literacy in order to create and drive expertise in data usage as well as promote best practices.

This professional development will be delivered through the appropriate organizations. The State possesses a number of vehicles for detailed and substantive professional development on data including modules done by the Response to Intervention (RtI) Center, the programs on value-added, through Student Information Management System (SIMS), and relationships with other partners such as higher education, research institutions, and LEAs themselves. The State will leverage the existing expertise of each of these groups to provide more comprehensive and thorough professional development on data to Participating LEAs in order to increase capacity statewide in the implementation of data driven intervention, evaluation, and school improvement. More detail on these efforts can be found in A(2) under the

OEII and the RtI Center. A full description of the State's efforts for professional development to be funded under this grant are described in detail in section C(3)(ii)

Table 41 - Performance Measures (C)(2)Performance measures for this criterion are optional. If the State wishes to include performancemeasures, please enter them as rows in this table and, for each measure, provide annual targetsin the columns provided.	or most recent)	(Current school year	Actual Data: Baseline	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
	•						

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction (18 points)

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its Participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan to—

(i) Increase the acquisition, adoption, and use of local instructional improvement systems (as defined in this notice) that provide teachers, principals, and administrators with the information and resources they need to inform and improve their instructional practices, decision-making, and overall effectiveness;

(ii) Support Participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) and schools that are using instructional improvement systems (as defined in this notice) in providing effective professional development to teachers, principals and administrators on how to use these systems and the resulting data to support continuous instructional improvement; and

(iii) Make the data from instructional improvement systems (as defined in this notice), together with statewide longitudinal data system data, available and accessible to researchers so that they have detailed information with which to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional materials, strategies, and approaches for educating different types of students (*e.g.*, students with disabilities, English language learners, students whose achievement is well below or above grade level).

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix, note the location where the attachment can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: Five pages

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its Participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan to—

(C)(3)(i) Increase the acquisition, adoption, and use of local instructional improvement systems (as defined in this notice) that provide teachers, principals, and administrators with the information and resources they need to inform and improve their instructional practices, decision-making, and overall effectiveness;

Powerful local data systems

The State believes that in the next year many efforts currently in production will come to fruition to improve the utility of the LDS in supporting local instructional improvement systems. This work is detailed under C(2). In addition to work already underway, the state is committed to ensuring that reform efforts in this application are 100% supported by the LDS and that the LDS is used to increase the accountability and effectiveness of these reforms. With funds from RTTT the state's ability to provide holistic and timely data to classroom teachers, principals, and district personnel will be markedly increased.

To this end the state is committed to incorporating data from a new benchmark assessment system into the LDS as well as providing Participating LEAs extensive professional development on data access, usage, and analysis to build their capacity to leverage such data for meaningful change. Notably, in section B, the state describes its commitment to implementing a new statewide benchmark assessment as part of the MOSAIC consortium [See MOSAIC Lead State MOU, in Appendix 15].

MOSAIC will have multiple components, including an item bank, professional development modules and instructional improvement tools. Each state in the MOSAIC consortium will contribute to the development of hands-on training and workshop modules for educators that provide user-friendly strategies and focus on making data-informed instructional decisions based upon formative, benchmark, and summative assessment results. All materials will be disseminated across the collaborating states, and these professional development resources will be critical to SEA-LEA collaboration around the use of data for improve instruction. Units of instruction, learning progressions, student tutorials and quick diagnostic items will also be incorporated into the instructional improvement system.

One of Wisconsin's primary goals for the instructional improvement system within MOSAIC is that the system will provide a platform for the creation of individualized eLearning Portfolios. Student and teachers working one-on-one would craft each student's learning goals, review progress towards these goals, and adjust instruction along the way. The eLearning Portfolios would be viewed on a secure dashboard that displays assessment data, intervention data (if any), and links instructional information to each students' place in the curriculum as well as to the Common Core standards.

A clear advantage of the MOSAIC consortium is the focus on making implementation of the assessment as teacher and principal friendly as possible. Educators will have access to hand on training and workshop modules that train them in how to leverage assessment results to make data-informed instructional decisions based not only on the benchmark, but also on summative and formative assessment results. These professional development resources will be critical to SEA-LEA collaboration and will be used to build teacher use and understanding of data to improve instruction. Units of instruction, learning progressions, student tutorials and quick diagnostic items will also be incorporated into the instructional improvement system dramatically increasing the way data is used to guide instruction and improve educational performance.

Wisconsin will develop a robust report interface – similar to dashboard reporting – where teachers can track individual student results on the MOSAIC benchmark assessments, student participation in specific interventions, and myriad other student data points. The interface will integrate relevant and related data in a teacher-friendly application. The State will support teachers in connecting data points of individual students and across classroom data by pulling disparate data pieces together for quick and efficient data views. The State intends to include summative assessment results and growth data, which may include value-added data, in the interface in order to have integrated data at teachers' fingertips.

A unique feature of this interface is that it will be developed to allow students to participate in developing their own eLearning Portfolios, helping to guide their own educational planning and goal-setting. Teachers may access the eLearning Portfolios from this interface, monitoring progress and place within the curriculum along with their students.

Development and piloting of this application (envisioned as GOALS: Growth Oriented Achievement Learning System), would be an essential tool in driving the ongoing professional development around using data to improve instruction.

In addition to the efforts to build LEA capacity to leverage data through the efforts surrounding MOSAIC the state plans to invest heavily in other professional development efforts around data usage. The state will provide both professional development modules and trainers to LEAs to increase the usage of data in the improvement of instruction.

The state plans to spend \$3.5 million under Race to the Top to distribute this professional training. The state plans to do this by working with CESAs to create regional expertise that can be distributed to LEAs as needed. The state will model this after current efforts conducted to train districts in the use of statewide growth and value added reports issued by VARC. This system centers on training facilitators at each CESA and then bringing in staff from the districts to be trained by CESA staff.

To this end the state already has several districts participating in a statewide value-added data system administered by VARC and through collaboration with the state to provide the data. This program provides districts with professional development training on the utility and meaning of growth models, comparisons with all districts in the state (participating or not), and several reports for the district as a whole, schools, and grade levels. As the teacher-student linkage in the state data system comes online, this system will be easily expanded to provide growth analysis for classroom level data as well.

To achieve this ambitious expansion of statewide capacity in data usage, the state plan outlines, "The OEII will collaborate and/or contract with educational institutions, professional organizations, or non-profit organizations to develop and provide professional development modules, tools, and training. The OEII will also work with the CESAs, professional organizations, or non-profit organizations to provide educators with the professional development tools and face to face training in student growth and value-added data reports."

(C)(3)(ii) Support Participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) and schools that are using instructional improvement systems (as defined in this notice) in providing effective professional development to teachers, principals and administrators on how to use these systems and the resulting data to support continuous instructional improvement;

Professional development around using data to improve instruction

Wisconsin will provide professional development to teachers and administrators on:

- 1) The use of MOSAIC's instructional improvement and benchmark assessment systems
- 2) The use and interpretation of the data in the GOALS reporting interface
- 3) The use and accessing of eLearning Portfolios

The model of professional development will include in-person workshops and in-district training sessions that function as a train-the-trainer method. The State will also post materials, updates, training schedules on the SEA website. In addition, Wisconsin will collaborate with the other states in the MOSAIC consortium to share professional development modules and best practices.

USING DATA TO SUPPORT INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENTS									
GOAL	KEY ACTIVITIES	TIMELINE	KEY PARTIES						
	Identify pilot districts	• Year 1 (Q1)	WDPIMOSAICPilot LEAs						
Provide high quality professional development opportunities under the MOSAIC initiative.	Establish communication plan and protocol with pilot districts	• Year 1 (Q1)	WDPI MOSAIC Pilot LEAs						
	Identify key personnel within WDPI responsible for communicating with pilot districts	• Year 1 (Q2)	WDPIMOSAICPilot LEAs						
	Begin communication around professional development plan with pilot districts to clarify key elements of plan, requirements, expectations and timelines	• Year 1 (Q3)	 WDPI CESAs MOSAIC LEAs 						
Pilot computer-based instructional improvement system	 Provide training on the requirements, components, and process for submitting instructional items to the instructional improvement system including formative strategies, learning progressions and curricular content supporting the Common Core. 	• Year 2	 WDPI CESAs MOSAIC LEAs 						
Pilot computer-based benchmark assessment system	• Provide training on the benchmark system, how to make data-based decisions around this assessment data and how teachers tie benchmark data to the Common Core, and classroom curriculum.	• Year 2	 WDPI CESAs MOSAIC LEAs 						

Table 42 – Implementation plan for using data to support instructional improvements.

Pilot eLearning Portfolios	• Provide training on the requirements, components, and process for developing a student-centered and data-based learning portfolio	• Year 2	 WDPI CESAs MOSAIC LEAs
Pilot reporting interface that displays instructional improvement system, assessment scores and eLearning Portfolios	Using established regional Professional Learning Communities and lesson study, develop performance tasks and related components via quarterly 3-day regional meetings	• Year 2 (Q3) – Year 4 (Q2)	 WDPI CESAs Pilot LEAs
	Work with MOSAIC consortium states to develop web component for multi-state sharing of formative assessment components.	• Year 1 (Q3) – Year 2 (Q2)	 WDPI MOSAIC MOSAIC partner states MOSAIC contracted vendor
	Pilot the use of MOSAIC assessment resources with selected district, gather feedback and modify as needed	• Year 2 (Q2) – Year 3 (Q1)	 WDPI Pilot LEAs MOSAIC MOSAIC partner states MOSAIC contracted vendor
Provide educators with a web-based bank of formative assessment components for use with classroom instructional units designed around the Common Core	Provide access to MOSAIC instructional resources state-wide	• Year 3 (Q4)	 WDPI CESAs MOSAIC MOSAIC partner states MOSAIC contracted vendor
Standards.	Provide ongoing professional development on use of MOSAIC assessment resources, via web-based modules and other venues	• Year 2 – Year 4	 WDPI CESAs MOSAIC MOSAIC partner states MOSAIC contracted vendor RtI Centers
	Continue to add resources to MOSAIC assessment components, building a flexible bank of classroom assessment tasks across MOSAIC states	• Year 2 – Year 4	 WDPI CESAs LEAs MOSAIC MOSAIC partner states MOSAIC contracted vendor
Develop online, adaptive defined quarterly benchmark assessments – gauging progress on Common Core Standards	Using items from summer institute development and from MOSAIC state item bank contributions, develop quarterly benchmark assessments gauging progress on defined learning progression within	• Year 3 – Year 4	 WDPI LEAs MOSAIC MOSAIC partner states MOSAIC contracted vendor

	each grade level and content area (reading/mathematics)		
	Define report formats that facilitate documentation of student growth over time, with teacher- and parent- friendly feedback on next steps to move a student to the next level of learning	• Year 3	 WDPI Pilot LEAs MOSAIC MOSAIC partner states MOSAIC contracted vendor
	• Pilot assessments in selected districts and grade levels, integrate feedback into assessments	• Year 4 (Q1)	 Pilot LEAs WDPI MOSAIC MOSAIC partner states MOSAIC contracted vendor
	Set standard for performance expectations consistent in definition across all participating MOSAIC states	• Year 4 (Q2)	 WDPI LEAs MOSAIC MOSAIC partner states MOSAIC contracted vendor
	Assessments available statewide and to other MOSAIC states	• Year 4 (Q2)	 WDPI LEAs MOSAIC MOSAIC partner states MOSAIC contracted vendor
Provide ongoing professional development on use of MOSAIC benchmark assessments, via web-based modules and other venues	Provide ongoing support	• Year 4	 WDPI CESAs MOSAIC MOSAIC partner states MOSAIC contracted vendor

Educational Consultants at WDPI will provide the overall organization for the formative/benchmark assessment system key activities, under the direction of the Assistant Director and Director of Educational Accountability. These staff will divide oversight responsibilities by content area and grade-level, collectively developing a broad bank of classroom assessment resource materials K-12, and defined benchmark assessments in grades 3-8 and high school, in both mathematics and reading/language arts. Consultants will work with regional

CESA staff and LEAs, and will collaborate with other MOSAIC states to assure that assessment materials developed across states fit with defined learning progressions and meet the same high quality standards.

MOSAIC will contract with vendors to provide the computer platform, and to provide expertise in assessment development, computer-based assessment delivery, and to support regional workshops and summer institutes.

Activities build on the known successful model of professional learning communities and lesson study, with ongoing learning groups learning and sharing across districts within each state region. Extended learning opportunities during the summer complement the regional work during the school and provide opportunities for university credit and completion of Professional Development Plans (PDPs) for license renewal. Workshops and summer institutes will integrate curriculum and assessment work, while allowing opportunities for educators to participate in the components that fit best with their professional expertise.

By the end of the grant period, a significant body of assessment materials will be available to Wisconsin educators, and to other participating MOSAIC states. States will continue to add resources, although the pace may decrease somewhat once the foundations of the system have been developed.

	US	ING DA	ТА ТО	SUPPO	RT INS	TRUCT	IONAL	IMPRO	VEME	NTS						
KEY TASK		YEA	AR 1			YEA	R 2			YEA	R 3			YEAI	R 4	
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Identify pilot districts	•															
Establish communication plan and protocol with pilot districts	•															
Identify key personnel within WDPI responsible for communicating with pilot districts		•														
Begin communication around professional development plan with pilot districts to clarify key elements of plan, requirements, expectations and timelines			•													
Provide training on the requirements, components, and process for submitting					•	•	•	•								

Table 43 – Timetable for using data to support instruction.

instructional items to the instructional															
improvement system including formative															
strategies, learning progressions and															
curricular content supporting the Common															
Core.															
Provide training on the benchmark system,															
how to make data-based decisions around															
this assessment data and how teachers tie				•	•	•	•								
benchmark data to the Common Core, and															
classroom curriculum.															
Provide training on the requirements,															
components, and process for developing a															
student-centered and data-based learning				•	•	•	•								
portfolio															
Using established regional Professional															
Learning Communities and lesson study,															
develop performance tasks and related						•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		
components via quarterly 3-day regional															
meetings															
Work with MOSAIC consortium states to															
develop web component for multi-state		•	•	•	•										
sharing of formative assessment components.															
Pilot the use of MOSAIC assessment															
resources with selected district, gather					•	•	•	•							
feedback and modify as needed															
Provide access to MOSAIC instructional															
resources state-wide											•				
Provide ongoing professional development															
on use of MOSAIC assessment resources, via				•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
web-based modules and other venues															
Continue to add resources to MOSAIC															
assessment components, building a flexible															
bank of classroom assessment tasks across				•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
MOSAIC states															
Using items from summer institute															
development and from MOSAIC state item															
bank contributions, develop quarterly															
benchmark assessments gauging progress on								•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
defined learning progression within each															
grade level and content area															
(reading/mathematics)															
Define report formats that facilitate															
documentation of student growth over time,								•	•	•	•				
with teacher- and parent-friendly feedback on															

next steps to move a student to the next level										
of learning										
Pilot assessments in selected districts and										
grade levels, integrate feedback into							•			
assessments										
Set standard for performance expectations										
consistent in definition across all								•		
participating MOSAIC states										
Assessments available statewide and to other										
MOSAIC states								•		
Provide ongoing support							•	•	•	•

(C)(3)(iii) Make the data from instructional improvement systems (as defined in this notice), together with statewide longitudinal data system data, available and accessible to researchers so that they have detailed information with which to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional materials, strategies, and approaches for educating different types of students (e.g., students with disabilities, English language learners, students whose achievement is well below or above grade level).

Sharing data with researchers

Traditionally, the research efforts in Wisconsin have been selective and highly targeted in scope. In 2009, Memoranda of Understanding were signed with the University of Wisconsin-Madison Value-Added Research Center (VARC) and the Wisconsin Department of Health Services. The first MOU enables the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) to share Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Exam (WKCE) data with VARC and support their efforts to create a statewide context for value added analysis and research in Wisconsin (See Appendix 20). The second MOU enables WDPI to share WKCE data with the Department of Health Services, Division of Public Health and interested families, in an effort to research the effects of an early exposure to lead on educational outcomes (See Appendix 21).

In November, Governor Jim Doyle signed 2009 Wisconsin Act 59 into law. This Act authorized WDPI, University of Wisconsin System, Wisconsin Technical College System, and Wisconsin Association of Independent Colleges and Universities to study each other's education programs and establish a PK-16 Longitudinal Data System (LDS) of student data. Staff from each of the four partner education systems

immediately began developing an overarching PK-16 compact to implement this system. Additionally, staff members are negotiating a series of subsequent memoranda of understanding to delineate and define data governance, security requirements, research protocols, and any relevant costs. We expect the compact will be signed by the end of the year, and that subsequent agreements will be reached by the end of the first quarter of 2010.

The WDPI will set aside a grant of \$500,000 for a Value-added research partner to provide value-added analysis and results for the state-wide summative assessment (currently the WKCE). The proposed work supports the core effort around calculating and providing value-added results for all participating schools and districts in the tested grades and subjects. While these funds do not fully support the delivery of value-added results, they do provide a critical level of consistent support for the ongoing work. This funding will be leveraged to generate additional foundation and research support for the work. One such value-added research partner could be Value-Added Research Center (VARC) at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, which has a proven record in its ability to secure funding for its value-added district-level work in Milwaukee, Chicago, and New York City as well as state-level work in Wisconsin, Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota. If chosen as a partner, VARC's prominence as a center of research and applied analytics in this area will allow us to leverage State resources in the future as well as draw on outside funding for this work. In particular, expanding our investment in summative assessment growth and value-added analysis addresses critical accountability and instructional improvement requirements of the RTTT application. In short, value-added analysis gets at the "apples to apples" concerns about accurately comparing of school performance, providing valuable data to educators, parents and students.

However, the expanding our growth and value-added analysis around the State's summative assessment is only the first step. Moreover, the State's work on diagnostic and benchmark value-added analysis actually follows two distinct tracks. As part of the multi-state consortium, WDPI will be leveraging the best thinking about the future of benchmark assessments across several national partnerships. Meanwhile, the State's value-added research partner will work with individual districts in Wisconsin as well as nationally around developing diagnostic value-added analytics, based on shorter-cycle assessments. In working with a national partner like VARC, the State would be able to leverage their expertise as well as their multi-state consortium for professional development and report artifacts, which could inform the development of our next generation assessment system. This approach would allow leverage the innovation of local districts, while providing a laboratory for the development of professional

development resources in anticipation of the new assessment. This process will lead to a more mature assessment tool that has a significantly higher degree of precision for value-added analysis.

With this work as a foundation, WDPI will conduct internal research on the use of the instructional improvement system and examine the link between benchmark and summative assessment with pilot LEAs. The State will also continue its current research partnership with VARC, leveraging the expertise of these nationally recognized value-added researchers.

VALUE-ADDED RESEARCH EXPANSION											
GOAL	KEY ACTIVITIES	TIMELINE	KEY PARTIES								
Expand district participation	 Review progress on current statewide value-added project 	• Year 1 (Q1 – Q3)	WDPIValue-added research partner								
in growth reporting and / or value-added analysis around the current summative	VARC Forming Multi-State Advisory Group	• Year 1 (Q2 – Q4)	WDPIValue-added research partner								
assessment and pilot new benchmark assessment	 Reconfirm Existing Data Exchange Agreements 	• Year 1 (Q1 – Q2)	WDPIValue-added research partner								
value-added and growth reporting work	 Confirm MOUs with other Test Vendors for Development (ThinkLink, MAP, etc.) 	• Year 1 (Q1 – Q4)	WDPIValue added research partner								
	 Form test development advisory group 	• Year 1 (Q2) – Year 2 (Q1)	WDPIValue added research partner								
Increase the precision and accuracy of growth reporting	 Test integration of VA metrics in LDS (Using Pilot Data) 	• Year 1 (Q1 – Q2)	WDPIValue added research partner								
Integrate growth reporting of the State's summative and	Test integration of VA metrics using local assessments	• Year 1 (Q3) – Year 2 (Q3)	WDPIValue added research partner								
the State's summative and benchmark assessments into the statewide LDS	 Collaborate around the value-added properties of new assessments 	• Year 1 (Q3) – Year 3 (Q2)	WDPIValue added research partner								
	Field VA results for local benchmark assessments	• Year 1 (Q3) – Year 3 (Q2)	WDPIValue added research partner								

Table 44 – Implementation plan for expanding value-added research.

VALUE-ADDED RESEARCH EXPANSION																
KEY TASK	YEAR 1			YEAR 2				YEAR 3				YEAR 4				
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Review progress on current statewide value- added project	•	•	•													
VARC Forming Multi-State Advisory Group		•	•	•												
Reconfirm Existing Data Exchange Agreements	•	•														
Confirm MOUs with other Test Vendors for Development (ThinkLink, MAP, etc.)	•	•	•	•												
Form test development advisory group		•	•	•	•											
Test integration of VA metrics in LDS (Using Pilot Data)	•	•														
Test integration of VA metrics using local assessments				•	•	•	•									
Coordinate with TAC, WDPI, OEII on VA properties of new assessments			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•						
Field VA results for local benchmark assessments			•	•	•	•										
VARC Forming Multi-State Advisory Group																

Table 45 – Timeline for value-added research expansion.

Table 46 – Performance Measures (C)(3) Performance measures for this criterion are optional. If the State wishes to include performance measures, please enter them as rows in this table and, for each measure, provide annual targets in the columns provided.	most recent)	(Current school year or	Actual Data: Baseline	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014	

(D) Great Teachers and Leaders (138 total points)

State Reform Conditions Criteria

(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals (21 points)

The extent to which the State has—

- (i) Legal, statutory, or regulatory provisions that allow alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice) for teachers and principals, particularly routes that allow for providers in addition to institutions of higher education;
- (ii) Alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice) that are in use; and
- (iii) A process for monitoring, evaluating, and identifying areas of teacher and principal shortage and for preparing teachers and principals to fill these areas of shortage.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (D)(1)(i), regarding alternative routes to certification for both teachers and principals:

• A description of the State's applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents, including information on the elements of the State's alternative routes (as described in the alternative route to certification definition in this notice).

Evidence for (D)(1)(ii), regarding alternative routes to certification for both teachers and principals:

- A list of the alternative certification programs operating in the State under the State's alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice), and for each:
 - The elements of the program (as described in the alternative routes to certification definition in this notice).
 - The number of teachers and principals that successfully completed each program in the previous academic year.
 - The total number of teachers and principals certified statewide in the previous academic year.

Recommended maximum response length: Two pages

(D)(1)(i) Legal, statutory, or regulatory provisions that allow alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice) for teachers and principals, particularly routes that allow for providers in addition to institutions of higher education;

Evidence for (*D*) (*1*) (*i*), *regarding alternative routes to certification for both teachers and principals:*

• A description of the State's applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents, including information on the elements of the State's alternative routes (as described in the alternative route to certification definition in this notice).

Wisconsin's teacher certification process

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) initiated a collaborative reform effort in 1994 to meet the changing needs of Wisconsin schools and districts. WDPI appointed the Restructuring Teacher Education and Licensure in Wisconsin Task Force that included representatives from all Wisconsin stakeholder groups. Educators from all ranks and areas joined with union representatives, Cooperative Educational Service Agencies (CESAs), representatives from higher education, members of professional organizations, and district superintendents to forge a new structure for educator preparation and licensure in the State of Wisconsin.

The Task Force put forth its recommendations in April 1995. Three work groups immediately formed to respond to the recommendations and detail proposed rules. By May 1997, the work concluded, rules were put forth to the legislature in 1999, and Wis. Admin. Code Ch. PI 34, known as the Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative (WQEI), was promulgated in 2000. The sweeping efforts of multiple stakeholders across the education landscape in Wisconsin set the tone for how quickly the State could mobilize around a noble initiative, the students of Wisconsin.

Under WQEI, the requirements for educator preparation and licensure shifted to a performance-based system and aimed to create a seamless system of preparing and retaining quality educators. Performance-based proficiency is demonstrated by a candidate during the preparation program and continues into an educator's career through a multi-tiered licensing system: initial educator, professional educator, and master educator stages.

Within WQEI, a new provision for granting initial educator licenses based on equivalency was created. This new licensure opened the door for any previous 100-hour permit programs to establish **alternative route certification programs** which provided full educator licenses. It also allowed organizations previously partnering with institutions of higher education to establish their own alternative route program. In Wisconsin, the State Superintendent is given authority in Wis. Stat. § 115.28 (7) to prescribe rule standards and procedures for approval of educator preparation programs leading to licensure. Alternative route programs are specifically prescribed in Wis. Admin. Code § PI 34.17 (6). The complete statutory citations can be found in Appendix 22. The procedures detailed in the *Wisconsin Educator Preparation Program Approval Handbook for the Review of Wisconsin Alternative Route Programs* describe the application process for an alternative route certification program and the program review process for ongoing approval. An excerpt from the handbook, including the tool used to review applications for approval, can be found in Appendix 23.

Wisconsin clearly has State laws that allow the establishment and operation of teacher and administrator preparation programs in the state, and alternative route certification programs which can be provided by various types of qualified providers, including both institutions of higher education and other providers operating independently from institutions of higher education.

(D)(1)(ii) Alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice) that are in use

Evidence for (D) (1) (ii), regarding alternative routes to certification for both teachers and principals:

- A list of the alternative certification programs operating in the State under the State's alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice), and for each:
 - The elements of the program (as described in the alternative routes to certification definition in this notice).
 - The number of teachers and principals that successfully completed each program in the previous academic year.
 - The total number of teachers and principals certified statewide in the previous academic year.

Alternative routes for teacher certification in Wisconsin

Currently, eleven alternative route programs prepare candidates in Wisconsin: nine programs prepare candidates for teaching licenses and two programs prepare candidates for administrative licenses. These programs are operated by non-profit agencies, public and private colleges/universities, and a for-profit organization. Additionally, the state is divided geographically into 12 Cooperative Educational Service Agency (CESA) regions. Each CESA serves as a link between the school districts within the CESA and the State. A detailed description of each program along with data on the number of teachers and principals certified can be found in Appendix 24.

Current program providers include:

Proficiency Based Licensure (PBL) – CESA 1; Residency in Teacher Education (RITE) – CESA 6; Teacher Development Center (TDC) – CESA 7; College of Menominee Nation; Accelerated Teacher Certification - Concordia University Wisconsin; Milwaukee Teacher Education Center (mTec) – 501c non-profit; Norda, Inc. Project Teaching and Norda, Inc. 10SPED – for profit organization; Urban Education Fellows – Alverno College and Mount Mary College; Alternative Careers in Teaching (ACT!) – University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh and University of Wisconsin-Fox Valley; New Leaders for New Schools; and Norda, Inc. WiscAd.

Wisconsin alternative route programs prepare candidates for critical shortage areas and/or seek to increase the diversity of the state's teachers. Examples of critical shortage content fields are special education, mathematics, science, computer science, bilingual-bicultural, and ESL. Content areas difficult to fill due to geographic location may also be considered a critical shortage area. Please refer to the previously mentioned application review tool found in Appendix 23 for a complete picture of the components that must be in place to be approved to operate an alternative route program in Wisconsin.

To complete a program, a candidate must have a bachelor's degree, be proficient in the Wisconsin educator standards and meet the Wisconsin statutory requirements (i.e. conflict resolution, Wisconsin Indian tribes, etc.). Furthermore, a candidate must demonstrate communication skills, human relations and professional dispositions, pedagogical knowledge, content knowledge, and teaching practice through a clinical experience. The Praxis I exams are used as an assessment for communication skills. Content knowledge is assessed through Praxis II content exams and the completion of a major or the equivalent of a major. Alternative route programs complete a review of each candidate's bachelor degree, transcript(s) and experiences to determine if the candidate has a major or the equivalent and to design each candidate's academic path.

A clinical experience, per Wis. Stat. § 118.19 (3), must be at minimum one full semester for full days (18 weeks) following the schedule of the cooperating school district. The clinical experience can be completed through a residency model or while employed by a cooperating school district. Program providers must provide mentors/coaches/supervisors to support candidates during the process. Candidates must demonstrate proficiency in the educator standards through a developmental, performance-based portfolio of evidence. Upon completion, a Wisconsin Initial Educator License is issued which allows candidates to teach or lead in public schools in Wisconsin. Candidates seeking an administrative license must have a master's degree or the equivalent for licensure. For Superintendent licensure, candidates must have a specialist degree or the equivalent.

Though the new measures implemented through recent reform have brought positive changes in the credentialing process, it is only the first step in the process for requiring greater accountability and sufficient measures of teacher performance. Wisconsin recognizes that the system

must advance further in developing adequate, specific, and data driven systems for measuring teacher proficiency. The measures in the Race to The Top grant will bring Wisconsin closer to reaching our goals.

(D)(1)(iii) A process for monitoring, evaluating, and identifying areas of teacher and principal shortage and for preparing teachers and principals to fill these areas of shortage.

Identifying and addressing teacher and principal shortage areas

Wisconsin prepares an annual supply and demand report to provide a profile of the positions considered critical shortage areas for school districts. The data collection registers the number of completers in each licensure area from the 32 public and private institutions of higher education and the 11 alternative route certification programs. A survey is administered directly to school districts ascertaining the number of applicants for vacant positions and identifying hard to staff positions. The data collection of completers, reported directly by the educator preparation programs, correlates with our Title II Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA) reporting data. Supply and demand data is available to the public and posted annually on the WDPI website.

The State has identified special education as our primary shortage area. Secondary shortage areas are: Mathematics, Science, Technology Education, World Languages and ESL. Some school districts, due to their geographic location, may also be experiencing shortages. Wisconsin alternative route programs assist with the recruitment, selection, training, and retention of qualified teachers to address the critical shortage areas identified in the state. Section (D)(3) will further describe how alternative route programs are addressing Wisconsin's critical shortage areas and the equitable distribution of teachers and principals.
Reform Plan Criteria

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance (58 points)

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its Participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to ensure that Participating LEAs (as defined in this notice)—

(i) Establish clear approaches to measuring student growth (as defined in this notice) and measure it for each individual student; (5 points)
(ii) Design and implement rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor, and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; (15 points)

(iii) Conduct annual evaluations of teachers and principals that include timely and constructive feedback; as part of such evaluations, provide teachers and principals with data on student growth for their students, classes, and schools; (10 points) and
(iv) Use these evaluations, at a minimum, to inform decisions regarding— (28 points)

- (a) Developing teachers and principals, including by providing relevant coaching, induction support, and/or professional development;
- (b) Compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals, including by providing opportunities for highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) to obtain additional compensation and be given additional responsibilities;
- (c) Whether to grant tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures; and
- (d) Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals after they have had ample opportunities to improve, and

ensuring that such decisions are made using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures.

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: Ten pages

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its Participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to ensure that Participating LEAs (as defined in this notice)—

(D)(2)(i) Establish clear approaches to measuring student growth (as defined in this notice) and measure it for each individual student;

Measuring student growth

Wisconsin is currently developing a new student assessment system that will transform its statewide testing program into a system that combines state, district, and classroom assessments. As described in Section (C) Data, Wisconsin will be building onto its longitudinal data system to provide the additional data points necessary to connect student growth data to teachers, principals, districts, and educator preparation programs. New assessments at the elementary and middle school level will likely be computer-based with multiple opportunities to benchmark student progress during the school year. This type of assessment tool allows for immediate and detailed information about student understanding and facilitates the teachers' ability to transform state assessment system data to re-teach or accelerate classroom instruction.

Additionally, the WDPI will request proposals on a wide range of assessment system components, seeking maximum flexibility to meet Wisconsin's educational and statutory needs as well as cost and implementation constraints. The new assessments being developed in consortium with the National Common Core Standards Initiative in combination with the development of the new electronic platform to track and evaluate students' progress will provide Wisconsin educators with a system that is responsive to student, teacher, and parent needs while offering greater public accountability for education.

To build on these initiatives:

<u>Strategy 1:</u> Wisconsin is currently developing a Longitudinal Data System (LDS) that can both measure student growth and success as well as inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction. Wisconsin school districts need access to data that shows student growth tracked across time, both within-grade and across-grades. The LDS system will include an upgraded multidimensional analytic tool (MDAT2), a proficiency-based predictor of individual student growth and value-added reports, which can collectively be used examined students at the individual, classroom, school, and district levels. These approaches will help answer crucial questions about progress of our students, educators and schools.

(D)(2)(ii) Design and implement rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor, and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement;

Evaluation Systems

As required in Wis. Stat. § 121.02 (1)(q) and further detailed in Wis. Admin. Code § PI 8.01(2)(q), each school board in the state must establish specific criteria and a systematic procedure to measure the performance of licensed school personnel. The written evaluation must be based on a board adopted position description, including job related activities, and must include observation of the individual's

performance as part of the evaluation data. This evaluation must occur during the first year of employment and at least every third year thereafter. New legislation, 2009 Wisconsin Act 60 was recently enacted, allowing the results of standardized examinations to be used to evaluate teachers. This, too, will propel Wisconsin forward in developing effective teachers and principals. Each district is further required to ensure that evaluations, including those for purposes of discipline, job retention or promotion, are performed by persons who have the training, knowledge and skills necessary to evaluate professional school personnel. The school district board is responsible for the evaluation of the district administrator.

Wis. Admin. Code Ch. PI 8, often referred to as the Twenty Standards for Wisconsin school districts, prescribes the baseline requirements for each school district. Comprehensive monitoring visits to school districts to substantiate compliance must also occur as needed. As such, for Wis. Admin. Code § PI 8.01 (2)(q) each school district in the state should, at all times, be able to provide evidence of the criteria and the systematic procedure used to measure the performance of licensed school personnel; the written evaluations including evidence of an observation; and evidence that the evaluations have occurred during the first year of employment and every third year thereafter.

Since performance evaluation documentation is housed within each school district, a collective perspective of the teacher or principal evaluation systems used by districts across the state is not known at this time. Yet, anecdotally we know models of teacher performance assessments and evaluation systems are in use. As well, districts have introduced student assessment systems to measure student growth. For example, 152 school districts have reported using the MAPTM Measure of Academic Progress. To gain a basic understanding of our districts and to gather baseline data, a survey was developed. The survey protocol questions are available in Appendix 25. The survey data was collected using survey monkey, and data was compiled and analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Results are presented in the evidence tables below. These data will allow the State to identify the components of a teacher and principal evaluation system that are most needed by Wisconsin districts and will assist us in moving forward with the development and piloting of a model evaluation system.

Support for improving the quality of leadership in education, specifically has been addressed through the work completed through two significant grant awards from the Wallace Foundation that will assist us in building our principal evaluation system. In 2004, Wisconsin was

awarded a three-year Wallace Foundation grant. The \$1.2 million grant supported work aimed at improving leadership for urban schools, specifically developing principals for the state's five largest urban school districts: Milwaukee, Madison, Green Bay, Kenosha, and Racine. During the project, three principal preparation programs supported the participants in learning research-based practices on effective strategies for urban principals. The Wisconsin Master Educator Assessment Process was also used as each of these principals worked to achieve their Wisconsin Master Educator License. As a result of the project, valuable principal evaluation resources were developed, including a site visit evaluation tool to measure principal effectiveness. Of the 56 master educator administrators in Wisconsin, 44 were certified as a result of the Wallace project.

In 2008, Wisconsin was awarded another grant from the Wallace Foundation, Learning for Leadership. This \$2 million project increased the capacity of 14 *Leadership for Learning* teams from five urban school districts to lead instructionally focused teams, manage resources, and effectively use data to increase student achievement, as well as strengthen field placement and mentoring supports for preservice administrators. The grant further leveraged resources through a Statewide High School Leadership Network to share lessons learned through the grant throughout the state. This grant also helped align leadership development from preservice training through the state's three licensure levels. The project brought together a state work team to develop new program standards for principal preparation based on the national 2008 Interstate Standards for Leadership and Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards. Of significance is the development of a toolkit of leader assessment measures and supporting documents, and a toolkit for use in leadership teams. The aligned system of leadership development will ultimately will impact the state's 15 preservice and three alternative pathways to educational leadership training programs. While the grant concludes in August 2010, Wisconsin has gained considerable knowledge of principal effectiveness and evaluation systems. We will continue to pilot and validate these performance assessment pieces and build upon the invaluable learning gained as we move forward to develop and pilot a model evaluation system for Wisconsin teachers and principals.

To build on these initiatives, Wisconsin plans to:

<u>Strategy 1</u>: Conduct a survey to establish an initial baseline for the percentage of Participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for teachers and principals, and to determine how evaluation systems are used.

<u>Strategy 2</u>: Develop and pilot a model evaluation system for **teachers** based on Wisconsin Educator Standards, aligned with the National Board Certification and the Wisconsin Master Educator Assessment Process, which includes student growth as a significant factor. This model evaluation system may also include: growth models, classroom observations, supervisor evaluations, analysis of classroom or school artifacts, portfolios, self-reports of practice and multiple student achievement measures. This evaluation system will be developed in conjunction with educational institutions, professional organizations, and other related education stakeholders.

<u>Strategy 3</u>: Develop and pilot a model evaluation system for **principals** based on Wisconsin Educator Standards, aligned with the National Board Certification and the Wisconsin Master Educator Assessment Process, and with student growth as a significant factor. This model evaluation system may include: growth models, building site visits, supervisor evaluations, analysis of classroom or school artifacts, portfolios, self-reports of practice, and multiple student achievement measures. This evaluation system will be developed in conjunction with educational institutions, professional organizations, and other related education stakeholders.

<u>Strategy 4</u>: Participate in a ten state partnership created by the Council of Chief State Officers (CCSSO) and the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) to develop, pilot and validate a preservice teacher performance assessment tool to be used by educator preparation programs to evaluate and endorse candidates for State licensure. Wisconsin will provide funding for students from Alverno College, University of Wisconsin-Madison, and the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, which are all current program participants, to field test the tool. Additional educator preparation programs may be added based on an available funding basis.

(D)(2)(iii) Conduct annual evaluations of teachers and principals that include timely and constructive feedback; as part of such evaluations, provide teachers and principals with data on student growth for their students, classes, and schools;

Annual evaluations that include student growth data

As described in (D)(2)(i), Wis. Stat. § 121.02 (1)(q) and Wis. Admin. Code § PI 8.01(2)(q), establish specific criteria and a systematic procedure to measure the performance of licensed school personnel. An observation of the individual's performance must be included as part of the evaluation data. Wisconsin statutory language indicates the evaluation must occur during the first year of employment and at least every third year thereafter. However the State recognizes that an annual evaluation of teachers and principals will provide more timely feedback and encourage the development of effective educators.

To build on these initiatives, the State Plan requires Participating LEAs to develop and/or implement a rigorous, transparent, and fair annual evaluation system for teachers and principals that differentiates effectiveness using multiple rating categories, takes into account data on student growth as a significant factor, and includes multiple observations or examples of actual classroom instruction. For teacher evaluations, districts may adopt: an established model which may include, but not be limited to, piloting the Gates tools for teacher evaluations, contracting with the New Teacher Center for the use of their formative assessment system, or adopt the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) model, or districts may design a comparably rigorous, locally developed evaluation system. For principal evaluations, districts may adopt: an established model which may include, but not be limited to, using the evaluation system. For principal evaluations, districts may adopt: an established model which may include, but not be limited to, using the evaluation system. For principal evaluations, districts may adopt: an established model which may include, but not be limited to, using the evaluation protocol developed by New Leaders for New Schools or using the principal score card developed in the Milwaukee Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) project, or district's may co-design a comparably rigorous, locally developed evaluation system. (*See Exhibit I of the MOU in Appendix 2 for more information*)

(D)(2)(iv) Use these evaluations, at a minimum, to inform decisions regarding—

- (a) Developing teachers and principals, including by providing relevant coaching, induction support, and/or professional development;
- (b) Compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals, including by providing opportunities for highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) to obtain additional compensation and be given additional responsibilities;
- (c) Whether to grant tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures; and
- (d) Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals after they have had ample opportunities to improve, and ensuring that such decisions are made using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures.

Using evaluations to inform professional development and advancement

To support initial educators, Wisconsin school districts, per Wis. Admin. Code § PI 34.17 (2), are required to provide ongoing orientation, support seminars and qualified mentors for all initial educators within their districts. School districts can secure funds to assist in developing and supporting the required induction program. Wis. Stat. § 115.405 (2m)(b) provides for districts to receive up to \$375 per initial educator, determined by the amount that the employer is spending to provide support for the initial educator through mentoring, orientation, and support seminars. Funding exists to cover one year of induction support, and the remaining funds are prorated to cover induction support for year two; however, only one year of induction is currently required under State law. These allocations to districts have grown over the last three years as districts have developed their induction programs. To date, \$3,330,053 has been awarded since the 2006-2007 school year.

Further, the Peer Review and Mentoring Grant, authorized through Wis. Stat. § 115.405, is an annual competitive grant to consortia partners. Priority is given, by the department, to consortia that include schools where at least 30% of students are eligible for free and/or reduced priced lunch and whose programs focus on improving student learning through differentiated training and support for educators in mentoring, induction, and/or professional development plan development.

In order to evaluate how districts were addressing the induction and mentoring requirements, with the assistance of Great Lakes West Comprehensive Assistance Center, surveys were developed and administered for the past three years to evaluate the initial educator support system. Each year, surveys were sent to initial educator teacher, initial educator administrators, initial educator pupil services professionals, and their respective mentors. These data have provided valuable insights into the induction programs in the state. Some problem areas include: inconsistent quality of mentor training; insufficient mentor release time; insufficient initial educator release time; and, varying quality of support seminars. The WDPI has responded with the creation of additional resources and support to all stakeholders involved in the process. Additionally, three statewide seminars have been held each year with the assistance of Great Lakes West. Of importance is the emphasis Wisconsin places on utilizing multiple state stakeholder groups to gather feedback and collaborate on improvements to the Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative. To truly move forward, we must learn from the survey data, mobilize our stakeholders across the state, and place considerable resources in taking our mentoring and induction system to a level of excellence.

In addition to the statutory requirements for districts to have an induction program and mentor for all initial educators, districts per Wis. Admin. Code § PI 34.17(3) must designate a WDPI trained administrator to be available to serve on the initial educator's Professional Development Plan (PDP) team. Institutions of higher education (IHE) per Wis. Admin. Code § PI 34.17 (3) must also designate representatives to be trained and to be available to serve on the initial educator's PDP team. This provides a connection from preservice to in-service within the performance-based system. A three person team including an administrator, a teacher, and an IHE representative approve and verify the PDP of an initial educator. Beginning in January 2005, WDPI began training PDP team members. To date, 238 training sessions have occurred to train representatives from institutions of higher education (IHE), administrators from school districts, pupil services professionals, and teachers to serve on PDP teams. As of June 2009, the total number of trained PDP team members serving in Wisconsin included: 781 IHE representatives; 3,191 administrators; 555 pupil services professionals; and 7,017 teachers.

To address the requirements of D(2)(iv) (b), (c) and (d), we did not require specific action on these measures of all Participating LEAs, but the purpose of the competitive grant program is to reward districts that are willing to tackle these more contentious issues. In addition, the

large urban districts and districts identified for improvement are encouraged to develop monetary incentives under closing the achievement gap initiatives.

To build on these initiatives, Wisconsin plans to:

<u>Strategy 1</u>: Develop mentor and coaching guidelines and best practices to improve effectiveness. The WDPI will work in collaboration and/or contract with groups such as educational institutions, CESAs, professional organizations, and/or non-profit organizations to build on existing efforts to develop and provide high quality mentoring and coaching guidelines as well as best practices for teachers and principals. These guidelines and best practices will include: mentoring and coaching strategies; guidelines for length and quality of mentoring and coaching; mentor and coach recruitment and selection; and, mentoring and coaching training materials.

<u>Strategy 2</u>: Provide high quality coaching and mentoring resources and tools for principal and teacher effectiveness. The OEII will work in collaboration and/or contract with groups such as educational institutions, CESAs, professional organizations, and/or non-profit organizations to create and provide professional development modules, tools, and training around principal and teacher effectiveness. These tools will be based on the best practices and methods of evaluating and supporting teachers and principals previously identified under Strategy 1.

<u>Strategy 3</u>: Provide mentor academies, training, and support. The OEII will work in collaboration and/or contract with groups such as educational institutions, CESAs, professional organizations, and non-profit organizations to provide mentor academies and training throughout the state, using the guidelines, best practices, resources, and tools (including professional development modules) already developed under Strategy 1 and Strategy 2.

<u>Strategy 4</u>: Provide coaching institutes, training, and support. The OEII will work in collaboration and/or contract with groups such as educational institutions, CESAs, professional organizations, and non-profit organizations to provide coaching institutes and training

throughout the state, using the guidelines, best practices, resources and tools (including professional development modules) already developed under Strategy 1 and Strategy 2.

<u>Strategy 5</u>: Require Participating LEAs to implement a teacher mentoring program that utilizes an ongoing feedback process that supports teacher growth and development. Teacher mentors must be highly trained, at least partially released from classroom responsibility (or compensated for additional hours of service if specified in the Final Work Plan), and must work with new teachers for at least two years. Districts may develop their own teacher mentoring program or contract with training organizations such as CESAs, The New Teacher Center, or institutions of higher education to implement this reform. (*See Exhibit I of the MOU in Appendix 2*)

<u>Strategy 6</u>: Require Participating LEAs to implement a principal mentoring program that includes ongoing feedback and supports principal development. Principal mentors must be highly trained and principal leadership programs must be high quality. Mentoring programs should address effective use of data and teacher evaluations to inform instructional improvement and staff professional development. Districts may develop their own principal mentoring program or contract with training organizations such as New Leaders for New Schools to implement this reform. (*See Exhibit I of the MOU in Appendix 2*)

<u>Strategy 7</u>: Require Participating LEAs to provide school-based coaches for reading and mathematics at a level such that there are coaches in each school in the district at least the equivalent of one full day each week. These coaches must be highly trained and work with teachers in classrooms to implement new curriculum and/or instructional strategies as well as assist teachers in using data effectively to improve instruction. (*See Exhibit I of the MOU in Appendix 2*)

<u>Strategy 8</u>: Require Participating LEAs to provide professional development and support to staff to implement new curriculum and/or instructional strategies as well as to use data effectively to improve instruction. Districts must use student achievement data, as well as teacher and principal evaluations, to inform professional development. Districts must participate in evaluations or conduct their own evaluations of the effectiveness of the professional development offered by the district. (*See Exhibit I of the MOU in Appendix 2*)

Table 47 – Implementation plan for mentoring.

		MENTORING	
GOAL	KEY ACTIVITIES	TIMELINE	KEY PARTIES
	Establish stakeholder process	• Year 1 (Q1)	 WDPI Stakeholders (AWSA, WASB, WASDA, New Teacher Center, LEAs, education related experts)
Develop mentor and coaching guidelines and	• Review key literature	• Year 1 (Q1)	WDPI Stakeholders
best practices to improve effectiveness	Develop mentor guidelines	• Year 1 (Q1)	WDPI Stakeholders
(D)(2)(iv) Strategy 1:	• Develop guidelines for math and reading coaches	• Year 1 (Q1)	WDPI,Stakeholders
Mentor and Coaching Guidelines (also (D)(5)(i))	Publish the guidelines	• Year 1 (Q2)	WDPI Stakeholders
	Identify resources to be developed	• Year 1 (Q2)	WDPI Stakeholders
	Contract with outside experts for resource development	• Year 1 (Q2 – Q4)	• WDPI
Provide high quality coaching and mentoring	Develop mentor training curriculum and resources	• Year 1 (Q2 – Q4)	Contract entityWDPI
resources and tools for principal and teacher	Develop coaching resources	• Year 1 (Q2 – Q4)	Contract entityWDPI
(D)(2)(iv) Strategy 2:	Plan mentor training and coaching institutes	• Year 1 (Q2 – Q3)	WDPI Stakeholders
(D)(2)(W) Strategy 2. Coaching and Mentoring	Conduct Mentor training	• Year 1 (Q4)	• WDPI
Resources and Tools (also (D)(5)(i)	Conduct Mentor academy	• Year 2 - Year 4	WDPIStakeholder group
Provide mentor academies and training throughout the	• Evaluate training and make updates	• Year 2 - Year4	WDPI Stakeholders
state, using the guidelines,	Conduct math coach training	• Year 2 - Year4	• WDPI
best practices, resources, and tools	Conduct reading coach training	• Year 2 - Year4	• WDPI
and tools	• Evaluate training and make updates	• Year 2 - Year4	• WDPI
(D)(2)(iv) Strategy 3: Mentor Academies, Training, Support			

Provide coaching institutes	Ongoing support	• Year 2 - Year4	• WDPI
and training throughout the			
state, using the guidelines,			
best practices, resources and			
tools			
(D)(2)(iv) Strategy 4:			
Coaching Institutes,			
Training, and Support			

Currently, per statute, LEA's must provide a trained mentor for all initial educators. Inconsistent practices exist across the state as the language is interpreted. While some funding is available to LEAs to provide mentoring, funding does not exist for all LEAs to implement a high-quality induction program. A set of concrete guidelines for selection, training, and using mentors for a two-year induction program is needed to provide greater consistency and improve the quality of initial educator induction. Once the guidelines are developed, resources and support tools along with high-quality mentor training will provide quality induction. RTTT funding will allow the state to develop a high-quality two-year mentoring program with training and resources accessible to all LEAs.

Currently, guidance does not exist to assist LEAs in selection, training, and use of math and reading coaches. Additionally, licensure questions have not been addressed. RTTT funding will allow the state to develop clear guidelines on how to select, train, and use reading and math coaches. It will also support the development of resources to support coaches and coaching institutes to train coaches.

Table 48 – Timeline for implementing and expanding mentoring activities.

MENTOR	ING															
KEY TASK		YE	AR 1			YEA	AR 2			YEA	AR 3			YE/	AR 4	
	Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4												
Establish stakeholder process	•															
Review key literature	•															
Develop mentor guidelines	•															
Develop guidelines for math and reading coaches	•															
Publish the guidelines		•														
Identify resources to be developed		•														
Contract with outside experts for resource development			•	•	•											
Develop mentor training curriculum and resources			•	•	•											
Develop coaching resources			•	•	•											
Plan mentor training and coaching institutes		٠	•													
Conduct Mentor training				•	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠
Conduct Mentor academy				•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠
Evaluate training and make updates				•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠
Conduct math coach training				•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠
Conduct reading coach training				•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Evaluate training and make updates				•	•	•	•	•	٠	•	٠	•	•	•	•	•
Ongoing support				•	٠	•	٠	•	٠	•	٠	•	•	•	٠	۲

Table 49 – Implementation plan for model evaluations.

	MO	DEL EVALUATIONS	
GOAL	KEY ACTIVITIES	TIMELINE	KEY PARTIES
	Contract with outside expert	• Year 1 (Q1)	• WDPI
	• Establish stakeholder process	• Year 1 (Q1)	 Contract entity WDPI Stakeholders (AWSA, WASB, WASDA, UW-Madison, Wallace LEAs, education related experts, principals)
	Review key literature	• Year 1 (Q1)	 Contract entity WDPI Stakeholders
Develop and pilot a model evaluation system for principals	• Evaluate Wallace grant site visit tools	• Year 1 (Q1)	 Contract entity WDPI Stakeholders
(D)(2)(ii) Strategy 3: Model Evaluation System for	Make recommendations for tool development	• Year 1 (Q1)	Contract entityWDPIStakeholders
Principals	Develop remaining evaluation tools	• Year 1 (Q2-3)	Contract entityWDPI
	Pilot tools	• Year 1 (Q3-4) – Year 2	 Contract entity WDPI LEAs
	Provide training to support implementation of tools	• Years 2-3	Contract entityWDPI
	Conduct follow up evaluation	• Year 4	 Contract entity WDPI Stakeholders
	Contract with outside expert	• Year 1 (Q1)	WDPI
Develop and pilot a model evaluation system for teachers	• Establish stakeholder process	• Year 1 (Q1)	 Contract entity WDPI Stakeholders (WEAC, AFT, AWSA, WASB, WASDA, education related experts, teachers)
(D)(2)(ii) Strategy 2: Model Evaluation System for	• Review key literature	• Year 1 (Q1)	Contract entityWDPIStakeholders
L CUCITET S	• Review and evaluate tools currently in use by LEAs	• Year 1 (Q1)	 Contract entity WDPI Stakeholders

Make recommendations for tool development	• Year 1 (Q1)	Contract entityWDPIStakeholders
• Develop remaining evaluation tools	• Year 1 (Q2-3)	Contract entityWDPI
Pilot tools	• Year 1 (Q3-4) – Year 2	Contract entityWDPILEAs
• Provide training to support implementation of tools	• Years 2-3	Contract entityWDPI
Conduct follow up evaluation	• Year 4	Contract entityWDPIstakeholders

Two grants from the Wallace Foundation to the WDPI have been used to develop a site tool for principal evaluation as well as the initial development of other preliminary principal evaluation tools. Prior to beginning this work, Wisconsin did not have a well-developed, research-based principal or teacher evaluation model. Wisconsin school districts have a wide variety of evaluation tools and student growth assessment systems/models currently in use at the local level.

The RTTT funding will allow us to develop a model principal evaluation system and a model teacher evaluation system that includes a student growth component and evaluation tools to differentiate ineffective, effective, and highly effective categories. The model evaluation system will be available for LEAs to use.

				MO	DEL EV	VALUA'	TIONS									
KEY TASK		YE	AR 1			YE	AR 2			YE	AR 3			YE	AR 4	
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Contract with outside expert	•															
Establish stakeholder process	•															
Review key literature	•															
Evaluate Wallace grant site visit tools	•															
Make recommendations for tool development	•															
Develop remaining evaluation tools		•	•													
Pilot tools			•	•	•	•	•	•								
Provide training to support implementation of																
tools					•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•				
Conduct follow up evaluation													•	•	•	•
Contract with outside expert	•															
Establish stakeholder process	•															
Review key literature	•															
Review and evaluate tools currently in use																
by LEAs	•															
Make recommendations for tool development	•															
Develop remaining evaluation tools		•	•													
Pilot tools			•	•												
Provide training to support implementation of																
tools					•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•				
Conduct follow up evaluation													•	•	•	•

Table 50 – Timeline for implementing model evaluation activities.

	PRESERV	VICE ASSESSMENT TOOL	
GOAL	KEY ACTIVITIES	TIMELINE	KEY PARTIES
	• Sign letters of intent to participate	• Year 1 (Q1)	 WDPI Alverno UW-Madison UW-Eau Claire
Participate in a ten state partnership created by the Council of Chief State	Conduct PACT critique of current model	• Year 1 (Q2)	 WDPI Alverno UW-Madison UW-Eau Claire
Officers (CCSSO) and the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE)	Field test tools	• Year 1(Q2) – Year 3	AlvernoUW-MadisonUW-Eau Claire
(D) (2)(ii) Strategy 4: Preservice Teacher	• Evaluate the field tests	• Year 1(Q2) –Year 3	AlvernoUW-MadisonUW-Eau Claire
Performance Assessment	Secure access to completed tools, and electronic results	• Year 3	• WDPI
	Report field test results and project updates to Wisconsin Preparation programs	• Years 2-4	 WDPI Alverno UW-Madison UW-Eau Claire

Table 51 – Implementation plan for preservice assessment tool.

Currently Wisconsin WDPI along with Alverno College, UW-Madison, and UW-Eau Claire have joined a ten state partnership to develop, field test, and bring to scale a national preservice teacher performance assessment tool. The project is fully funded by AACTE up to the final phase of implementation. RTTT funding will assist Wisconsin in completing the final phase of implementation by accelerating the field testing and securing access to results. As a result, Wisconsin preparation programs will be able to begin accessing the tool for use sooner.

			PR	ESERV	ICE AS	SSESSN	IENT TO	OOL								
KEY TASK				YE	AR 1					YEAR 2	2	YE	EAR 3		YEAR	4
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Sign letters of intent to participate	•															
Conduct PACT critique of current model		•														
Field test tools		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•				
Evaluate the field tests		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•				
Secure access to completed tools, and																
electronic results									•	•	•	•				
Report field test results and project updates to																
Wisconsin Preparation programs					•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	

Table 52 – Timeline for implementing preservice assessment tool activities.

Table 53 - PerNotes: Data shcontained in thare those that	rformance Measures (D)(2) nould be reported in a manner consistent with the definitions his application package in Section II. Qualifying evaluation systems meet the criteria described in (D)(2)(ii).	(Current school	Baseline	Actual Data:	End of SY 2010- 2011	End of SY 2011- 2012	End of SY 2012- 2013	End of SY 2015- 2014		
Criteria	General goals to be provided at time of application:		B	aseli	ne data a	and ann	ual targe	ts		
(D)(2)(i)	Percentage of Participating LEAs that measure student growth (as defined in this notice).	,	77%	,)	79%	82%	91%	100%		
(D)(2)(ii)	Percentage of Participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for teachers.		14%	,)	18%	48%	79%	100%		
(D)(2)(ii)	Percentage of Participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for principals.	28%		28%		28%		48%	75%	100%
(D)(2)(iv)	Percentage of Participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems that are used to inform:									

(D)(2)(iv)(a)	Developing teachers and principals.	14%	24%	38%	65%	100%
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	Compensating teachers and principals.	6.12%	7%	12%	19%	25%
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	Promoting teachers and principals.	9.81%	100%	100%	100%	100%
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	Retaining effective teachers and principals.	5.6%	7.5%	15%	29%	35%
(D)(2)(iv)(c)	• Granting tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals.	9.24%	11%	19%	35%	50%
(D)(2)(iv)(d)	• Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals.	13%	19%	34%	47%	60%

Performance Measures Data

Of the 431 LEAs signing MOUs, 357 submitted data to the survey (covered in greater detail in the following paragraphs). Our baseline data and targets in this data table are calculated based on the 357 LEAs who submitted both a signed MOU and completed a survey. On award of a RTTT grant this baseline data and annual targets will be updated through a more robust survey of all Participating LEAs.

Since performance evaluation documentation is housed within each school district, a collective perspective of the teacher or principal evaluation systems used by districts across the state is not known at this time. Yet, anecdotally we know models of teacher performance assessments and evaluation systems are in use. As well, districts have introduced student assessment systems to measure student growth.

To gain a basic understanding of our districts and to gather baseline data, a survey was developed. The survey protocol questions are available in Appendix 25. The survey data was collected using survey monkey and data was compiled and analyzed using SPSS. This data will allow the State to identify the components of a teacher and principal evaluation system that are most needed by Wisconsin districts and will assist us in moving forward with the development and piloting of a model evaluation system.

The following explanations will provide context for how our survey data was used to determine our baseline data and to make an initial

projection of annual targets across the next four years.

Criteria - General goals to be provided at time of application:

<u>(D)(2)(i)</u>

Percentage of Participating LEAs that measure student growth (as defined in this notice)

Using the <u>student growth</u> definition and the <u>student achievement</u> definition in the *Race to the Top Application for Initial Funding CFDA Number: 84.395A*, three survey questions were developed. Two examples of common student assessment systems being used in Wisconsin to measure student growth were included in the first question. Participating LEAs would need to respond yes to the first question to be included in our baseline data. We expect to see this number near a full participation rate by SY 2013-2014. However, we expect a small increase in the first two years of the project, as districts research and implement systems and as the State builds a new student assessment system.

Student Growth Models

- Y N a) Other than the WKCE, our district tracks student progress across time (for example: MAPS, ThinkLink, etc.)
- Y N b) Our district provides **teachers** with student growth data for their students, classes, and schools
- Y N c) Our district provides **principals** with student growth data for their students, classes, and schools

(D)(2)(ii)

Percentage of Participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for teachers

Using the <u>effective teacher</u> definition and the <u>highly effective teacher</u> definitions in the *Race to the Top Application for Initial Funding CFDA Number: 84.395A*, using the parameters we have identified for the model teacher evaluation system that will be developed within

this project, and using the MOU requirements for our Participating LEAs, survey questions were developed. The first two questions (a) and (b) focus on student growth attributes of a teacher evaluation system. Questions (c) through (f) focus on multiple supplemental measures, including the parameters outlined as possibilities within Wisconsin's model teacher evaluation system that will be developed and piloted during this project. The next questions, (g) through (i), are examples identified in the RTTT definition of highly effective teacher or principal. Some LEAs in Wisconsin are recognizing and awarding additional pay for National Board Certification and Master Educator licensure. Perhaps LEAs are using this as a component within their teacher evaluation system, perhaps even to measure highly effective. The final question (l) will provide a profile of LEAs that are using a purchased teacher evaluation system.

For our baseline data, a **qualifying evaluation system** must include:

- Student growth models <u>and</u> a classroom observation, or
- Student growth models <u>and</u> a purchased product.
- We expect to see this number near a full participation rate by SY 2013-2014. However, we expect a small increase in the first two years of the project, as districts research and implement the components of a teacher evaluation system and as the State builds a model teacher evaluation system.

Does your district use any of these methods/models/measures within your teacher evaluation system?

- Y N a) State standardized test results WKCE, WIDA-ACCESS
- Y N b) Student growth models
- Y N c) Classroom observations
- Y N d) Portfolios containing teacher artifacts

Y N e) Analysis of classroom artifacts

Y N f) Teacher self reports of practices

Y N g) High school graduation rates; attendance rates

Race to the Top Application for Initial Funding CFDA Number: 84.395A

Effective teacher means a teacher whose students achieve acceptable rates (*e.g.*, at least one grade level in an academic year) of student growth (as defined in this notice). States, LEAs, or schools must include multiple measures, provided that teacher effectiveness is evaluated, in significant part, by student growth (as defined in this notice). Supplemental measures may include, for example, multiple observation-based assessments of teacher performance.

Highly effective teacher means a teacher whose students achieve high rates (*e.g.*, one and one-half grade levels in an academic year) of student growth (as defined in this notice). States, LEAs, or schools must include multiple measures, provided that teacher effectiveness is evaluated, in significant part, by student growth (as defined in this notice). Supplemental measures may include, for example, multiple observation-based assessments of teacher performance or evidence of leadership roles (which may include mentoring or leading professional learning communities) that increase the effectiveness of other teachers in the school or LEA.

Wisconsin model evaluation system for teachers

Strategy: Develop and pilot a model evaluation system for **teachers** based on Wisconsin Educator Standards, aligned with the National Board Certification and the Wisconsin Master Educator Assessment Process, and with student growth as a significant factor. This model evaluation system may include: growth models, classroom observations, supervisor evaluations, analysis of classroom or school artifacts, portfolios, self-reports of practice, and multiple student achievement measures. This evaluation system will be developed in conjunction with educational institutions, professional organizations, and other related education stakeholders. *State Plan*

Participating LEAs MOU requirement

Strategy: Require Participating LEAs to develop or implement a rigorous, transparent, and fair annual evaluation system for teachers and principals that differentiates effectiveness using multiple rating categories, takes into account data on student growth as significant factor, and includes multiple observations or examples of actual classroom instruction.

• Districts may adopt an established national model, which may include, but not be limited to, piloting the Gates tools for teacher evaluations, contracting with the New Teacher Center formation assessment system, or adopting the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) model or districts may design a comparably rigorous, locally developed evaluation system. *MOU*

<u>D(2)(ii)</u>

Percentage of Participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for principals

Using the <u>effective principal</u> definition and the <u>highly effective principal</u> definitions in the *Race to the Top Application for Initial Funding CFDA Number: 84.395A*, using the parameters we have identified for the model teacher evaluation system that will be developed within this project, and using the MOU requirements for our Participating LEAs, survey questions were developed. The first two questions (a) and (b) focus on student growth attributes of a principal evaluation system. The next questions (c) through (e) focus on multiple supplemental measures, including examples outlined as possibilities within Wisconsin's model teacher evaluation system parameters that will be developed and piloted during this project. The next questions (f) through (j) were identified as examples in the RTTT definition of highly effective principal. The Wisconsin Master Educator Assessment Process (WMEAP) is parallel to the national board process, and it is used in Wisconsin for administrators and for certificate areas that national board does not have. Question (k) will indicate the LEAs that might be using this as part of their principal evaluation system. The final question (l) will provide a profile of LEAs that are using a purchased principal evaluation system.

For our baseline data, a **qualifying evaluation system** must include:

- Student growth models and at least one additional item (c) (j), or
- Student growth models <u>and</u> a purchased product.
- We expect to see this number near a full participation rate by SY 2013-2014. However, we expect a small increase in the first two years of the project, as districts research and implement the components of a principal evaluation system and as the State builds a model principal evaluation system.

Does your district use any of these methods/models/measures within your principal evaluation system?

- Y N a) State standardized test results WKCE, WIDA-ACCESS
- Y N b) Student growth models
- Y N c) Building site visits
- Y N d) Portfolios containing artifacts
- Y N e) Principal self reports of practices
- Y N f) High school graduation rates; attendance rates
- Y N g) College enrollment rates
- $Y \ N \ h)$ Evidence of supportive teaching and learning conditions
- Y N i) Instructional leadership

Y N j) Family and community engagement

Y N k) Wisconsin Master Educator Assessment Process Licensure

Y N l) A purchased principal evaluation product such as: Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education (VAL-ED)

Race to the Top Application for Initial Funding CFDA Number: 84.395A

Effective principal means a principal whose students, overall and for each subgroup, achieve acceptable rates (*e.g.*, at least one grade level in an academic year) of student growth (as defined in this notice). States, LEAs, or schools must include multiple measures, provided that principal effectiveness is evaluated, in significant part, by student growth (as defined in this notice). Supplemental measures may include, for example, high school graduation rates and college enrollment rates, as well as evidence of providing supportive teaching and learning conditions, strong instructional leadership, and positive family and community engagement.

Highly effective principal means a principal whose students, overall and for each subgroup, achieve high rates (*e.g.*, one and one-half grade levels in an academic year) of student growth (as defined in this notice). States, LEAs, or schools must include multiple measures, provided that principal effectiveness is evaluated, in significant part, by student growth (as defined in this notice). Supplemental measures may include, for example, high school graduation rates; college enrollment rates; evidence of providing supportive teaching and learning conditions, strong instructional leadership, and positive family and community engagement; or evidence of attracting, developing, and retaining high numbers of effective teachers.

Wisconsin model evaluation system for teachers

Strategy: Develop and pilot a model evaluation system for **principals** based on Wisconsin Educator Standards, aligned with the National Board Certification and the Wisconsin Master Educator Assessment Process, and with student growth as a significant factor. This model

evaluation system may include: growth models, building site visits, supervisor evaluations, analysis of classroom or school artifacts, portfolios, self-reports of practice, and multiple student achievement measures. This evaluation system will be developed in conjunction with educational institutions, professional organizations, and other related education stakeholders. *State Plan Overview*

Participating LEAs MOU requirement

Strategy: Require Participating LEAs to develop or implement a rigorous, transparent, and fair annual evaluation system for teachers and principals that differentiates effectiveness using multiple rating categories, takes into account data on student growth as significant factor, and includes multiple observations or examples of actual classroom instruction.

• Districts may use or adopt an established national model, which may include, but not be limited to, using the evaluation protocol developed by New Leaders for New Schools or using the principal score card developed in the Milwaukee Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) project, or districts may co-design a comparably rigorous, locally developed evaluation system. *MOU*

<u>D(2)(iv)</u>

Percentage of Participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems that are used to inform:

D(2)(iv)(a) Developing teachers and principals

- D(2)(iv)(b) Compensating teachers and principals
- D(2)(iv)(b) Promoting teachers and principals
- D(2)(iv)(b) Retaining effective teachers and principals
- D(2)(iv)(c) Granting tenure and/or full certification (where applicable to teachers and principals)

D(2)(iv)(d) Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals

After the data is generated to identify the Participating LEAs with **qualifying evaluation systems for teachers** identified in (D)(2)(ii), these additional survey questions can be used to gather the respective data to collect baseline data for D(2)(iv).

We use our current <u>teacher evaluation</u> system results to:

- Y N a) Develop teachers provide relevant coaching, induction support, and/or professional development based on teachers needs
- Y = N = b) Compensate teachers offer incentives, additional compensation, etc.
- Y = N = c) Promote teachers be given additional responsibilities or leadership roles
- $Y \ \ N \ \ d) \ Retain \ effective \ teachers offer \ incentives \ to \ stay$
- Y N e) Grant tenure (non probationary status)
- Y N f) Remove ineffective probationary and/or non probationary teachers after they have had ample opportunities to improve

Similarly the process is repeated for LEAs with **qualifying evaluation systems for principals** identified in (D)(2)(ii) and these additional survey questions.

We use our current principal evaluation system results to:

- Y N a) Develop principals provide relevant coaching, induction support, and/or professional development based on needs
- $Y \ \ N \ \ b) \ Compensate \ principals offer \ incentives, \ additional \ compensation, \ etc.$

Y N c) Promote principals – be given additional responsibilities or leadership roles Y N d) Retain effective principals – offer incentives to stay Y N e) Grant tenure (non probationary status) Y N f) Remove ineffective principals General data to be provided at time of application: Total number of Participating LEAs. 431 Total number of principals in Participating LEAs. 1,634 Total number of teachers in Participating LEAs. 55,894 Data to be requested of grantees in the future: Criterion Number of teachers and principals in Participating LEAs with (D)(2)(ii) qualifying evaluation systems. $(D)(2)(iii)^{12}$ Number of teachers and principals in Participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year.

 $^{^{12}}$ Note that for some data elements there are likely to be data collection activities the State would do in order to provide aggregated data to the Department. For example, in Criteria (D)(2)(iii), States may want to ask each Participating LEA to report, for each rating category in its evaluation system, the definition of that category and the number of teachers and principals in the category. The State could then organize these two categories as effective and ineffective, for Department reporting purposes.

Number of teachers and principals in Participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year.
Number of teachers and principals in Participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems whose evaluations were used to inform compensation decisions in the prior academic year.
Number of teachers and principals in Participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as effective or better and were retained in the prior academic year.
Number of teachers in Participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were eligible for tenure in the prior academic year.
Number of teachers in Participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems whose evaluations were used to inform tenure decisions in the prior academic year.
Number of teachers and principals in Participating LEAs who were removed for being ineffective in the prior academic year.
-

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals (25 points)

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its Participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

(i) Ensure the equitable distribution of teachers and principals by developing a plan, informed by reviews of prior actions and data, to ensure that students in high-poverty and/or high-minority schools (both as defined in this notice) have equitable access to highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) and are not served by ineffective teachers and principals at higher rates than other students; (*15 points*) and

(ii) Increase the number and percentage of effective teachers (as defined in this notice) teaching hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas including mathematics, science, and special education; teaching in language instruction educational programs (as defined under Title III of the ESEA); and teaching in other areas as identified by the State or LEA. (*10 points*)

Plans for (i) and (ii) may include, but are not limited to, the implementation of incentives and strategies in such areas as recruitment, compensation, teaching and learning environments, professional development, and human resources practices and processes.

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can

be found.

Evidence for (D)(3)(i):

• Definitions of high-minority and low-minority schools as defined by the State for the purposes of the State's Teacher Equity Plan.

Recommended maximum response length: Three pages

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its Participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

(D)(3)(i) Ensure the equitable distribution of teachers and principals by developing a plan, informed by reviews of prior actions and data, to ensure that students in high-poverty and/or high-minority schools (both as defined in this notice) have equitable access to highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) and are not served by ineffective teachers and principals at higher rates than other students; (15 points) and

Equitable distribution of teachers

Wisconsin collects data annually to report the highly qualified status of the teaching force. Any districts with educators reported as not highly qualified must file a highly qualified report with the Department of Public Instruction and ensure these educators are enrolled in an educator preparation program working towards full licensure, are provided with high quality professional development, and demonstrating content knowledge through the passing of a Praxis II content exam and the completion of a major. Teacher quality data collected and reported for the 2007-2008 school year pursuant to §9101(23) of ESEA can be found in Appendix 26, Wisconsin Teacher Quality Data 2007-08.

Wisconsin prepares an annual supply and demand report to provide a profile of the positions considered critical shortage areas for school districts. The data collection registers the number of completers in each licensure area from the 32 public and private institutions of higher education and the 11 alternative route certification programs. A survey is administered directly to school districts ascertaining the number of applicants for vacant positions and identifying hard to staff positions. As a result, the State has a much better perspective of supply versus demand. Nonetheless, we have identified special education as our primary shortage area. Districts have sought emergency licensure for unlicensed candidates in this area. Secondary shortage areas are: Mathematics, Science, Technology,Education, World Languages and English as a Second Language (ESL). Some school districts, due to their geographic location, may also be experiencing shortages. Several programs are now operating to assist with the recruitment, selection, training, and retention of qualified teachers to address the human capital needs of high-poverty districts and the critical shortage areas identified in the state.

The WDPI received a \$2.2 million, five-year grant award through the U.S. Department of Education, Transition to Teaching competitive grant program to train 100 mathematics, science, and special education teachers through alternative route certification programs. The goal of the initiative is to improve both the quantity and quality of the teaching force throughout the schools in the participating high-need local education agencies (LEAs). The Support for Mid-Career Advancement and Retention through Transition-to-Teaching (SMARTT) Project targets mid-career professionals, paraprofessionals, recent college graduates, and honorably discharged military personnel. Individuals must already have a bachelor's degree, but not a teaching license. Candidates who are accepted and enroll in the project typically complete the program within 1 to 2 years. Graduates from this project are required to teach in any of the partner LEAs for at least 3 years. The project offers tuition assistance and a \$5,000 incentive to all participants who obtain Wisconsin licensure and fulfill the 3 year teaching commitment.

Wisconsin encourages National Board Certified Teachers (NBCT) and Wisconsin Master Educators to consider relocating to high-need schools in Wisconsin by providing additional compensation. The State has shown considerable growth in the number of teachers identified through the National Board For Professional Teacher Standards process, a process that identifies effective teaching. While many states have reduced or eliminated compensation awards to National Board Certified Teachers (NBCT), the Wisconsin legislature continues to provide a

10-year sum sufficient allocation to NBCT's who teach in Wisconsin public and private schools. Upon certifying, a grant award up to \$2,000 is made to cover the costs incurred to become board certified. For the next nine years, the NBCT is eligible for an annual \$2,500 grant award while teaching in a public or private school in Wisconsin. In 2008, the legislature approved a \$5,000 annual grant for NBCT's who teach in high poverty schools. High Poverty Schools for PI 37 Grants for National Teacher Certification are those in which at least 60% of the pupils enrolled are eligible for a free or reduced-price lunch under 42 USC 1758 (b). Wisconsin has 597 NBCT's. Of those, 519 were teaching in Wisconsin schools and received annual grants this past year: 74 received year one awards totaling \$132,167 for expenses incurred to complete the certification process; 408 received \$2,500 annual grants totaling \$1,020,000; and 37, who worked in a high-need schools, received \$5,000 annual grants totaling \$185,000. School districts have added their own compensation awards for NBCT's in addition to the legislated State award.

Wisconsin was instrumental in developing a comprehensive professional development process for certification areas that are not represented in the national board process. The Wisconsin Master Educator Assessment Process (WMEAP) aligns with the national board process, but extends beyond teaching to include pupil services professionals and administrators. Wisconsin developed the process, trains assessors, and conducts the certification process. Educators who certify through WMEAP earn a 10-year Wisconsin Master Educator license. The State legislature also included WMEAP candidates in the national teacher certification compensation legislation in 2008. The definition of teacher was broadened to include pupil services professionals (school counselors, school social workers, and school psychologists) who work directly with pupils under a teacher contract. Wisconsin has 65 master educators who completed the WMEAP process. Of those, 6 have received annual grants of \$2,500 totaling \$15,000 this past year, and 3, who work in a high-need school, received annual grants of \$5,000 totaling \$15,000. The remaining 56 master educators are administrators.

Fifteen partnering school districts, in high-need geographic areas of the state, will benefit from the equitable distribution of highly qualified teachers. Determined through census data, these districts represent all of the high need districts in the state except Milwaukee Public Schools. These districts experience the recruitment and retention concerns of rural districts and Wisconsin Indian reservation districts, along with the achievement concerns of an urban district. The participating districts are: Augusta, Bayfield, Beloit, Bowler, Cashton,

Chequamegon, Crandon, Granton Area, Hillsboro, Menominee Indian, Northwood, Norwalk-Ontario-Wilton, Royal, Wausaukee, and Weston school districts.

To address shortage areas for Milwaukee Public Schools, specifically in the area of special education, mathematics, science, and bilingual teaching positions, The New Teacher Project (TNTP) was welcomed to Milwaukee as the Milwaukee Teaching Fellows program. Milwaukee Teaching Fellows is a partnership between the Milwaukee Public Schools, Cardinal Stritch University, the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, and Milwaukee Teaching Fellows (TNTP). Nationally, TNTP typically operates as an alternative certification program. In Wisconsin, the Milwaukee Teaching Fellows Project partners with educator preparation programs to complete the content major requirements and State requirements for full licensure. The Milwaukee Teaching Fellows are teachers of record in MPS earning a full salary from MPS. Their training is fully paid through the support of TNTP donor funding. The project serves a valuable role in recruitment, selection, placement, and support during the residency placement for Milwaukee Public Schools. As of September 1, 2009, 40 fellows filled high-need positions in MPS in bilingual education, special education, mathematics, and science.

To address data distribution concerns, especially in the Milwaukee Public Schools District (MPS), a number of initiatives were undertaken:

Teach for America (TFA) is in a partnership with the Milwaukee Public Schools, Cardinal Stritch University, Marquette University, the Kern Family Foundation, and Milwaukee TFA. Nationally, TFA typically operates as an alternative certification program. In Wisconsin, the Milwaukee TFA program partners with educator preparation programs to complete the content major requirements and State requirements for full licensure. The project serves a valuable role in the recruitment, selection, placement, and support during the residency placement for Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS). TFA corps members are teachers of record in MPS earning a full salary from MPS. Their training is paid through the support of TFA donor funding. The TFA placements are assisting MPS in meeting requirements for MPS DIFI status. Milwaukee TFA has placed 37 corps members in MPS positions in elementary, special education, mathematics, science, and additional areas.

Wisconsin recognizes that the development of a corps of leaders helps to support system change in a district. Milwaukee New Leaders for New Schools (NLNS) is approved by the State Superintendent as an alternative route certification program for principal licensure. New Leaders for New Schools operates in Milwaukee, partnering with MPS to recruit, train, place, and support principals in MPS. NLNS places emphasis on training for urban leadership and closing the gap in student achievement. A rigorous selection process is used to ensure leadership potential in an urban setting. Residents must commit to 5 years in the district and training expenses are paid through NLNS donor funding. To date, NLNS Milwaukee has three cohort groups totaling 32 residents who are in MPS at this time. Of the 32 residents, 16 are completing the program to be a licensed principal. The remaining candidates came to the program as fully licensed principals seeking an opportunity for this training as a route to being a principal in MPS.

To build on these initiatives, Wisconsin plans to:

<u>Strategy 1</u>: Develop a longitudinal data system that will collect and track educator supply and demand data, including data on teachers in the Mathematics, Science, ESL and Special Education areas. This information may be used by LEAs or State policy-makers to facilitate the development of incentives to encourage highly effective teachers to relocate to high need schools. (LDS 3 competitive grant submitted.)

<u>Strategy 2</u>: Recruit and prepare through alternative route programs, support with high quality mentoring, and retain 100 special education, mathematics, and science teachers for a 3-year teaching commitment in Wisconsin high-poverty districts. (*Wisconsin SMARTT grant – U.S. Department of Education - \$2 million*)

<u>Strategy 3</u>: Require Participating LEAs to develop a plan to ensure the equitable distribution of effective teachers in high-poverty and highminority schools. (*See Exhibit I of the MOU in Appendix 2*)
(D)(3)(ii) Increase the number and percentage of effective teachers (as defined in this notice) teaching hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas including mathematics, science, and special education; teaching in language instruction educational programs (as defined under Title III of the ESEA); and teaching in other areas as identified by the State or LEA.

Effective teachers for hard-to-staff subjects and schools

As discussed in (D)(3)(i), Wisconsin prepares an annual supply and demand report to provide a profile of the positions considered critical shortage areas for school districts. Through the report, special education has been identified as the State's primary shortage area. Districts have sought the most emergency licensures for unlicensed candidates in this area. Secondary shortage areas are: mathematics, science, technology education, world languages and ESL. Some school districts, due to their geographic location, may also be experiencing shortages. As noted in (D)(3)(i), several programs, including an ED Transition to Teaching Grant, are now operating to assist with the recruitment, selection, training, and retention of qualified teachers to address the shortage of mathematics, science and special education in Wisconsin's high need districts. As well, the Teach for America, the Milwaukee Teaching Fellows, and the New Leaders for New Schools Programs, as presented in (D)(3)(i), are assisting in recruitment of teachers and principals. Section (D)(1) includes information about Wisconsin's alternative route programs which are approved specifically to address Wisconsin critical shortage areas. (See Appendix 24)

Another program in Wisconsin proven to have significant impact at the preservice teacher preparation level is the University of Wisconsin system's Institute for Urban Education. The program aims to advance the field of urban education and to recruit, promote and retain high quality educators for urban districts. Through a three phase program the Institute aims to reach preservice educators, currently practicing educators and scholars who believe in the promise of urban education. In the preservice phase, the Institute accepts a cohort group of approximately 20 preservice students who complete their student teaching clinical experience in the Milwaukee Public Schools. The Institute provides regular support, weekly seminars, and community service connections. Educator preparation programs from across the state line up to gain access to these 20 placements. The Institute reports that of the 59 students who have completed their clinical placements, 88% have signed full time contracts in Milwaukee Public Schools or remained in the field of urban education or community building. The Institute would like to expand its efforts by focusing on adding a STEM cohort of candidates.

Wisconsin has had a long-standing program, Urban Teacher World which has recently expanded. Its aim is to increase the number of students of color exploring careers of teaching in their early academic preparation and explorations of careers. The program offers students opportunities to better understand the many roles a teacher plays in their lives, preparation needed to become a teacher, as well as expose them to campus life and connect them to pre-professional pathways into professional education careers. Partnerships within this programexist between the WDPI, urban school districts, other State agencies and colleges and university. The Urban Teacher World (UTW) program began in 1996 offering college visitations to middle school students. The UTW program provides opportunities for students, especially students of color in grades 6-12 to attend teacher centered student conferences, education fairs, and college visitations. Further, it encourages them to become active in their Future Educators of America club.

To build on these initiatives, Wisconsin plans to:

<u>Strategy 1</u>: Develop a longitudinal data system (LDS) that will collect and track educator supply and demand data as well as information regarding effective teachers in the mathematics, science, ESL and special education areas. This information will be used to facilitate the development of incentives to encourage effective teachers in those licensure areas to relocate to high need schools. (LDS 3 competitive grant submitted)

<u>Strategy 2</u>: Expand urban teacher training and recruitment programs through funding for the University of Wisconsin System's Institute for Urban Education (and/or similar programs) to expand the placement of preservice teachers from across the state in urban centers for their student teaching clinical experience.

<u>Strategy 3</u>: Support programs that recruit prospective secondary and post secondary students interested in urban teaching and / or retain those students or current teachers in an urban setting.

<u>Strategy 4</u>: Develop Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) Academies for students and teachers and construct an academy component that provides incentives for high school teachers to participate through interactive technology in lesson study based on the STEM curriculum from the student academies, observing instruction at the academies, receiving feedback as teachers bring the STEM units of instruction to their schools, and collaborating in professional learning communities.

Plans for (i) and (ii) may include, but are not limited to, the implementation of incentives and strategies in such areas as recruitment, compensation, teaching and learning environments, professional development, and human resources practices and processes.

Evidence for (D)(3)(i): Definitions of high-minority and low-minority schools as defined by the State for the purposes of the State's Teacher Equity Plan. In Wisconsin, high minority and low minority schools as defined by the State, are those in the highest or lowest quartile with regard to student populations. Minority student population is calculated by taking the count on nonwhite students on the Third Friday of September (TFS) in the numerator and the count of total TFS enrollment in the denominator.

	URBAN	TEACHER TRAINING	
GOAL	KEY ACTIVITIES	TIMELINE	KEY PARTIES
Expand urban teacher training and recruitment programs, in particularly the placement of preservice	• Contract with the University of Wisconsin (UW) System Institute for Urban Education to expand programs services.	• Year 1 (Q1)	WDPIUW System
teachers from across the state in urban centers for their student teaching clinical	Management and accountability: collect an annual report, including fiscal and programmatic data.	• Years 1-4 annually (Q4)	WDPI UW System
experience.	• Publish annual report on the WDPI website.	• Years 1-4 annually (Q4)	• WDPI
Establish a competitive grant	Develop competitive grant application	• Year 1 (Q1)	• WDPI
program to provide funding	Award grants to programs	• Year 1 (Q3)	• WDPI
to support programs that recruit prospective secondary and post secondary students	• Management and accountability: collect an annual report, including fiscal and programmatic data.	• Years 1-4 annually (Q4)	• WDPI
and / or retain those students or current teachers in an urban setting.	• Publish annual report on the WDPI website.	• Years 1-4 annually (Q4)	• WDPI

Table 54 – Implementation plan for urban teacher training.

The UW System Institute for Urban Education aims to advance the field of urban education and to recruit, promote and retain high quality educators for urban districts. Through a three-phase program, the institute aims to reach preservice educators, currently practicing educators and scholars who believe in the promise of urban education.

The RTTT funding will allow for a rapid expansion of recruitment and preparation services, expanding the pool of highly qualified mathematics, science, special education and other hard to staff subject teachers for our urban districts.

While a number of future teacher recruitment and development program exist, many of which funnel prospective students into the UW System Institute for Urban Education, there is an insufficient supply of candidates to meet urban education needs in Wisconsin. To this end, funding will be provided to encourage and recruit secondary and postsecondary students, particularly students of color, to enter the teacher professional with a focus on urban education.

				URBAN	N TEAC	HER TI	RAININ	G								
KEY TASK		YE	AR 1		YEAR 2			YEAR 3				YEAR 4				
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Contract with the University of Wisconsin																
(UW) System Institute for Urban Education	•															
to expand programs services.																
Management and accountability: collect an																
annual report, including fiscal and				•				•				•				•
programmatic data.																
Publish annual report on the WDPI website.				•				•				•				•
Develop competitive grant application	•															
Award grants to programs			•													
Management and accountability: collect an																
annual report, including fiscal and				•				•				•				•
programmatic data.																
Publish annual report on the WDPI website.				•				•				•				•

Table 55 – Timeline for urban teacher training expansion activities.

Table 56 - Performance Measures for (D)(3)(i) Note: All information below is requested for Participating LEAs.	Baseline (Current	Actual Data:	End of SY 2011-	End of SY 2012-	End of SY 2013- 2014
General goals to be provided at time of application:	ваѕе	iine dat	a and ai	inual ta	rgets
Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	1.14%	1.9%	4.7%	6.8%	8.5%
Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	37%	39%	47%	59%	70%
Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	35%	32%	26%	20%	13%
Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	1.8%	1.6%	1.2%	.8%	0%
Percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	1.13%	1.9%	4.5%	6.5%	8.5%
Percentage of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	36%	38%	48%	59%	70%
Percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	34%	31%	26%	18%	13%

Percentage of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined	1.90/	1.50/	1 20/	70/	00/
in this notice) who are ineffective.	1.8%	1.3%	1.2%	.1%	0%
<u>(D)(3)(i)</u>					
To establish our baseline data for these performance measures, we will use:					
• signed MOU's from Participating LEAs					
• current data on <u>high-poverty schools</u> and <u>low poverty schools</u> in each of these LEAs					
• current data on <u>high-minority schools</u> in each of these LEAs					
• staffing data on the number of teachers in each of these schools					
• staffing data on the number of principals leading each of these schools					
Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Exam (WKCE) and WINSS data					
As part of the RTTT reform effort, Participating LEAs will be developing teacher evaluation syste	ms and j	principal	evaluati	on syste	ms
that can differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories and take into account data on st	tudent gr	owth as	a signifi	cant fact	or.
The definition of ineffective, effective, and highly effective for each of these LEAs is unknown at	this time	e.			
Our baseline data, therefore, will assume that:					
• all teachers in the school are <u>highly effective</u> if the school has achieved 10% growth on Wi	isconsin	Knowle	dge and	Concept	S
Exam (WKCE) in mathematics, reading, and science for all grades of each participating sc	hools ov	er the la	st three	years 200)6-
2009					

- all teachers in the school are <u>effective</u> if the school has achieved between 5% to 9% growth on WKCE in mathematics, reading, and science for all grades of each participating schools over the last three years 2006-2009
- all teachers in the school are <u>ineffective</u> if the school has achieved 4% or less growth on the WKCE in mathematics, reading, and science for all grades of each participating schools over the last three years 2006-2009
- We expect a small increase in the first two years of the project, as districts research and implement the components of a teacher evaluation system, a principal evaluation system, and a student growth models. We expect some schools will share actual data by SY 2013-2014.
- Our projections will need to be recalculated using more precise measurement data once districts have ratings available to differentiate ineffective, effective, and highly effective
- Our baseline data projection will remain our annual target through SY 2011-2012. In SY 2013-2014 we will assume 10% or our teachers as ineffective, 85% effective and 5% highly effective.

Table 57 - General data to be provided at time of application:		
Total number of schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice).	546	
Total number of schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice).	539	
Total number of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice).	12,434	
Total number of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice).	15,024	

Total number of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice).	383	
Total number of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice).	418	
Data to be requested of grantees in the future:		
Number of teachers and principals in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who were evaluated as highly effective (as defined in this notice) in the prior academic year.		
Number of teachers and principals in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who were evaluated as highly effective (as defined in this notice) in the prior academic year.		
Number of teachers and principals in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year.		
Number of teachers and principals in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year.		

Table 58 - Performance Measures for (D)(3)(ii) Note: All information below is requested for Participating LEAs.	Actual Data: Baseline (Current	2011	End of SY 2010-	End of SY 2011- 2012	End of SY 2012- 2013	End of SY 2013- 2014
General goals to be provided at time of application:	Baseline data and annual					al
				targets	;	
Percentage of mathematics teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	77%	7	9%	83%	87%	90%
Percentage of science teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	75%	7	8%	83%	87%	90%
Percentage of special education teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	65%	6	7%	73%	76%	80%
Percentage of teachers in language instruction educational programs who were evaluated as effective or better.	52%	5.	3%	56%	59%	63%

<u>(D)(3)(ii)</u>

After the calculations were determined in Section (D)(3)(i) for all Participating LEAs, we then extracted the data for mathematics, science, special education, and English as a Second Language teachers who were effective or better.

Table 59 - General data to be provided at time of application:		
Total number of mathematics teachers.	3,499	
Total number of science teachers.	3,316	
Total number of special education teachers.	8,058	
Total number of teachers in language instruction educational programs.	1,041	

Data to be requested of grantees in the future:	
Number of mathematics teachers in Participating LEAs who were evaluated as effective or better	
in the prior academic year.	
Number of science teachers in Participating LEAs who were evaluated as effective or better in the	
prior academic year.	
Number of special education teachers in Participating LEAs who were evaluated as effective or	
better in the prior academic year.	
Number of teachers in language instruction educational programs in Participating LEAs who were	
evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year.	

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs (14 points)

The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

(i) Link student achievement and student growth (both as defined in this notice) data to the students' teachers and principals, to link this information to the in-State programs where those teachers and principals were prepared for credentialing, and to publicly report the data for each credentialing program in the State; and

(ii) Expand preparation and credentialing options and programs that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice).

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals,

activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: One page

The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

(D)(4)(i) Link student achievement and student growth (both as defined in this notice) data to the students' teachers and principals, to link this information to the in-State programs where those teachers and principals were prepared for credentialing, and to publicly report the data for each credentialing program in the State; and

Linking student achievement to educator preparation

All educator preparation programs in the state must annually report to the WDPI completer data for each licensure area. The data is requested and reported for first time licenses and additional licenses. These data, available to the public in the annual Supply and Demand Report, provide a perspective of the state supply of educators. Additionally, completer data for all teaching licenses and the passing scores for content knowledge exams are reported annually to the U.S. Department of Education through the Title II Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA) report. These data are available to the public on the federal Title II HEOA website. Wisconsin will be collecting and reporting additional data that will further delineate preparation program effectiveness, as prescribed by the new guidelines resulting from the reauthorization of the HEOA.

Wisconsin's Quality Educator Initiative, Wis. Admin. Code Ch. PI 34, established broad authority for WDPI to monitor all aspects of educator preparation in the state, and instituted a standards and performance-based system of program approval and licensure. As such,

educator preparation programs are required to provide evidence that students who complete their programs after August 31, 2004 have the necessary knowledge, skills, and dispositions to demonstrate exit level proficiency in the standards through performance-based measures. Since 2006-07, 18 of the 32 institutions of higher education and all ten alternative route programs that offer educator preparation programs have been reviewed. During the program approval review process, significant emphasis has been placed on the assessment system, the use of data to inform program changes, graduate and employer follow up studies, and examining the preservice educator portfolios. Per Wis. Admin. Code Ch. PI 34, all educator preparation programs, including alternative route programs, must create a developmental portfolio system which provides at least two measurement points: prior to student teaching and at the culmination of a full 18-week student teaching or practicum experience. Data from these sources are currently collected specific to the institution and are not comparable across the state.

Currently, Wisconsin is participating in a ten state partnership created by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) to develop, pilot, and validate a preservice teacher performance assessment (TPA) tool with a rating scale to be used during the student teaching clinical experience. The five-year project began in spring 2009. Preservice candidates from University of Wisconsin-Madison, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, and Alverno College will pilot the process for Wisconsin. The project will require university supervisors and cooperating teachers to be trained so that tools remain valid and reliable across candidates. The tool will allow preparation programs to comprehensively measure preservice teacher effectiveness. Accelerating the development process for Wisconsin would allow educator preparation programs to begin to have a valid and reliable tool sooner. The performance assessment will assist educator preparation programs determine their effectiveness in preparing candidates and reporting results. Additional funding is needed to accelerate the State's participation in the AACTE TPA project. Additionally, the University of Wisconsin System secured a federal Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) grant to create a teacher performance evaluation tool for mathematics and science preservice teachers. The common evaluation tool will be used during the student teaching experience to measure both content and pedagogical knowledge for mathematics and science teachers. Each year, the project has included more institutions of higher education, both public and private, across the state.

To build on these initiatives, Wisconsin plans to:

<u>Strategy 1</u>: Develop an online licensing system which would collect, aggregate, and report completer data and licensing data for the State to provide a profile of the teaching force at all times; and to link this information to the in-state programs where those teachers and principals were prepared for credentialing, and to publicly report the data for each credentialing program. This strategy was delineated in the LDS competitive grant recently submitted under the ARRA guidelines [See Appendix 27]

<u>Strategy 2</u>: Develop a preservice teacher performance assessment tool. The WDPI will participate in a national partnership to develop and pilot a teacher performance assessment to be used by educator preparation programs to endorse candidates for State licensure. The OEII will provide funding for student teachers from Alverno College, University of Wisconsin-Madison, and University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, which are all current program participants to field test the tool. Additional educator preparation programs may be added based on available funding.

(D)(4)(ii) Expand preparation and credentialing options and programs that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice).

Expanding preparation programs for effective teachers and principals

Wisconsin has had a long-standing program, *Urban Teacher World* (UTW), which has recently expanded. Its aim is to increase the number of students of color exploring careers in teaching in their early academic preparation. The program offers students opportunities to better understand the many roles a teacher plays in students lives, the preparation needed to become a teacher, as well as expose them to campus life and connect them to pre-professional pathways into professional education careers. Partnerships exist between the WDPI, urban school districts, other State agencies and colleges and universities. The UTW program began in 1996 offering college visitations to middle school students. The UTW program provides opportunities for students, especially students of color, in grades 6-12 to attend teacher-centered student conferences, education fairs, and college visitations. Further, it encourages them to become active in their Future Educators Association club.

To build on these initiatives, Wisconsin plans to:

<u>Strategy 1</u>: Expand urban teacher training and recruitment programs by providing funding for the University of Wisconsin System's Institute for Urban Education (and/or similar programs) to expand the placement of preservice teachers from across the state in urban centers for their student teaching clinical experience.

<u>Strategy 2</u>: Provide funding to support programs that recruit prospective secondary and postsecondary students interested in urban teaching and/or retains those students or current students in an urban school setting.

Table 60 - Performance Measures (D)(4)	Actual Data: Baseline	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
General goals to be provided at time of application:	Ba	seline da	ta and an	nual targ	ets
Percentage of teacher preparation programs in the State for which the public can					
access data on the achievement and growth (as defined in this notice) of the graduates'	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
students.					
Percentage of principal preparation programs in the state for which the public can					
access data on the achievement and growth (as defined in this notice) of the graduates'	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
students.					
Educator preparation program providers in the state maintain data on their candidates. V	When the p	proposed l	ongitudin	al data sys	tem is
complete, we will be able to report some data. Therefore, our baseline data will remain (0 until the	end of SY	2013-20	14. At tha	t time
we are hopeful that we may be able to realize some data to report to our programs.					
General data to be provided at time of application:					
Total number of teacher credentialing programs in the state.	41				
Total number of principal credentialing programs in the state.	16				
Total number of teachers in the state.	61,440				
Total number of principals in the state.	1,688				
32 institutions of higher education $+$ 9 alternative route programs $=$ 41	1				
14 institutions of higher education $+ 2$ alternative route programs $= 16$					
Total teacher and principals in the state based reported as FTE					

Data to be requested of grantees in the future:	
Number of teacher credentialing programs in the state for which the information (as	
described in the criterion) is publicly reported.	
Number of teachers prepared by each credentialing program in the state for which the	
information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported.	
Number of principal credentialing programs in the state for which the information (as	
described in the criterion) is publicly reported.	
Number of principals prepared by each credentialing program in the state for which	
the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported.	
Number of teachers in the state whose data are aggregated to produce publicly	
available reports on the State's credentialing programs.	
Number of principals in the state whose data are aggregated to produce publicly	
available reports on the State's credentialing programs.	

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals (20 points)

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its Participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan for its Participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to—

(i) Provide effective, data-informed professional development, coaching, induction, and common planning and collaboration time to teachers and principals that are, where appropriate, ongoing and job-embedded. Such support might focus on, for example, gathering, analyzing, and using data; designing instructional strategies for improvement; differentiating instruction; creating school environments

supportive of data-informed decisions; designing instruction to meet the specific needs of high need students (as defined in this notice); and aligning systems and removing barriers to effective implementation of practices designed to improve student learning outcomes; and

(ii) Measure, evaluate, and continuously improve the effectiveness of those supports in order to improve student achievement (as defined in this notice).

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: Five pages

(D)(5)(i) Provide effective, data-informed professional development, coaching, induction, and common planning and collaboration time to teachers and principals that are, where appropriate, ongoing and job-embedded. Such support might focus on, for example, gathering, analyzing, and using data; designing instructional strategies for improvement; differentiating instruction; creating school environments supportive of data-informed decisions; designing instruction to meet the specific needs of high need students (as defined in this notice); and aligning systems and removing barriers to effective implementation of practices designed to improve student learning outcomes; and

Effective professional development, mentoring, coaching and support

To support initial educators, per Wis. Admin. Code § PI 34.17 (2), Wisconsin school districts are required to provide ongoing orientation, support seminars and qualified mentors for all initial educators within their districts. School districts can secure funds to assist in developing

and supporting the required induction program. Wis. Stat. § 115.405 (2m)(b) provides for districts to receive up to \$375 per initial educator, determined by the amount that the employer is spending to provide support for the initial educator through mentoring, orientation, and support seminars. Funding exists to cover one year of induction support, and the remaining funds are prorated to cover induction support for year two however only one year of induction is required. Allocations to districts have grown over the last three years as districts have developed their induction programs. To date, \$3,330,053 has been awarded since the 2006-2007 school year.

Further, the Peer Review and Mentoring Grant, authorized through Wis. Stat. § 115.405, is an annual competitive grant to consortia partners. The consortia must include high-need schools, those with at least 30% of students eligible for free and/or reduced priced lunch. The grants must focus on improving student learning through differentiated training and support for educators in mentoring, induction, and/or Professional Development Plan (PDP) development. Over the past three years, annual totals have ranged from \$315,000 to \$360,000.

In addition to the statutory requirements for districts to have an induction program and mentor for all initial educators, districts per Wis. Admin. Code § PI 34.17 (3) must designate a WDPI trained administrator to be available to serve on the initial educator's Professional Development Plan (PDP) team. Institutions of higher education (IHE) per Wis. Admin. Code § PI 34.17 (3) must also designate representatives to be trained and to be available to serve on the initial educator's PDP team. This provides a connection from preservice to in-service within the performance-based system. Beginning in January 2005, WDPI began training PDP team members. To date, 238 training sessions have occurred to train representatives from institutions of higher education (IHE), administrators from school districts, pupil services professionals, and teachers to serve on PDP teams. A three person team including an administrator, a teacher, and an IHE representative approve and verify initial educator PDP's. As of June 2009, the total number of trained PDP team members serving in Wisconsin included: 781 IHE representatives; 3,191 administrators; 555 pupil services professionals; and 7,017 teachers.

Three years of survey data regarding induction support for initial educators in Wisconsin public schools show that the implementation of strong, effective support systems varies from outstanding to minimal. Two State-funded grant programs are aimed at improving induction support (Peer Review and Mentor Grant and Mentoring Grants for Initial Educators) by providing incentive funds for improving programs.

Some problem areas include inconsistent quality of mentor training, insufficient mentor release time, insufficient initial educator release time and varying quality of support seminars.

Wisconsin's Statewide System of Support (SSOS) is targeted at providing technical assistance to districts with Title I schools identified for improvement (SIFI), Title I schools that have missed Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), and other Title I high priority schools. Rather than providing prescriptive measures for district improvement, SSOS processes and tools are designed to enhance a district's ability to improve the effectiveness of its programs and strategies for providing support to low-performing schools. The system also includes tools and strategies to build capacity at the local level for district-focused school improvement through a district self-assessment. An online reporting form allows a district (with the support of a WDPI-trained facilitator) to create a comprehensive report on all data sources gathered as part of the District Self-Assessment.

To build on these initiatives, Wisconsin plans to:

<u>Strategy 1</u>: Develop mentor and coaching guidelines and best practices to improve effectiveness. The OEII will work in collaboration and/or contract with groups such as educational institutions, CESAs, professional organizations, and/or non-profit organizations to build on existing efforts to develop and provide high quality mentoring and coaching guidelines as well as best practices for teachers and principals. These guidelines and best practices will include: mentoring and coaching strategies, guidelines for length and quality of mentoring and coaching, mentor and coach recruitment and selection, and mentoring and coaching training materials.

<u>Strategy 2</u>: Provide high quality coaching and mentoring resources and tools for principal and teacher effectiveness. The OEII will work in collaboration and/or contract with groups such as educational institutions, CESAs, professional organizations, and/or non-profit organizations to create and provide professional development modules, tools, and training around principal and teacher effectiveness. These tools will be based on the best practices and methods of evaluating and supporting teachers and principals previously identified under Strategy 1.

<u>Strategy 3</u>: Provide mentor academies, training, and support. The OEII will work in collaboration and/or contract with groups such as educational institutions, CESAs, professional organizations, and non-profit organizations to provide mentor academies and training throughout the state, using the guidelines, best practices, resources, and tools (including professional development modules) already developed under Strategy 1 and Strategy 2.

<u>Strategy 4</u>: Provide coach institutes, training, and support. The OEII will work in collaboration and/or contract with groups such as educational institutions, CESAs, professional organizations, and non-profit organizations to provide coaching institutes and training throughout the state, using the guidelines, best practices, resources and tools (including professional development modules) already developed under Strategy 1 and Strategy 2. This may include supporting the professional development network, which principals have established in cooperation with the five major urban districts in Wisconsin including —Milwaukee, Madison, Racine, Kenosha, Green Bay as well as the University of Wisconsin-Madison, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, and Cardinal Stritch University.

<u>Strategy 5</u>: Contract with the Educational Communications Board to develop an electronic portal accessible throughout the state and nation to house tools and professional development online training materials developed in Strategies 1-4.

<u>Strategy 6</u>: Require Participating LEAs to implement a teacher mentoring program that utilizes an ongoing feedback process that supports teacher growth and development. Teacher mentors must be highly trained, at least partially released from classroom responsibility (or compensated for additional hours of service if specified in the Final Work Plan), and must work with new teachers for at least two years. Districts may develop their own teacher mentoring program or contract with training organizations such as CESAs, The New Teacher Center, or institutions of higher education to implement this reform. (*See Exhibit I of the MOU in Appendix 2*)

<u>Strategy 7</u>: Require Participating LEAs to implement a principal mentoring program that includes ongoing feedback and supports principal development. Principal mentors must be highly trained and principal leadership programs must be high quality. Mentoring programs should address effective use of data and teacher evaluations to inform instructional improvement and staff professional development. Districts may

develop their own principal mentoring program or contract with training organizations such as New Leaders for New Schools to implement this reform. (*See Exhibit I of the MOU in Appendix 2*)

<u>Strategy 8</u>: Require Participating LEAs to align professional development with the data resulting from analyzing the specific criteria and systematic procedure used to measure the performance of licensed school personnel in their districts.

<u>Strategy 9</u>: Require Participating LEAs to provide school-based coaches for reading and mathematics at a level such that there are coaches in each school in the district at least the equivalent of one full day each week. These coaches must be highly trained and work with teachers in classrooms to implement new curriculum and/or instructional strategies as well as assist teachers in using data effectively to improve instruction. (*See Exhibit I of the MOU in Appendix 2*)

<u>Strategy 10</u>: Require Participating LEAs to provide professional development and support to staff to implement new curriculum and/or instructional strategies as well as to use data effectively to improve instruction. Districts must use student achievement data, as well as teacher and principal evaluations, to inform professional development. Districts must participate in evaluations or conduct their own evaluations of the effectiveness of the professional development offered by the district. (*See Exhibit I of the MOU in Appendix 2*)

<u>Strategy 11</u>: Survey school and school district leaders to evaluate the role leadership plays in developing and maintaining strong educator induction programs linked with increased student achievement, and to identify professional development strategies to improve such leadership.

<u>Strategy 12</u>: Continue to develop the Wisconsin Response to Intervention (RtI) Center, a center that promotes a Wisconsin vision for building expertise among educators to increase academic and behavior success for all students, from students who need additional support to those who need additional challenge. The Center will function as a trainer of trainer model aligned with the National Staff Development Center and, in partnership with leading Wisconsin professional organizations, will empower teachers and educators to use:

1. Systems change processes, including building capacity and exploring innovative organizational approaches to schooling.

- 2. Data and leadership, including data to inform decision-making teacher leadership and collaborative teaming around problem solving and using.
- 3. Academic programming, including evidence based instructional practice, differentiation and interventions and progress monitoring tools for reading and mathematics.
- 4. Social and emotional wellness programming, including positive behavior supports and effective classroom intervention tools for social-emotional growth.

(D)(5)(ii) Measure, evaluate, and continuously improve the effectiveness of those supports in order to improve student achievement (as defined in this notice).

Evaluating teacher and principal supports

With the assistance of Great Lakes West Comprehensive Assistance Center, surveys were developed and administered for the past three years to evaluate the initial educator support system. Each year, surveys were sent to initial educator teachers, initial educator administrators, initial educator pupil services professionals, and their respective mentors. This data has provided valuable insights into the induction programs in the state. The WDPI has responded with the creation of additional resources and support to all stakeholders involved in the process. Additionally, three statewide seminars have been held each year with the assistance of Great Lakes West. Of importance, is the emphasis Wisconsin places on utilizing multiple state stakeholder groups to gather feedback and collaborate on improvements to the Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative.

To build on these initiatives, Wisconsin plans to:

<u>Strategy 1</u>: Develop a plan to gather data on the extent to which the Wisconsin educator Professional Development Plan results in improved student achievement. (LDS 3 competitive grant submitted.)

<u>Strategy 2</u>: Participate in a ten state partnership created by the Council of Chief State Officers (CCSSO) and the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) to develop, pilot and validate a preservice teacher performance assessment tool to be used by educator preparation programs to evaluate and endorse candidates for State licensure. Provide funding for students from Alverno College, University of Wisconsin-Madison, and the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, which are all current program participants, to field test the tool. Additional educator preparation programs may be added based on an available funding basis.

Table 61- Performance Measures (D)(5) Performance measures for this criterion are optional. If the State wishes to include performance measures, please enter them as rows in this table and, for each measure, provide annual targets in the columns provided.	or most recent)	Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014

(E) Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools (50 total points)

State Reform Conditions Criteria

(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs (10 points)

The extent to which the State has the legal, statutory, or regulatory authority to intervene directly in the State's persistently lowestachieving schools (as defined in this notice) and in LEAs that are in improvement or corrective action status.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (E)(1):

• A description of the State's applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents.

Recommended maximum response length: One page

As a condition of receiving federal funds, federal law requires the State Superintendent to take corrective action against a district identified for improvement (DIFI) for at least two years. However, federal law does not confer any authority upon the State Superintendent to take those actions—that authority must be found in State law. The State Superintendent has only that authority which is expressly conferred, or

necessarily implied, in Wisconsin State law. Further, corrective action under federal law must be consistent with state law. 20 USC §6316 (c)(10).

Under Article X, section 1 of the Wisconsin Constitution, the State Superintendent is charged with the general supervision of public instruction in this state. In exercising that general supervision and as the agent for the receipt and disbursement of federal funds, under Wis. Stat. § 115.28(9), the State Superintendent of Public Instruction is authorized to intervene in chronically under-performing schools or school districts to:

- 1) Provide technical assistance to districts to support the building of an improvement plan and to work with individual schools needing improvement.
- 2) Require a school district deemed not in compliance with No Child Left Behind to have selected Title I schools monitored for compliance with the district's consolidated application for Title I funds. If a district continues to record poor performance, the State Superintendent may review the district's Title I ESEA consolidated plan before its submittal to ensure that funding is going to targeted programmatic needs. This review could include re-directing ESEA funding, if deemed necessary by the State Superintendent.
- Require a district that misses annual yearly progress (AYP) for three consecutive years to submit an improvement plan to the State Superintendent.

Under the ESEA, the State Superintendent must impose corrective action requirements on a district that misses AYP for four consecutive years. Those corrective action requirements must include at least one of seven actions prescribed in 20 USC 6316 (c)(10).¹³ (For more information on this subject, please see Appendix 28 – "Sanctions for Title I Districts Not Making Annual Yearly Progress")

Current State law authorizes the State Superintendent to impose only one of the seven actions prescribed in 20 USC 6316 (c)(10). Specifically, the State Superintendent as the agent for the receipt and disbursement of federal funds is authorized to defer federal programmatic funds or reduce administrative funds.²

In addition, Wis. Stat. § 121.006 authorizes the State Superintendent to withhold State aid from a district "in which the scope and character of the work are not maintained in such a manner as to meet the State Superintendent's approval."

The State Superintendent has leveraged his funding authority to effectuate other interventions in chronically underperforming schools and districts. For example, the State Superintendent has required the Milwaukee Public Schools to restructure aspects of administrative oversight en lieu of withholding funds. However, additional statutory authority would strengthen and expedite efforts to turn around struggling schools.

Additional statutory authority, introduced as 2009 Senate Bill 437 and 2009 Assembly Bill 534, is pending currently in the State legislature. The legislation provides the State Superintendent the specific authority to intervene in chronically underperforming schools and districts.

¹³ These actions include -1) defer programmatic funds or reduce administrative funds; 2) institute and implement a new curriculum; 3) replace the LEA personnel who are relevant to the failure; 4) remove particular schools from the LEA's jurisdiction and establish alternative arrangements for public governance of those schools; 5) appoint a receiver or trustee to administer the LEA's affairs in place of the district's superintendent or board; 6) abolish or restructure the LEA; 7) authorize students to transfer to a school in a different LEA.

 $^{^{2}}$ Wis. Stat. s. 115.28(9) The State Superintendent "[shall] accept federal funds for any function over which the State Superintendent has jurisdiction and act as the agent for the receipt and disbursement of such funds."

The interventions focus on core academic and management areas, such as reading and math instruction and school leadership, which are crucial for student success. The legislation authorizes the State Superintendent to intervene in a chronically underperforming school or district and to direct them to:

- 1) Implement a new curriculum.
- 2) Implement a new instructional design, including expanded school hours, additional pupil supports and services and individual learning plans for pupils.
- 3) Implement professional development programs focused on improving pupil academic achievement.
- 4) Make personnel changes consistent with collective bargaining agreements.
- Adopt accountability measures to monitor the school district's finances or to monitor other interventions directed by the State Superintendent.

The legislation further provides that the State Superintendent may withhold all State aid from any district that fails to comply with these directives. The legislation has passed the Assembly Committee on Education with a 9-3 bipartisan vote, and it has been introduced on a bipartisan vote in the Senate Committee on Education. The Governor and State Superintendent are urging immediate action on this timely and vital legislation.

Reform Plan Criteria

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools (40 points)

The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to-

(i) Identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) and, at its discretion, any non-Title I eligible secondary schools that would be considered persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) if they were eligible to receive Title I funds; and (5 points)

(ii) Support its LEAs in turning around these schools by implementing one of the four school intervention models (as described in Appendix C): turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model (provided that an LEA with more than nine persistently lowest-achieving schools may not use the transformation model for more than 50 percent of its schools). (*35 points*)

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (E)(2) (please fill in table below):

• The State's historic performance on school turnaround, as evidenced by the total number of persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) that States or LEAs attempted to turn around in the last five years, the approach used, and the results and

lessons learned to date.

Recommended maximum response length: Eight pages

(E)(2)(i) Identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) and, at its discretion, any non-Title I eligible secondary schools that would be considered persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) if they were eligible to receive Title I funds; and

Persistently low-achieving schools

In order to identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools, the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) started with the list of 58 Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action and restructuring (SIFI). Based on that number and the requirements outlined in the RTTT guidance, Wisconsin's list of persistently lowest-performing Title I schools consists of five schools. A school was identified as "persistently low-performing" if: it was currently identified for improvement in reading or mathematics, had missed Adequate Yearly Progress in reading and mathematics in any subgroup, had the lowest combined, absolute reading and math State test scores and made less than 5 percentage points worth of progress in reading and mathematics in the all-students group over three years. After careful consideration, schools that are exclusively for "at-risk" students, including schools that designed to serve over-age, under-credited, or incarcerated youth, were excluded from this list per the guidance provided by ED. The five persistently low-performing Title I schools are all located in the Milwaukee Public School District (MPS):

- Milwaukee African American Immersion High School.
- Washington High School of Law, Education and Public Service.
- DuBois High School.
- Custer High School.
- Vincent High School.

Three-Year Performance of Persistently Low-Performing Title I Schools									
School	% Proficient & Advanced 08-09		% Proficient & Advanced 07-08		% Proficient & Advanced 06-07				
	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math			
Milwaukee African American Immersion High School	11.1%	1.9%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			
Washington High School of Law, Education and Public Service	22.7%	4.5%	29.2%	8.3%	16.3%	8.2%			
DuBois High School	25.5%	3.9%	24.1%	5.6%	33.3%	23.8%			
Custer High School	19.8%	8.3%	18.5%	12.6%	26.9%	10.8%			
Vincent High School	24.8%	17.1%	31.6%	14.9%	30.8%	14.9%			

Table 62 - Three-Year Performance of Persistently Low-Performing Title I Schools

The State also examined the graduation rates in the Title I high schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring to identify those with a graduation rate below 60 percent over the last three years. After careful consideration, schools that are exclusively for "at-risk" students, including schools that designed to serve over-age, under-credited, or incarcerated youth, were excluded from this list per the guidance provided by ED.

Next, WDPI compiled a list of the 87 secondary schools in Wisconsin that are eligible for, but do not receive Title I funds. Eligibility for Title I funding was based on the school poverty rate. Any secondary school with a poverty rate of 35% or higher was determined as Title I eligible. Schools were then ranked by combined proficiency rates and by rate of growth in achievement over 3 years. The lowest five ranking schools on this list will not be served under Race to the Top as their achievement rates are not low enough to warrant implementing the prescribed intervention strategies.

WDPI also identified the secondary schools which are eligible for, but do not receive Title I funds, that have had a graduation rate of under 60 percent over the last three years. After careful consideration, schools that are exclusively for "at-risk" students, including schools that designed to serve over-age, under-credited, or incarcerated youth, were excluded from this list per the guidance provided by ED.

The student achievement rates in the identified Title I schools are so significantly below both state average and the average for the next tier of potential schools, that these schools warrant exclusive attention and support.

(E)(2)(ii) Support its LEAs in turning around these schools by implementing one of the four school intervention models (as described in Appendix C): turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model (provided that an LEA with more than nine persistently lowest-achieving schools may not use the transformation model for more than 50 percent of its schools).

Between the current capacity to help turnaround struggling schools and the enhanced capacity through RTTT resources, Wisconsin is wellpositioned to support rapid improvement in our 5 persistently low-performing schools as described in the next two sections.

Supporting Persistently Low-Performing Schools: Current Conditions

Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS) is also a district in corrective action under the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Beginning in 2007, the WDPI has directed the district to implement specific corrective action requirements. The current corrective action requirements for 2009-10 are provided in Appendix 29.

As a result, WDPI has established an extensive monitoring and technical assistance system within MPS to ensure that district corrective action requirements are being implemented effectively. We will build on that system to monitor the progress of the lowest performing schools. The MPS monitoring and technical assistance system includes the creation of a Director of School and District Improvement at the SEA. This position, which participates directly in the State Superintendent's Cabinet and serves as a liaison between WDPI and MPS.

Examples of specific responsibilities of the Director related to improvement plans in Milwaukee include:

- Co-facilitate the MPS Superintendent's Committee on District & School Improvement.
- Co-facilitate the Wisconsin State Superintendent's Committee on District & School Improvement.
- Monitor to ensure implementation of corrective action requirements and individual school improvement plans.
- Keep on-going communication with MPS Director of District & School Improvement.
- Attend SIFI technical support team meetings in MPS.
- Attend SIFI Principal meetings in MPS.
- Attend monthly meetings with Central Office staff directly responsible for implementing district corrective action and the implementation of intensive improvement strategies in the lowest performing schools.
- Maintain on-going communication among WDPI staff relative to MPS efforts.

In addition to a position at the WDPI exclusively focusing on improvement efforts, MPS has been required to create a similar position that serves on the district administrator's cabinet. Both the WDPI Director of DIFI and the MPS Director of District and School Improvement and related agency staff meet monthly to monitor the implementation of the school and district improvement plans. MPS has restructured the district by creating nine School Support clusters. Each cluster is staffed by a school improvement supervisor. (see Appendix 30) These supervisors are administrative positions. The supervisors provide school level oversight to ensure implementation of all improvement strategies required under corrective action. Examples of improvement strategies currently required of Title I SIFI include: extended learning time in reading and mathematics K-8; reading intervention courses in all high schools; summer school; after school and/or before school tutoring by highly qualified teachers; and, implementation of Response to Interventions (RtI). Two SIFI schools will be required to implement extended calendar in the 2010-11 school year. The school improvement supervisors also arrange for internal or external technical assistance to improve implementation of school improvement strategies as needed based on consultation with school principals and the MPS Director of District and School Improvement. The school improvement supervisors work with SIFI principals and staff and Central Office personnel to review achievement data on a monthly basis to determine if the improvement efforts are resulting in improved student achievement.

This district support structure is enhancing consistency related to implementation of school improvement strategies in all SIFI. However, currently all SIFI schools have the same requirements and the same timelines for demonstrating improvement even though they are not all demonstrating equal rates of achievement. By identifying 5 Title I SIFI as the most persistently low-achieving and by putting substantial expectations and resources toward the neediest schools, we intend to create strong school improvement models for other low- performing schools. In order to truly call these schools models for improvement, considerable resources, attention and accountability must be focused on them over time. Much of that work will begin with the Title I 1003 (g) School Improvement funds but Race to the Top funds are necessary to make improvement efforts in those schools more productive.

Enhanced Support 2009 -10 and Beyond

MPS will receive approximately \$46 million in Title I School Improvement funds to first implement one of the federally required intervention methods in the 5 lowest performing SIFI and to support current improvement efforts in the remaining 42 Title I SIFI. The WDPI has begun consultation with MPS personnel to identify the intervention strategy to be implemented in each persistently low-performing school.

- Milwaukee African American Immersion High School is currently targeted for the Restart model. In 2010-11 the LEA will implement a rigorous review process to identify the appropriate charter management organization to operate the school beginning Fall 2011.
- DuBois High School is targeted for closure. In the past, when the district has closed low performing schools it has lacked procedures to ensure that students are then enrolled in better performing schools. These district wide policies and procedures will be established in preparation for the 2010-11 school year.
- Custer, Vincent, and Washington Law, Education and Public Service High Schools have begun to implement many of the elements of the transformation model but current efforts lack consistency, rigor, and results. Therefore, MPS and WDPI will identify and implement a more aggressive set of reform strategies, investing the Title I Federal funds to provide external support to reform these schools rather than relying on current strategies.

Title I School Improvement dollars will begin to flow to MPS during the current school year. In order to release these funds in Spring 2010, MPS and WDPI must agree on the appropriate intervention strategy for each school and MPS will need to submit a three year plan for each school detailing the implementation schedule of the selected intervention. WDPI staff are currently developing research-based criteria that define quality implementation for the turnaround, transformation, and restart models. These criteria are being developed with assistance from personnel at the Great Lakes West Comprehensive Center. They provide specific required implementation strategies for the school and the LEA. The criteria will also provide examples of the evidence schools and LEA must collect to demonstrate effective implementation of the intervention strategy. Working drafts of these resources are included in Appendix 31.

With Title I School Improvement funds, WDPI will assign each of the lowest-performing schools to a WDPI intervention implementation monitor. These monitors will meet monthly with school and district representatives to assess the degree to which each school is on target with implementation of the selected intervention using the tools in Appendix 31. Monitors will also examine achievement data. The progress of each school will be shared monthly with the Assistant State Superintendent for Reading and Student Achievement and the WDPI Director of District and School Improvement who report directly to the State Superintendent.

It is anticipated that external experts will be needed to assist in the implementation of the reform models, and limited resources are available through Title 1. Rather than building internal capacity, the OEII, described above (A2i) will employ Race to the top funds to contract with outside organizations to assist in these tasks. These organizations will enhance the technical assistance resources available to the schools. This cadre of technical assistance providers will work exclusively with the persistently low-performing schools. Wisconsin will allocate \$2.7 million dollars to hire these personnel, organizations and experts to assist with:

- Charter school start up and operations.
- Teacher evaluation and development.
- Response to Intervention at the secondary level including universal screening, progress monitoring, and tiered interventions.
- Adolescent literacy.
- Principal Leadership.

Tracking the success of the RTTT initiatives will require a specific focus on Milwaukee schools, with an eye toward identifying what is working and trying to take those initiatives to scale. Urban school districts and their community partners have long recognized the need to conduct research focused on their public schools. Some have established entities focused on improving education via research alliances and public education funds. Chicago's Consortium on School Research (CCSR) and the Boston Plan for Excellence (BPE) are national models for how external entities can contribute positively and directly to education reform efforts. MPS, in partnership with the Wisconsin Center for Education Research at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, has invested significant resources to evaluate numerous MPS education initiatives. RTTT resources will be dedicated to supporting a research alliance of major academic and civic entities around the improvement efforts Wisconsin implements in the persistently low-performing schools in order to identify effective practices.

TURNING AROUND STRUGGLING SCHOOLS							
GOAL	KEY ACTIVITIES	TIMELINE	KEY PARTIES				
	 Hire a Director of School and District Improvement Hire or contact with individuals and or 	 Within 60 days of grant award Within 60 days of grant award and 	WDPI OEII Director of School and District				
	organizations that have specialist expertise in the areas of; Charter school start up and operations; Teacher evaluation and development; Response to Intervention ; Adolescent literacy; Principal leadership	ongoing	Improvement WDPI OEII 				
Expand Struggling Schools Monitoring and Technical Assistance infrastructure in order to effectively implement detailed reform /	• Contract with outside organizations (as required / necessary) to assist in the implementation of reform models	Within 60 days of grant award and ongoing	 Director of School and District Improvement WDPI OEII 				
intervention plans	Identification of appropriate intervention strategy and necessary tactics and implementation steps for each school	• Year 1 (Q1 – Q3)	 Director of School and District Improvement and team WDPI OEII Outside organizations (as applicable) LEAs (MPS) 				
	• Development of detailed three-year plan for each school, including implementation schedule of the selected intervention and	• Year 1 (Q1 – Q3)	 Director of School and District Improvement and team WDPI 				

Table 63 – Implementation plan for turning around struggling schools.

identification of resources (WDPI and / or external orgs) required		 OEII Outside organizations (as applicable) LEAs (MPS) 														
• Agreement between LEA (MPS) and WDPI on the proposed reform implementation plans	• Year 1 (Q4)	 Director of School and District Improvement and team WDPI OEII Outside organizations (as applicable) LEAs (MPS) 														
• Implementation of agreed reform plans	• Year 2 – Year 4	 Director of School and District Improvement and team WDPI OEII Outside organizations (as applicable) LEAs (MPS) 														
Monitoring, management and reporting of implementation activities; corrective actions made where necessary	• Year 2 – Year 4 (progress of each school will be evaluated monthly)	 Director of School and District Improvement and team WDPI OEII Outside organizations (as applicable) LEAs (MPS) 														
TURNING AROUND STRUGGLING SCHOOLS																
--	----	----	------	----	----	-----	------	----	----	-----	------	----	----	-----	------	----
KEY TASK		YE	AR 1			YEA	AR 2			YEA	AR 3			YEA	AR 4	
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Hire a Director of School and District																
Improvement	•	•														
Hire or contact with individuals and or																
organizations that have specialist																
expertise in the areas of; Charter school																
start up and operations; Teacher	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
evaluation and development; Response to																
Intervention ; Adolescent literacy;																
Principal leadership																
Contract with outside organizations (as																
required / necessary) to assist in the	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
implementation of reform models																
Identification of appropriate intervention																
strategy and necessary tactics and	•	•	•													
implementation steps for each school																
Development of detailed three year plan			-	-			-	-								
for each school including implementation																
schedule of the selected intervention and	•	•	•													
identification of resources (WDPI and / or	•	•	•													
external orgs) required																
Agreement between LFA (MPS) and																
WDPI on the proposed reform				•												
implementation plans				•												
Implementation of agreed reform plans					•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Monitoring, management and reporting of																
implementation activities: corrective					•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
actions made where necessary																

Table 64 – *Timeline for implementing turning around struggling schools activities.*

Wisconsin Initiative for Neighborhoods and Schools that Work for Children (WINS for Children)

In recent decades, research has documented the effects of concentrated poverty on both people and place, showing that social dislocations such as crime, public disorder, truancy, school failure, and joblessness come bundled in geographic space. This means that neighborhoods with poverty rates that exceed 30 percent have disproportionately higher rates of crime, disorder, and inadequate housing; their residents

have disproportionately lower rates of labor force participation, lower household income, fewer years of schooling, and fewer tangible assets as well. Though individual residents may have strong ties in the community, and the community may have significant cultural and other assets, residents' social networks typically are not connected to the knowledge, influence, and other sources of advantage that facilitate ready access to good schools, good jobs, and other opportunities. In too many instances, the schools in distressed neighborhood are struggling schools.

Milwaukee is a case in point. The majority of Wisconsin's schools identified for improvement are in Milwaukee, and all of its lowest performing schools are located in neighborhoods characterized by higher rates of crime and unemployment, and lower rates of household income and educational attainment. These conditions pose a threat, not only to the welfare of those who live in distressed neighborhoods, but also to the continued growth and vitality of the region and state, given that the quality of life in a city's neighborhoods is a significant predictor of the economic competitiveness of that city and the surrounding region. They also provide a clear point of entry for social problem solving at scale.

WINS for Children, based on the Harlem Children's Zone Project, builds on efforts that focus more on fostering local initiative and social organization than on facilities and physical improvements; more on strengthening skills and increasing educational attainment than on social welfare strategies; and more on individual choice and delivery systems reform than on distributive policies. In particular, WINS for Children will build on an infrastructure established by the Zilber Neighborhood Initiative (ZNI). Already underway in two Milwaukee neighborhoods, ZNI is a \$50 million philanthropic investment to finance direct resident involvement in creating and carrying out comprehensive plans for improving the quality of life in ten city neighborhoods. The Quality of Life plans developed thus far reflect the values and preferences of area residents and trusted organizations, such as community nonprofits, local businesses, and faith institutions; they address social, economic, and physical conditions in specific geographic areas; they provide the basis for organizing and activating local capacity; and they offer a range of funding opportunities for others who want to support human and community transformation in urban neighborhoods.

WINS for Children will take full advantage of the infrastructure undergirding the Zilber Neighborhood Initiative, directing resources to those aspects of Quality of Life plans that promote academic achievement; foster social and emotional development of children from birth through 25; encourage parental engagement and effective parenting; increase student stability; support instructional leaders and neighborhood schools; and improve teaching and learning.

To ensure that children acquire the intellectual capacities and civic character that lead to productive adulthood, WINS for Children will promote high-quality teaching and learning in community schools that: implement an extended-day/extended-year school calendar; utilize incentives to promote attendance, appropriate behavior, academic achievement; use a common curricula across area schools; offer nutritious food service and daily physical education; provide in-school physical and mental health and wellness services; deliver college and career counseling for youth and parents; and facilitate parents' engagement in students' education, including direct access to individual student records and timely public release of comparable aggregate school performance data and analyses.

In addition, educators will work closely with WINS for Children navigators to connect children and their families to the full range of community supports children may need to achieve age-related milestones of healthy development. Navigators will help families obtain adequate food, housing, and safety; prenatal care and comprehensive health services, including mental health and substance abuse services; certified infant and child-care; literacy and language acquisition programs; universal pre-kindergarten for four- and five-year-olds; a mix of afterschool and out-of-school programs, some academically structured, others aimed to strengthen youth self-esteem and sense of achievement; and recreational, health and wellness, and cultural programs for all family and community members. WINS for Children will use the data from the expanded State LDS which will allow for instructional leaders, parents, and providers to access information on demand. Neighborhood navigators will be trained to assist parents in accessing and interpreting information about the academic progress of their children and the overall quality of the schools in the neighborhood. As a condition of participation and funding, providers will be

required to specify their efforts to outcomes for all children, including those with developmental or learning differences, and to make information about program quality and impact readily available to consumers.

The Zilber Family Foundation, which is led by a former Program Director of the MacArthur Foundation, is a Chicago-based private foundation that sponsors applied research and practical efforts to advance the transformation of urban education. That connection and geographical proximity will facilitate meetings of the scholars from the University of Wisconsin System with those from the University of Chicago and elsewhere to assist with the implementation of WINS for Children implementation in Wisconsin. The Zilber Family Foundation is working to support educational efforts by awarding \$1.5 million to Discovery World, an accomplished STEM educational institution, to involve the youth served by WINS for Children in its existing STEM programming and to establish satellite learning programs in WINS zones.

Following the incorporation of the nonprofit WINS for Children, Inc. and the development of strategic and business plans, two zones will be chosen based on site selection criteria that include: evidence of both need and opportunity; presence of turnaround or transforming schools predisposed to or already committed to the community school model, including the local high school; availability of a comprehensive neighborhood plan that emphasizes education reform; and evidence of local capacity and courage.

Program providers will be identified using partner selection criteria that include: an organizational culture of high standards that uses data to drive performance; a history of a high degree of real collaboration; the presence of systems for quality assurance and accountability; evidence of leadership and whatever-it-takes passion; and, as the following grid illustrates, alignment between what they can deliver and what is known to contribute healthy human development.

WINS for Children will be governed by a 10-member board accountable for ensuring its successful implementation. The Board will include WINS Chief Executive Officer, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Secretary of the Wisconsin Dept. of Administration and

the director from the Zilber Family Foundation, as well as philanthropic, civic, business, community leaders and nonprofit leaders from local community planning groups (e.g., the Lindsay Heights Community Planning Council, the Clarke Square Council).

Governor Jim Doyle and State Superintendent Tony Evers are confident of the success of the WINS for Children effort based on the philanthropic support of the Zilber Foundation, the commitment of the City of Milwaukee and State of Wisconsin, and the evidence of success demonstrated by the Harlem Children's Zone. Moreover, there is a record of success in Milwaukee for the creation of children's zones with education and other community wraparound services. The United Community Center (UCC) has a 39 year history of providing services to the Spanish-speaking community on Milwaukee's south side. Built from a small neighborhood teen center, the UCC now provides programs and services to more than 18,000 people per year. These include:

- Education through the Bruce Guadalupe School, a K-8 charter school; early childhood education; and, Generations Park facilities.
- Community Learning Center with activities and programs; such as pre-college, summer recreation, and Youth Volunteer Corps.
- Elderly programs that provide services as well as adult day center, housing, and senior center.
- Restaurant and conference facilities.
- Human services that include out-patient and residential programs.
- Walker Square Initiative, a neighborhood development strategy to increase home ownership and decrease crime.
- Health and athletics programs to promote good health.

With the Race to the Top funding, the opportunity to expand that success, scale, and sustainability is possible. This track record, along with the commitment from Milwaukee Public Schools in Exhibit II to fully participate in the implementation of WINS for Children, means that Wisconsin has the leadership, resources, data sources, and the ability to make a difference; all are elements cited by Geoffrey Canada as the keys to the success for implementing programs modeled after the Harlem Children's Zone. These proposals stand to help Milwaukee and the State of Wisconsin make significant strides toward dramatically raising achievement in the struggling schools in the state's largest city.

Table 65 – Implementation plan for WINS.

ESTABLISH WINS FOR CH	HILDREN, AN ADAPTATION OF THE HAR	RLEM CHILDREN'S ZONE FOR MILWA	AUKEE NEIGHBORHOODS
GOAL	KEY ACTIVITIES	TIMELINE	KEY PARTIES
	• Obtain pro bono legal assistance and file necessary papers.	• Within 72 hours of notice of award.	• Zilber Family Foundation
	• Identify and recruit senior public and	• Within 60 days of notice of award.	Governor's Office
Establish a nonprofit corporation to	private officials to serve on governing		Donors Forum of Wisconsin
Children	board.		Mayor's Office
emilaren.			• DOA
	Recruit and retain executive staff.	• Within 90 days of notice of award.	WINS for Children Board
	• Locate and equip offices.	• Within 90 days of notice of award.	• DOA
	Obtain pro bono communications	• Within 30 days of notice of award.	Zilber Family Foundation
	expertise.		Donors Forum of Wisconsin
	Create program identity and initial		• WINS executive and program staff
Develop communications strategy.	materials (e.g., website, informational		
	packet).		
	Conduct quiet phase of community		
	outreach.		
Produce strategic plan for program	Convene facilitated planning process with public and popprofit loaders	• Within 150 days of notice of award.	WINS for Children governing board and executive and program staff
Implementation.	with public and nonprofit leaders.	Nors 1 (01, 02)	and executive and program starr.
Establish data exchange network to link	Convene state and city agency CIUs to	• Year I (QI - Q2)	DUA WING for Children and staff
school and service records.	develop system protocols.	Nors 1 (01, 02)	WINS for Children program start.
	Recruit and retain senior program and operations staff	• Year I $(QI - Q2)$	wind for Children executive and program staff
Develop business plan for program	Establish written policies and	• $V_{\text{part}} = 1 (01, 02)$	WINS for Children executive and
operations.	• Establish written policies and	• Teal $\Gamma(Q1 - Q2)$	• whys for clinicien executive and
	funding		program starr.
	Select sites and contract with providers.	• Year 1 (02)	WINS for Children staff and
	F		contract providers.
	• Hire, train, and deploy neighborhood	• Year 1 (Q2)	WINS for Children staff and
Initiate outreach and enrollment.	navigators.		contract providers.
	Beta test IT system.	• Year 1 (Q2)	WINS for Children staff and
			contract providers.
	• Produce and act on weekly data reports.	• Year 2 (Q2) – Year 4	WINS for Children staff and
			contract providers.
			• DOA
Coordinate and connect services with	Produce monthly analyses and make	• Year 2 (Q2) – Year 4	•
school-based programs.	necessary adjustments.		
	Conduct six-month reviews of	• Year 2 (Q2) – Year 4	•
	providers' progress toward benchmarks.		
	Adjust as needed.		

Table 66 – Timeline for implementing WINS activities.

ESTABLISH WINS FOR CHILDREN, AN ADAPTATION OF THE HARLEM CHILDREN'S ZONE FOR MILWAUKEE NEIGHBORHOODS																
KEY TASK		YEA	AR 1			YEA	AR 2			YEA	AR 3			YEA	AR 4	
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4												
Obtain pro bono legal assistance and file																
necessary papers.	•															
Identify and recruit senior public and																
private officials to serve on governing	•															
board.																
Recruit and retain executive staff.	•															
Locate and equip offices.	•															
Obtain pro bono communications expertise.	•															
Create program identity and initial materials																
(e.g., website, informational packet).	•															
Conduct quiet phase of community	•															
outreach.	•															
Convene facilitated planning process with	•	•														
public and nonprofit leaders.	•	•														
Convene state and city agency CIOs to	•	•														
develop system protocols.	•	•														
Recruit and retain senior program and	•	•														
operations staff.	•	•														
Establish written policies and procedures	•	•														
for program, operations, and funding.	•	•														
Select sites and contract with providers.	•	•														
Hire, train, and deploy neighborhood	•	•														
navigators.	•	•														
Beta test IT system.	•	•														
Produce and act on weekly data reports.						•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Produce monthly analyses and make																
necessary adjustments.						•			•	•	•	•	•		•	•
Conduct six-month reviews of providers'																
progress toward benchmarks. Adjust as						•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
needed.					1											

Support for Low Performing Schools Statewide

In addition to the support provided to MPS, each LEA requesting Race to the Top Funding must include in their Scope of Work, either plans to implement specific strategies in low performing schools or evidence that these strategies exist and are effective. Such strategies include:

- Implement a Response to Intervention (RtI) model that provides diagnostic assessments, core instruction to all students, differentiation strategies, and interventions in reading and mathematics.
- Implement or expand interventions for students who need more academic support and instructional time in at least one of the following areas: extended learning time, enhanced transitions, or intensive interventions.

Extended learning time, which may include:

- Additional instructional time in reading, English language arts, or mathematics for struggling students.
- Summer school.
- Saturday school with certified teachers.
- Before- and after-school programs with certified teachers.
- Intercession courses.
- Credit recovery programs.
- Extended school day.
- Extended school year.

Enhanced student transitions, which may include:

- Early college or middle college programs in high school.
- Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, Youth Options or similar programs.

Intensive interventions, which may include:

- One-to-one tutoring, or tutoring in small groups of less than 5, with certified teachers.
- Wraparound services.

<u>Creating a Response to Intervention Center</u>: In order to support these efforts, the WDPI will continue to develop and expand the Wisconsin Response to Intervention (RtI) Center. The Center promotes a Wisconsin vision for building expertise among educators to increase academic and behavior success for all students, from students who need additional support to those who need additional challenge. The Center will function as a trainer of trainer model aligned with the National Staff Development Center and, in partnership with leading Wisconsin professional organizations, will empower teachers and educators to use:

- Systems change processes, including building capacity and exploring innovative organizational approaches to schooling.
- Data and leadership, including data to inform decision-making teacher leadership and collaborative teaming around problem solving.
- Academic programming, including evidence based instructional practice, differentiation and interventions and progress monitoring tools for reading in mathematics.
- Social and emotional wellness programming, including positive behavior supports and effective classroom intervention tools for social-emotional growth.

The RtI Center will anchor an existing RtI integrated system of support, including an annual RtI Summit, co-sponsored professional development, and unique resources designed to help Wisconsin schools and districts implement RtI for all students.

<u>Improve mathematics and science by expanding Project Lead the Way</u>: Project Lead the Way is an integrated curriculum targeted at preparing students for careers in engineering and mathematics. Already in place in several key districts in Wisconsin it proposes integrating mathematics and science tightly within an applied engineering context. Fiscal Implications: Total Cost for a District to Implement a Pilot of PLTW (1 high school lab, 2 middle school labs--not empty rooms--and an evaluation of the program)

	SET UF	P RtI	
GOAL	KEY ACTIVITIES	TIMELINE	KEY PARTIES
	• Use appropriate procedures to recruit, interview, and employ appropriate staff.	• Within 60 days of being awarded the grant.	RtI Director
	Post positions	Within 10 days of grant award	RtI Director
Employ RtI assistant director and staff	Screen resumes	• Within 25 days of grant award	RtI Director
Provide training to RtI staff	Interview qualified candidates	• Within 40 days	RtI Director
	• Offer qualified candidates positions	• Within 60 days of being awarded the grant.	RtI Director
	Provide HR training to OEII staff	• Within 45 days of employment	RtI Director
Provide team development training to RtI staff	• Conduct series of team development training for OEII staff	• Within the first 10 days of full team employment	WDPI HR
Provide training related to RtI mission, Race to the Top, and DPI efforts	• Conduct series of training for RtI staff	• Within the first 10 days of full team employment	RtI director
Provide high quality, focused training to districts regarding: systems change, data and leadership; academic programming, and social and emotional wellness	• Provide training at the school, district, regional and state levels	Year 1 – Year 4: the RtI center will provide professional development	RtI director and staff
Create and disseminate resources for educators on RtI	Develop publications on RtI related materials	• Year 1 – Year 4: the RtI center will create and disseminate resources for educators on RtI both in print and online	• RtI director and staff
Create and disseminate resources for educators on RtI	• Develop videos on RtI related materials	• Year 1 – Year 4: the RtI center will create and disseminate five videos for educators on RtI	• RtI directors, staff, and the Education Communications Board

Table 67 – Implementation plan for Response to Intervention expansion.

					SET U	PRTI													
KEY TASK	YEAR 1				YEAR 2			YEAR 3				YEAR 3				YEAR 4			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4			
Use appropriate procedures to recruit, interview, and employ appropriate staff.	•	•																	
Post positions	•																		
Screen resumes	•																		
Interview qualified candidates	•	•																	
Offer qualified candidates positions	•	•																	
Provide HR training to OEII staff	•	•																	
Conduct series of team development training for OEII staff	•																		
Conduct series of training for RtI staff	•																		
Provide training at the school, district, regional and state levels	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•			
Develop publications on RtI related materials	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•			
Develop videos on RtI related materials	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•			

Table 68 – Timeline for Response to Intervention activities.

Approach Used	# of Schools Since SY2004-05	Results and Lessons Learned
School closure	23	No district plan for the reassignment of students resulted in some students moving from one low performing school to another.
Conversion to Charter	5	
Reduce management authority of the school	44	This strategy has begun to show promise as an extremely decentralizedschool district with high student mobility began to implement greaterconsistency in curriculum, instruction, assessment and professionaldevelopment.
Extended learning time	44	The success of this strategy relies on having highly effective teachers.

All of the schools listed above are in the Milwaukee Public School (MPS) district which, as a system, has been moving away from a decentralized approach to school improvement toward better aligned, focused, and support coming from the central office and external partners. In the past, MPS had been so decentralized that improvement strategies were often selected by school level staff. The District has been moving more of that decision making to Central Office which is a positive development. Our experience in working with MPS has taught us that the district central office plays a critical role in identifying the factors that are contributing to low performance in its schools, in establishing systems and resources to support meaningful reform and in holding leaders and teachers in low performing schools

accountable for results. Wisconsin will continue focus support to the district central office to increase effectiveness and oversight. Individual schools cannot improve outside the context of district operations. If the district isn't functioning well, the schools will struggle to implement, much less, sustain improvements.

Table 70- Performance Measures (E)(2)	Baseline	Data:	Actual	SY 2010-	End of	SY 2011-	End of	SY 2012-	End of	SY 2013-	End of
The number of schools for which one of the four school intervention models											
(described in Appendix C) will be initiated each year.		5		10)	2	0	4	0	e	50

In 2009-10, Wisconsin has 58 Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring (SIFI). Therefore we have identified 5 of these schools as persistently low performing. The maximum possible number of Title I SIFI in Wisconsin next year will be 104, thus we would be identifying an additional 5 schools. We expect the number to double each year until the 2013-14 sanction year as the benchmarks for demonstrating adequate yearly progress begin a steep trajectory in the 2011-12 school year.

(F) General (55 total points)

State Reform Conditions Criteria

(F)(1) Making education funding a priority (10 points)

The extent to which-

(i) The percentage of the total revenues available to the State (as defined in this notice) that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for FY 2009 was greater than or equal to the percentage of the total revenues available to the State (as defined in this notice) that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for FY 2008; and

(ii) The State's policies lead to equitable funding (a) between high-need LEAs (as defined in this notice) and other LEAs, and (b) within LEAs, between high-poverty schools (as defined in this notice) and other schools.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (F)(1)(i):

• Financial data to show whether and to what extent expenditures, as a percentage of the total revenues available to the State (as

defined in this notice), increased, decreased, or remained the same.

Evidence for (F)(1)(ii):

• Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.

Recommended maximum response length: Three pages

F(1)(i) The extent to which—

The percentage of the total revenues available to the State (as defined in this notice) that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for FY 2009 was greater than or equal to the percentage of the total revenues available to the State (as defined in this notice) that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for FY 2008;

Calculation of State revenues used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education

The percentage of State revenues used to support elementary, secondary and public higher education was 35.9% in fiscal year 2008 and 34.3% in fiscal year 2009. Please refer to the Appendix 32 for more detailed financial data.

State revenues used to support elementary and secondary education were determined by adding together State funding appropriated in State statute for: (1) general equalization aid through the State's primary elementary and secondary education funding formula, (2) categorical aids that partially fund specific school program costs such as special education, class size reduction, pupil transportation, and bilingual education, (3) funding for the state's two public residential schools, the Wisconsin School for the Deaf and the Wisconsin Center for the Blind and Visually Impaired, and (4) school levy credits that provide State funding to offset school property taxes. The inclusion of these four categories of funding is consistent with the method the State uses in calculating State funding for K-12 education. For fiscal year 2009, the amount of State aid budgeted for elementary and secondary education was adjusted to reflect cuts to general equalization aid under 2009

Wisconsin Acts 11 and 23, budget adjustment legislation. The level of State support for public institutions of higher education was determined by using the sum of the amounts appropriated in State statute for the University of Wisconsin System and the Wisconsin Technical College System. Appropriated funding for student financial aid, debt service payments, and research was not included in the calculation of State funding for public higher education.

Calculation of total revenues available to the State

The total amount of revenue available to the State was determined by summing all expenditures appropriated in State statute that were funded with General Purpose Revenues (GPR), Program Revenues (PR), and Segregated Fund Revenues (SEG). General Purpose Revenues consist of general taxes, miscellaneous receipts, and revenues collected by State agencies that are paid into a specific fund, lose their identity, and are then available for appropriation by the legislature. Program Revenues consist of revenues that are paid into the general fund and are credited by law to an appropriation to finance a specified program or State agency. Segregated Fund Revenues consist of revenues which, by law, are deposited into funds other than the general fund and are available for the purposes for which such funds are created. Fiscal year 2009 budgeted amounts were adjusted to reflect funding changes made under 2009 Wisconsin Act 2, budget adjustment legislation, and 2009 Wisconsin Act 28, the final 2009-11 biennial budget. Budgeted funding amounts were also adjusted to reflect appropriated lapses and compensation reserves, both of which are specified in State statute for each fiscal year.

F(1)(ii) - The State's policies lead to equitable funding (a) between high-need LEAs (as defined in this notice) and other LEAs, and (b) within LEAs, between high-poverty schools (as defined in this notice) and other schools.

Equitable funding policies

Wisconsin's policies for school funding are widely viewed as highly equitable. In the 2009 *Quality Counts* report issued by *Education Week*, Wisconsin ranked 8th overall for the quality of its school finance system. On specific measures, Wisconsin had the 3rd lowest coefficient of variation in school district spending, which indicates that Wisconsin ranked 3rd in per pupil spending equitability. On *Education Week's*

measure of per-pupil spending levels weighted by the degree to which districts meet or approach the national average for expenditures (cost and student-need adjusted), Wisconsin ranked 10th nationally.

Wisconsin's primary school funding formula distributes State aid based primarily on school district per pupil property values, providing a greater share of State support to districts with lower property values. Except for the districts with the very highest property values, the formula ensures that lower property value districts can spend the same amount per pupil as higher value districts at the same property tax rate. Of Wisconsin's \$5.3 billion in total direct State aid to school districts, 88 percent is distributed by the primary school funding formula. In practice, this results in a high level of equity in per pupil spending between districts, as demonstrated by both the *Quality Counts* data and comparing per pupil spending of high school poverty districts to the rest of the state. The 37 Wisconsin school districts with more than 20 percent of 5 to 17 year-olds living in families below the poverty line, based on 2008 U. S. Census estimates, spent an average of \$11,600 per pupil in the 2007-08 school year, excluding spending on debt service, transportation and food. This compares to \$10,100 per pupil for the 389 school districts with child poverty rates below 20 percent.

In addition, Wisconsin has several categorical aid programs targeted at districts with higher levels of poverty:

- <u>The Student Achievement Guarantee in Education (SAGE)</u> program provides \$2,250 per pupil for each pupil eligible for the Free or Reduced Price Lunch program. Participating schools are required to use SAGE funding to lower class size in grades Kindergarten through 3 to 15 pupils. Currently, 475 schools in 206 school districts voluntarily participate in the SAGE program (approximately 40 percent of all Wisconsin elementary schools), including schools in 86 percent of the school districts with child poverty rates above 20 percent. This compares to 45 percent participation by Wisconsin's remaining school districts.
- <u>Wisconsin's High Poverty Aid</u> program provides an additional \$112 per pupil in State aid to school districts with more than 50 percent of their pupils eligible for the federal free and reduced price lunch program. Of the 37 high poverty school districts, 34 percent (16 districts) receive High Poverty Aid compared to 8 percent of the remaining districts.

- <u>Preschool to Grade 5 Grants</u> support programs designed to improve the education of preschool through grade five pupils enrolled in school districts with high concentrations of economically disadvantaged and low-achieving pupils. Currently 38 schools in four school districts (Beloit, Kenosha, Milwaukee and Racine) receive grants. Grants are used to supplement spending based on performance objectives jointly established by the State Department of Public Instruction and the school.
- <u>Sparsity Aid</u> provides additional State support of \$150 to school districts with between 20 percent and 50 percent of their pupils eligible for free or reduced-price lunch (FRL) and \$300 per pupil for districts with over 50 percent FRL pupils that also meet have fewer than 725 pupils and a population density of less than 10 pupils per square mile. Of Wisconsin's 37 school districts with over child poverty rates above 20 percent, 68 percent (25 districts) receive sparsity aid compared to 23 percent for the remaining districts.

Wisconsin's categorical aid programs, especially the SAGE program, help direct additional aid to high-need schools within school districts to address learning issues related to poverty. However, Wisconsin does not allocate aid under the primary funding formula by school building nor does Wisconsin law mandate how much school districts must spend per pupil by individual school. School building budgets are controlled by local school boards.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools (40 points)

The extent to which-

(i) The State has a charter school law that does not prohibit or effectively inhibit increasing the number of high-performing charter schools (as defined in this notice) in the State, measured (as set forth in Appendix B) by the percentage of total schools in the State that are allowed to be charter schools or otherwise restrict student enrollment in charter schools;

(ii) The State has laws, statutes, regulations, or guidelines regarding how charter school authorizers approve, monitor, hold accountable, reauthorize, and close charter schools; in particular, whether authorizers require that student achievement (as defined in this notice) be one significant factor, among others, in authorization or renewal; encourage charter schools that serve student populations that are similar to local district student populations, especially relative to high-need students (as defined in this notice); and have closed or not renewed ineffective charter schools;

(iii) The State's charter schools receive (as set forth in Appendix B) equitable funding compared to traditional public schools, and a commensurate share of local, State, and Federal revenues;

(iv) The State provides charter schools with funding for facilities (for leasing facilities, purchasing facilities, or making tenant improvements), assistance with facilities acquisition, access to public facilities, the ability to share in bonds and mill levies, or other supports; and the extent to which the State does not impose any facility-related requirements on charter schools that are stricter than those applied to traditional public schools; and

(v) The State enables LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools (as defined in this notice) other than charter schools.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (F)(2)(i):

- A description of the State's applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents.
- The number of charter schools allowed under State law and the percentage this represents of the total number of schools in the State.
- The number and types of charter schools currently operating in the State.

Evidence for (F)(2)(ii):

- A description of the State's approach to charter school accountability and authorization, and a description of the State's applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents.
- For each of the last five years:
 - The number of charter school applications made in the State.
 - The number of charter school applications approved.
 - The number of charter school applications denied and reasons for the denials (academic, financial, low enrollment, other).
 - o The number of charter schools closed (including charter schools that were not reauthorized to operate).

Evidence for (F)(2)(iii):

- A description of the State's applicable statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents.
- A description of the State's approach to charter school funding, the amount of funding passed through to charter schools per

student, and how those amounts compare with traditional public school per-student funding allocations.

Evidence for (F)(2)(iv):

- A description of the State's applicable statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents.
- A description of the statewide facilities supports provided to charter schools, if any.

Evidence for (F)(2)(v):

• A description of how the State enables LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools (as defined in this notice) other than charter schools.

Recommended maximum response length: Six pages

Wisconsin has established a policy environment that fosters the proliferation of high-quality charter schools and innovative educational programs throughout the state. The State has made a continuous effort to create favorable conditions for high-quality charter schools since passing its first charter school law. Wisconsin charter schools encourage innovation and creativity in their approach to providing educational options for parents and their children and are an innovative part of the State's overall public education efforts to close the achievement gaps between economically disadvantaged students, students of color, and their peers. The state's charter schools also serve to increase the diversity of learning experiences in the state, provide testing grounds for new curricula and professional development training, and improve science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) opportunities throughout the state.

The extent to which-

(F)(2)(i) The State has a charter school law that does not prohibit or effectively inhibit increasing the number of high-performing charter schools (as defined in this notice) in the State, measured (as set forth in Appendix B) by the percentage of total schools in the State that are allowed to be charter schools or otherwise restrict student enrollment in charter schools;

Charter school laws

The Wisconsin Charter Program was established in 1993 Wisconsin Act 16 and empowered 10 school districts to authorize up to two charter schools each, for a total of 20 statewide. Thirteen charter schools were created under this law. In 1995 (1995 Wisconsin Act 27), revisions to the first charter school law granted chartering authority to all school boards statewide and eliminated the cap on the total number of charter schools. In 1997 (1997 Wisconsin Act 27), the State extended chartering authority in Milwaukee to the Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee (UW–Milwaukee), to the Milwaukee Area Technical College (MATC), and to the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee.

Charter school students in Wisconsin perform as well as traditional public school students. 82% percent of charter school students scored proficient or advanced in reading and 73% scored proficient or advanced in math on the most recent statewide assessments. The WDPI has made significant efforts to support the financial viability of charter schools. At the end of the four-year federal grant period, the State exceeded its goal to ensure at least 80% of the non-instrumentality and independent charter schools remained financially viable after their third year of operations. The final total of 83% in 2008 meant that 5 of 6 non-instrumentality or independent charter schools receiving grant monies met their financial and management goals to enable them to thrive after their federal grants ended.

In the 1998 (1997 Wisconsin Act 238), the State made additional changes to the law, allowing school districts to contract with regional Cooperative Educational Service Agencies (CESAs) to operate charter schools located within the CESA region. Another change required that a school board receiving a petition to establish a charter school or to convert a nonsectarian private school to a charter school must hold a public hearing on the matter and must consider the fiscal impact of the charter's establishment.

A final change enacted in 1998 requires that a school district in which a charter school is located determine whether the charter school is an instrumentality of the school district. If the board deems it an instrumentality, the district employs all personnel for the charter school. If the board determines the charter school is not an instrumentality, the personnel are considered employees of the charter school. The word "instrumentality" is not defined in the charter school law and has had limited use in Wisconsin. The word was initially included in the

charter law to ensure continuing eligibility of charter school teachers in the Wisconsin Retirement System. Instrumentality as used in the retirement law defines the employer, making it clear that the employing school district is the entity responsible for worker's compensation, insurance, unemployment compensation, employee insurance and benefits, liability for acts of school staff members, and so forth.

A charter school in Milwaukee that receives its charter from the Milwaukee Common Council, UW–Milwaukee, or MATC is not an instrumentality of the Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS), and the MPS school board may not employ any personnel for the charter school. However, if the Milwaukee Common Council contracts with an individual or group operating a charter school for profit, then that charter school is an instrumentality of the Milwaukee Public Schools. The MPS Board of Education will then employ all personnel for the charter school. If the Chancellor of University of Wisconsin–Parkside (UW-Parkside) contracts for the establishment of a charter school, the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System may employ instructional staff for the charter school.

The changes that occurred in the 1999–2001 biennial budget (1999 Wisconsin Act 9) revolved around Milwaukee per-pupil aids and statewide assessments. In the 2001–2003 budget bill (2001 Wisconsin Act 16), limited chartering authority was granted to UW–Parkside allowing it to establish a single charter school. Changes that occurred in the 2003–2005 biennial budget (2003 Wisconsin Act 156) exempted a specific charter school sponsored by UW–Milwaukee (Woodlands Academy) from some residency requirements. Additional changes in 2005 (2005 Wisconsin Act 25) resulted in the elimination of previous school year attendance requirements for students residing in Milwaukee. In 2008 (2007 Wisconsin Act 222), the State law was further amended to clarify requirements for virtual charter schools.

Most recently, the State legislature passed and the governor signed 2009 Wisconsin Act 61, to be effective in November 2009. The new law directs all charter school authorizers to consider the principles and standards for quality charter schools established by the National Association of Charter School Authorizers when establishing or contracting for the establishment of a charter school. The Wisconsin Charter School Association considers this measure an important step towards ensuring that charter school contracts will be comprehensive and clearly define the autonomy of the charter school governance board. The legislation governing Wisconsin's charter schools can be found in Wis. Stat. § 118.40.

There is no limit in State law or regulation concerning the number of charter schools that can be authorized or the number of children who can be served by such schools in the state. There are currently 79 local school boards that have authorized at least one charter school. Charter schools must employ Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) certified staff and participate in the state assessment system. From the 1997-98 school year to the 2009-10 school year, Wisconsin charter schools grew in number from 17 to 206, and they serve children in all corners of the state. See Appendix 33: Wisconsin Map of Charter Schools. In the 2009-2010 school year, 206 charter schools are serving approximately 35,000 students. These 206 charter schools are comprised of 169 instrumentality charters authorized by school boards, and 17 non-instrumentality charters authorized by the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, and the University of Wisconsin-Parkside.

In addition to monitoring which charter schools in the state are instrumentality and non-instrumentality charter schools, the State surveys schools to determine their focus, or purpose. Some service at-risk student populations, while others reports a general or liberal arts orientation, and still more identify themselves as project-based, technological/vocational, environmental, Montessori, virtual, arts/culture, mathematics/science, language, early learning, or gifted/talented schools. A breakdown of charter schools according to their curricular focus is provided in Appendix 34: 2009-2010 Charter Schools by Type.

(F)(2)(ii): The State has laws, statutes, regulations, or guidelines regarding how charter school authorizers approve, monitor, hold accountable, reauthorize, and close charter schools; in particular, whether authorizers require that student achievement (as defined in this notice) be one significant factor, among others, in authorization or renewal; encourage charter schools that serve student populations that are similar to local district student populations, especially relative to high-need students (as defined in this notice); and have closed or not renewed ineffective charter schools;

Wisconsin charter school statutes

Pursuant to Wisconsin law, a charter may be granted for any term not exceeding five school years and may be renewed for additional terms with each term not exceeding five years. Wis. Stat. § 118.40(3)(b). School boards are the primary charter school authorizers in Wis. Stat. § 118.40 (1m), (2), and (2m). State statutes concerning charter schools contain a list of required items that must be included in a petition to form a charter school. Wis. Stat. § 118.40(1m). These items are designed to ensure that submitted petitions are of high quality and to provide guidance to authorizers during the approval process. Among other things, the charter petition must include: a description of the school's educational program; the methods by which the school will help students achieve educational goals as well as the method by which student progress will be assessed; and, the governance structure of the school including methods of ensuring parental involvement. All of the provisions that are required in the charter petition must be included in the final contract that is established between the authorizer and the person who seeks to establish the school.

There is also a statutorily required process (a public hearing within 30 days to establish the level of support from parents and employees) and timeline of approval (30 days from the date of the public hearing). Wis. Stat. § 118.40(2) and (2m). The Milwaukee Common Council, UW–Milwaukee, Milwaukee Area Technical College, and UW–Parkside also have chartering authority Wis. Stat. § 118.40(2r), and the resultant charters and contracts must contain the same information that is required in a petition to a public school authorizer, Wis. Stat. § 118.40(2r)(b) With the exception of UW–Parkside, each of the other non-school board authorizers may establish, sponsor, and operate an unlimited number of charter schools in Milwaukee. The chartering entity reviews submitted petitions or proposals and reserves complete discretion in granting or denying a charter school. Under State law, all chartering entities must give preference to an applicant who would establish a charter school to serve an at-risk student population. Wis. Stat. § 118.40(3)(d). If the Milwaukee school board denies a petition, the denied petitioner may appeal to the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI). Wis. Stat. § 118.40(2)(c).

Regardless of authorizer, all charter school contracts must clearly describe the educational program of the school; how the school will achieve a racial and ethnic balance among its pupils that reflects the balance in the school district as a whole; the methods the school will use to enable the students to attain the educational goals and measure pupil progress toward attaining those goals; the methods the school

will use to ensure parental involvement; the procedures the school will use to ensure the health and safety of its pupils; the procedures to discipline students; the qualifications of people employed at the school; and the manner in which the school will conduct annual audits of financial and programmatic operations. All of these things (including the annual audits) must be included in the petition and the contract. As of November 2009, non public school authorizers must also consider the principles and standards for quality charter schools established by the National Association of Charter School Authorizers when establishing or contracting for the establishment of a charter school. Wis. Stat. § 118.40(2r)(f).

WDPI will continue to support high-quality charter school contracts through its administration of the competitive federal charter schools discretionary grant program. Previously, Wisconsin was the recipient of a federal Public Charter Schools Program Grant for approximately \$52 million for the three-year project period from 2005-2008. For the entire four-year period of the federal grant from August 1, 2005, through the extension year ending on July 31, 2009, WDPI awarded 72 planning grants, 100 initial implementation grants, 115 implementation renewal grants, 21 dissemination grants and 19 dissemination renewal grants. At the end of the four-year project, 91% of charter school teachers met the highly qualified standards of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The State Superintendent's advisory council on charter schools met in October, 2008, and May, 2009. The council was created to develop and support exemplary charter schools to increase student achievement and educational options for parents and children. The 22-member council continues to help ensure strong, accountable charter schools while also providing support related to a wide range of programs, services, and educational strategies to strengthen existing charter school programs and establish new high-quality charter schools. Each year of the federal grant, the WDPI co-sponsored the annual charter schools State conference with the Wisconsin Charter Schools Association.

Hundreds of parents, students, teachers, authorizers and charter school operators attend this two-day conference. WDPI staff present each year on the federal and State laws governing charter schools and the federal grant application process. During the last year of the project, WDPI Charter Schools Program staff worked frequently with the Green Charter Schools Network to plan and conduct a Green Charter Schools Conference in Ashland, Wisconsin, at Northland College. Staff also worked with and visited many new charter schools to help them launch project-based learning (PBL) curriculum and staff development projects. In November, 2009, the Wisconsin Charter School

Association named the WDPI's Charter Schools Team "Charter Innovator of the Year." The charter schools staff at WDPI was honored for its work in supporting and promoting the Project-based Learning Network (PBL) in PBL charter schools throughout the state.

A charter may be revoked if the authorizer finds that the charter school violated its contract or failed to comply with generally accepted accounting standards of fiscal management, or if its pupils failed to make sufficient progress in attaining educational goals. Wis. Stat. § 118.40(5).

WDPI annually surveys school districts to determine the number of first level and second level decisions made regarding the number of charter school "applications" in the state. First level decisions are defined as a concept approval for the purposes of further study, participation in a consortium or a signed planning grant application for federal charter school funds. Second level decisions are defined as an approved charter contract, a written agreement to participate in a consortium or a signature on an implementation grant application for federal charter school funds. The most recent information available is from 2003-04 through 2007-08 and is presented in Table 1 below. Each of the annual surveys also includes the applicable reasons for approval and denial. Reasons for denial include: (a) declining enrollment; (b)financial reasons; (c) educational program not unique or innovative; (d) lack of teacher, parent or community support; (e) liability of school district; (f) school district withdrew from a multi-district consortium; and (g) other.

	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08
First Level Decisions					
Approved	72	98	106	100	61
Denied	2	4	9	12	10
Total	74	102	115	112	71
Second Level Decisions					
Approved	47	80	76	86	57
Denied	1	3	0	6	1
Total	48	83	76	92	58

Table 71 - Number of Charter School Applications Made, Approved, & Denied

Over the past five years, the State's authorizers have opened 143 charter schools and closed 67 charter schools, with some of these closures occurring mid-contract and others as non-renewals. Forty of the closures occurred during the past two years – indicating that the State's authorizers, with support from WDPI, are increasingly holding charter schools accountable and shutting down ineffective schools. These numbers are presented by year in Table 2 below.

2004-05 2005-06 2007-08 2008-09 2009-10 2006-07 Opened 18 52 10 36 27 4 Closed 7 10 10 21 19 TBD Operating 221 162 182 190 232 206

Table 72 - Number of Charter Schools Opened, Closed, & Operating

Although Wisconsin does not systematically report reasons for charter school closures, it is clear from research and conversations that the following are some common reasons charter schools have closed: students do not choose to attend the charter school and thus there is insufficient student enrollment; the authorizer closes the charter school because the school has not met parts of the contract, including adequate student academic progress; the charter school governance board is not properly operating and the educational offerings of the charter school become a school district program or the charter school changes to an alternative school run by the school district; financial reasons, such as the lack of financial capital available to the charter school; and, school district declining student enrollments that result in less operating revenue for the school closed last year, the Wisconsin Charter School Association reports that six were closed for "poor performance." All of these six schools were non-instrumentality charter schools chartered by Milwaukee Public Schools.

(F)(2)(iii): The State's charter schools receive (as set forth in Appendix B) equitable funding compared to traditional public schools, and a commensurate share of local, State, and Federal revenues;

Equitable funding for charter schools

Most of the money that funds K–12 education in Wisconsin comes from State funds raised primarily through State income and sales taxes. The remaining funds come from other sources, including property taxes, federal aid, and local fees. Wisconsin statutes do not treat district authorized charter schools any differently than traditional public schools in how they are funded.

In schools chartered by a school district, the school district counts charter school students on its regular count for state and federal aid purposes, but the contract or charter determines the amount of funding for the charter school each year. In some cases, the district's perpupil expenditure (including local, state, and federal revenues) follows the student as he or she moves from a regular public school to a charter school. In other cases, the charter school may function with less money per pupil, though the district will have received the same amount of aid as had the student been at a traditional public school. This diminished funding arrangement may occur when a charter school shares an existing district facility, shares management costs with the school district, participates in district services such as co-curricular activities, special education, psychological services, and/or food service.

In schools chartered by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, UW–Milwaukee, Milwaukee Area Technical College, or UW– Parkside, State law determines the State school aids received. These non–school board sponsored independent charter schools are funded from a proportionate reduction in State school aids from all 425 school districts. For the 2009-2010 school year, the amount of State school aids is \$7,775 per pupil for the independent charter schools and is paid directly to the operator of the charter schools. The total amount is based on the number of eligible students attending the charter school. Several charter schools have received grants and gifts from community, state, and national organizations, foundations, businesses, and private individuals. These schools also receive additional federal monies under the ESEA's Title 1 for economically disadvantaged students, federal monies under Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

(IDEA) for special education students, and additional State aids for eligible special education program costs. These schools should therefore receive their commensurate share of state and federal revenues.

An external organization estimates that Wisconsin funds its charter schools at a slightly higher rate than most other states. According to the Center for Education Reform, only 10 other states fund their charters at a higher rate than Wisconsin. It is important to note, since school-level data are not generally available for school board authorized instrumentality charter schools, these estimates tend to be based on survey data and the data that is available for the non-school board independent charter schools in Milwaukee. Therefore, Wisconsin's rate is probably higher than reported. Finally, independent charter schools only comprise 8% of the charter schools in Wisconsin.

92% of charter schools in the state are authorized by a school district. The district receives state and federal aids for qualified students in these charter schools. So the *district's* per pupil revenue does not change. The vast majority of charter schools could be said to be receiving their commensurate share of state and federal resources. However, the district and the charter school negotiate the specific level of funding.

(F)(2)(iv): The State provides charter schools with funding for facilities (for leasing facilities, purchasing facilities, or making tenant improvements), assistance with facilities acquisition, access to public facilities, the ability to share in bonds and mill levies, or other supports; and the extent to which the State does not impose any facility-related requirements on charter schools that are stricter than those applied to traditional public schools; and

Equitable access to funding for charter schools

The State of Wisconsin does not provide separate facilities funds for traditional public schools or for public charter schools. The State funds a student enrolled in charter school the same as it funds a student that chooses to enroll in a traditional public school. Under the Wisconsin school financing system, a dollar spent on a school facility is aided exactly the same as a dollar spent on a teacher's salary.

(F)(2)(v): The State enables LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools (as defined in this notice) other than charter schools.

School board authority to operate innovative, autonomous public schools

Wisconsin allows local school boards maximum flexibility to create and operate innovative and autonomous public schools and educational programs. In addition, Wis. Stat. § 118.38 allows school boards to apply for a waiver from the WDPI to be exempt from any education related district requirement except those that concern the health and safety of pupils, pupil discrimination, the assessment program, teacher licensure, pupil records, data collection, and financial audits.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions (5 points)

The extent to which the State, in addition to information provided under other State Reform Conditions Criteria, has created, through law, regulation, or policy, other conditions favorable to education reform or innovation that have increased student achievement or graduation rates, narrowed achievement gaps, or resulted in other important outcomes.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (F)(3):

• A description of the State's other applicable key education laws, statutes, regulations, or relevant legal documents.

Recommended maximum response length: Two pages

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions

Foundation for reform

Wisconsin has a strong foundation of education innovations and reforms upon which to build. From early childhood education to teacher training to college access, current Wisconsin law, policy, and practices position the State to implement new reforms that will improve academic outcomes and close achievement gaps.

As the birthplace of kindergarten nearly a century and a half ago, Wisconsin has long understood the link between high quality early childhood education and student achievement. And, as one of the first and only states to fund four-year-old kindergarten (4K) though our primary State aid formula, Wisconsin has also pioneered "community approaches" to 4K, a unique collaboration among school districts, Head Start centers, and child-care centers in dozens of school districts around the state. Through these innovations, 4K teachers, who hold bachelor's degrees and are State licensed, are meeting parent and community needs and serving students in locations outside of the traditional school building. In the 2007-09 Budget Act, a new 4K start up grant program which gives priority to districts adopting community approaches, was established to expand 4K to districts that had not yet adopted the program. As a result of these investments, 80% of Wisconsin districts, serving over 34,000 children in 2009-10 now offer this program, which is critical for future success. In addition, Wisconsin established Model Early Learning Standards, which are used by early childhood education programs across the state to prepare children from birth to through first grade for academic readiness and success.

Wisconsin's emphasis on investing early in children's academic success is further underscored by our statewide small class size program, the Student Achievement Guarantee in Education (SAGE) program. The program requires participating schools to ensure class sizes of 15 to 1 in grades kindergarten through 3 in exchange for an additional \$2,250 per income-eligible pupil. Approximately 475 schools across the state participated in this program in 2009-10. The small class size program promotes greater personal interaction between teachers and students in the early grades, an intervention research has shown to be effective in improving student outcomes.

Investment in high quality educators has always been a top priority in Wisconsin, and recent reforms have underscored our state's commitment to our educator workforce. In 2000, Wisconsin adopted a major restructuring of educator licensing, preparation, and professional development that shifted the focus away from credits and longevity toward educator effectiveness. The Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative, or Wis. Admin. Code Ch. PI 34, a three-tiered system of initial, professional, and master educator licenses, now requires Wisconsin teachers, pupil service professionals, and administrators to demonstrate proficiency in critical knowledge and skills that impact student learning. Candidates for the optional master educator license must also demonstrate evidence that their work has resulted in measured improvements in student learning. To support these changes and to retain quality educators, Wisconsin has provided funding for initial educators in their critical first years of teaching, as well as additional stipends for master educators, or those educators achieving National Board Certification.

Further, with financial assistance from the Wallace Foundation, Wisconsin established the Wisconsin Urban Schools Leadership Project in 2004, a project focused on fostering principal excellence in the state's five largest school districts. The project underscores the importance of the school building leader in implementing reforms and closing achievement gaps at the school level. Based on the good work done in the first grant, the Wallace Foundation funded a second grant to Wisconsin on leadership for learning. Through this grant, guidelines for the content of principal preparation programs are being developed.

To further create opportunities for local innovation in recruiting and retaining top talent, Wisconsin lawmakers repealed in 2009 a longstanding law that had constrained teacher salaries and stifled reform. The so-called Qualified Economic Offer law had authorized school boards to limit the combined increase in teacher salary and fringe benefits to 3.8% annually, while requiring school boards to give first priority to funding the existing fringe benefit package. Freed from the constraints of this law, school districts and teachers unions are now in a far better position develop innovative educator compensation systems that reward teacher effectiveness rather than longevity and continuing education.

While seeking to ensure that all schools and educators in Wisconsin are of high quality, State law also provides parents many options beyond the neighborhood school when determining which school is the right fit for their child. Progressive Wisconsin laws around open

enrollment permit any Wisconsin child to apply to attend school in any district around the state. Further, Wisconsin established one of the first public charter school laws in the nation, as described in greater detail elsewhere in this application, and several charter options exist for students around the state. Students in the Milwaukee Public School (MPS) district have perhaps more publicly funded options available to them than any other school district in the country, with options in MPS public schools, MPS charter schools, independent charter schools run by the City and the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, private schools participating in the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program, suburban schools participating in the Chapter 220 inter-district transfer program, and open enrollment options.

While initiatives currently in place to improve academic achievement in the state's largest urban district are discussed elsewhere in the application, Wisconsin has also made a significant commitment in recent years to ensure academic opportunities for students in our small, rural schools, which serve about 44% of Wisconsin's public school students. In recent State budget actions, additional funds were provided for pupil transportation, a large cost-driver for sparsely populated rural areas. In addition, a new sparsity aid program, adopted as part of the 2007-09 budget, is providing additional financial help to pay the cost of educating students who live in rural areas.

The State is also pursuing several other initiatives to prepare students for success in higher education, the workplace, and in life. Wisconsin will adopt the Common Core Standards for English Language Arts and Common Core Standards for Mathematics, which are internationally benchmarked and align with post-secondary and workplace expectations. Efforts are underway to reform assessments and data systems that link to higher education are discussed elsewhere, as well.

Many of Wisconsin's fastest growing career fields require training in science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM), and Wisconsin has responded with a new focus on these content areas. In addition to developing new content standards in mathematics, recent State budget actions have supported STEM programs in schools throughout the state. For example, Project Lead the Way has received State an array of State support from a variety of sources to expand its engineering program to schools around the state. In addition, new competitive STEM grants were recently made available to school districts or consortia to develop, implement, and evaluate programs designed to provide innovative instructional programs, support students who are typically under-represented in STEM, and increase the academic achievement of students in these subjects.

In addition to these efforts, the Wisconsin Covenant Program, established by Governor Doyle in 2006 in partnership with the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) and the state's public and private institutions of higher education, promises a spot in a Wisconsin post-secondary institution and a financial aid package to 8th grade students who pledge to maintain above average grades and demonstrate good citizenship throughout their high school careers. A \$25 million appropriation was established to fund the first Wisconsin Covenant Scholars who will begin college in 2011-12, and a \$40 million private endowment and Wisconsin Covenant Foundation have been established to provide further financial support to students in the program.

While these efforts provide just a snapshot of areas where Wisconsin has made significant strides toward reform, many more laws, policies, and practices exist that promote student achievement and reduction of achievement gaps. In short, the State is ready to expand upon current efforts and commence new reforms that will lead to significant academic gains.

I. COMPETITION PRIORITIES

Priority 2: Competitive Preference Priority -- Emphasis on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM). (15 points, all or nothing)

To meet this priority, the State's application must have a high-quality plan to address the need to (i) offer a rigorous course of study in mathematics, the sciences, technology, and engineering; (ii) cooperate with industry experts, museums, universities, research centers, or other STEM-capable community partners to prepare and assist teachers in integrating STEM content across grades and disciplines, in promoting effective and relevant instruction, and in offering applied learning opportunities for students; and (iii) prepare more students for advanced study and careers in the sciences, technology, engineering, and mathematics, including by addressing the needs of underrepresented groups and of women and girls in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

The competitive preference priority will be evaluated in the context of the State's entire application. Therefore, a State that is responding to this priority should address it throughout the application, as appropriate, and provide a summary of its approach to addressing the priority in the text box below. The reviewers will assess the priority as part of their review of a State's application and determine whether it has been met.

Recommended maximum response length, if any: One page

Priority 2: Competitive Preference Priority -- Emphasis on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM).

The State of Wisconsin is committed to achieving excellence in STEM education, and has put forth a rigorous, but attainable plan that includes the following STEM initiatives.

Create an Advisory Council to coordinate statewide STEM education activities

The State will create a State Superintendent's STEM Advisory Council that represents schools, technical colleges, universities and technology business partners. This Advisory Council will serve to coordinate efforts around the state to strengthen ties with regional economic development partners and higher education
stakeholders, aligning STEM efforts around higher education and workforce needs, as well as promoting best practices within Wisconsin schools. The Advisory Council will serve as a clearinghouse for curricula and innovative education techniques, a coordinating body for developing STEM standards and assessments, and a channel of communication for integrating the efforts of school districts, businesses, and higher education institutions. This will formalize work underway through the collaboration of Wisconsin Charter Schools Association, Wisconsin Technical College System, the University of Wisconsin System, Wisconsin Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, STEM Equity Pipeline State Leadership team, Engineers & Scientists of Milwaukee, and the Wisconsin Technology Council.

Establish STEM Academies

The WDPI will support four STEM Academies located in four different areas across the state, developed through the collaboration of educational institutions, professional organizations, and non-profit organizations. The goal of the Academies is to provide a STEM-focused learning center initially for high school juniors and seniors on-site and via virtual learning options, staffed by faculty prepared to develop a program of coursework, experiences, and research projects connecting science, technology, and mathematics that is then a professional development vehicle for teachers statewide. Students who are not able to be onsite will participate in the coursework and other experiences via virtual learning. Likewise, high school teachers will also participate through interactive technology in lesson study based on the STEM curriculum from the Academies, observing the instruction at the Academies, receiving feedback as they bring the STEM units of instruction to their schools, and collaborating in professional learning communities.

Each STEM Academy will link with local businesses, industries, and workforce resources, collaborating with the Wisconsin regional economic development partners to provide relevant career-related applications of the critical skills and knowledge students are learning. Each Academy will also connect to the University of Wisconsin's System's Research to Jobs Initiative. The STEM Academies may adopt a focus connected with the local economy in order to tap local industry, business, and related institutions, such as forestry, agriculture, renewable energy, biotechnology, and advanced manufacturing. Existing and emerging STEM education efforts in urban districts will also link with University of Wisconsin's Research to Jobs Initiative.

As part of the STEM Academies and the work done to connect the Common Core Standards to the career pathways, university staff may be used to help teachers learn how to promote and to facilitate ways in which students can learn research strategies in STEM, thus increasing student knowledge and skill, increasing interest in STEM, and developing entrepreneurship skills.

Model teaching lessons at the STEM Academies would be captured via video to enable professional development aligned around more STEM coursework in high schools across the state and to implement common STEM coursework pre-approved for science and mathematics equivalency credit.

	STEM ACADEMIES												
GOAL	KEY ACTIVITIES	TIMELINE	KEY PARTIES										
	Engage potential staff and collaborating network of teachers to develop curriculum and sample units of instruction	May - August 2010	 WDPI Coalitions that might include; LEAs, CESAs; technical colleges; University of Wisconsin 										
	Summer training institute	August 2010	system and / or private										
	Preparation of STEM academy instructional sites	• June - August 2010	college / university; regional economic										
	Begin involvement of educators in professional development, collaborative development of units, and lesson study	• September 2010 - June 2011	development partners; public and private sponsors										
Establish STEM Academies	• Second year; adding non- course-based STEM experiences both on site and virtual	• September 2011 - June 2012											
	Expansion of involvement of educators in professional development, collaborative development of units, and lesson study	• September 2011 - June 2012											
	Third year of instruction; adding non-course-based STEM experiences both on site and virtual	• September 2012 - June 2013											
	Continuation of involvement of educators in professional development, collaborative development of units, and lesson study (sustained through Web 2.0 technology)	• September 2012 - June 2013											

Table 73 – Implementation plan for STEM Academies.

	STEM ACADEMIES															
KEY TASK		YEA	AR 1			YEA	AR 2			YEA	AR 3			YEA	R 4	
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Engage potential staff and collaborating network of teachers to develop curriculum and sample units of instruction		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠	*
Summer training institute			•													
Preparation of STEM academy instructional sites		•	•													
Begin involvement of educators in professional development, collaborative development of units, and lesson study			٠	•	•	•										
Second year; adding non- course-based STEM experiences both on site and virtual							•	•	•	•						
Expansion of involvement of educators in professional development, collaborative development of units, and lesson study							•	•	•	•						
Third year of instruction; adding non-course-based STEM experiences both on site and virtual											٠	٠	٠	٠		
Continuation of involvement of educators in professional development, collaborative development of units, and lesson study (sustained through Web 2.0 technology)											•	•	•	•		

Table 74 – Timeline for implementing activities around STEM Academies.

Provided below are the State's planned support initiatives designed to drive STEM best practices:

<u>Support STEM pilot projects in Participating LEAs</u>: The State will provide funding in the form of competitive grants to those districts proposing their own innovative solutions to enhance STEM education in their LEA, which could include among other strategies the implementation or expansion of Project Lead the Way or STEM charter schools. Programs that prove successful will then be recommended to other LEAs as a proven tool for training Wisconsin students in STEM areas. This initiative builds on the success of a current legislated STEM grant competition.

<u>Help schools improve mathematics and science achievement</u>: To be college- and career-ready in the 21st century requires a strong foundation in science and mathematics. Across Wisconsin, interest is growing to increase the number of science and mathematics credits required for high school graduation from the current two to at least three in both science and mathematics. Expanding to require three credits of science and

mathematics for high school graduation is identified as a reform strategy under the Exhibit II high leverage strategies, required in Beloit, Green Bay, Kenosha, Madison, Milwaukee, and Racine school districts. Coursework integrated across the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) provides new opportunities to earn these additional credits, rather than only providing a single option, such as Algebra II or Advanced Chemistry. By providing a variety of routes to earn science and mathematics credits, students are more likely to be successful, linking this learning with their career pathways.

Specific support will be provided to assist districts as they identify ways to expand opportunities for courses in STEM fields, one of the areas LEAs agreed to by signing the Memorandum of Understanding. The State's commitment is to provide funding for innovative solutions proposed by the LEA to enhance STEM education. One example is to expand Project Lead the Way, a curriculum integrating mathematics and science tightly within an applied engineering context and targeted at preparing students for careers in engineering and mathematics, already in place in several key districts in Wisconsin.

The State will also contract with educational institutions, professional organizations and / or non-profit organizations to provide STEM teacher and learning academies on site and via virtual learning opportunities throughout the State.

In addition, State support will focus on increasing Advanced Placement course taking by training high school staff. The strategy is to provide high school science and mathematics staff with training in effective learning strategies to increase the Advanced Placement course taking, exam completion, and participation of students of color. Currently funded through an ED grant involving 12 districts across the state with high minority populations, this funding would continue the effort, building on lessons learned and progress begun. The project goal is to increase Advanced Placement course taking in STEM by 5% for each targeted population.

<u>Expand equivalency credit options</u>: Expand the courses available for equivalency credit, currently limited to science credit through courses in agriculture and Project Lead the Way courses. The equivalency process will be expanded by devising model curriculum for STEM courses that will be pre-approved for equivalency credit in science and/or mathematics. Expanded equivalency courses will provide students with more options to earn a third credit in science and/or mathematics, rather than only one sequence through the subject areas.

Increase Advanced Placement course participation through training high school staff: For high school graduation, one-third of Wisconsin districts require and two-thirds of students enroll in mathematics beyond the State-required two credits.

	STEM BEST P	PRACTICES	
GOAL	KEY ACTIVITIES	TIMELINE	KEY PARTIES
	Convene existing partners supporting STEM initiatives across Wisconsin to plan for advisory council	• Year 1 (Q2 – Q3)	 WDPI Private funders (corporate donations and private foundations)
Create STEM Advisory Council	Convene STEM Advisory Council	• Year 1 (Q2) – Year 4, at least quarterly	Representatives from PK- 12, higher education, STEM workforce (private and public sector), regional economic development partners and public and private sponsors
Support initiatives to drive STEM best practices	 Award competitive grants Support STEM pilot projects in participating LEAs Expand Project Lead the Way Target undergraduate science and mathematics majors to enter teaching Increase Advanced Placement course taking by training high schools staff 	• Year 1 (Q2) – Year 4	 WDPI Coalitions that might include; LEAs, CESAs; technical colleges; University of Wisconsin system and / or private college / university; regional economic development partners; public and private sponsors

Table 75 – Implementation plan for STEM best practices.

Table 76 – Timeline for implement STEM best practices activities.

				STE	M BES	T PRA	ACTIC	CES								
KEY TASK		YEA	AR 1			YEA	AR 2			YEA	AR 3			YEA	AR 4	
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Convene existing partners																
supporting STEM initiatives																
across Wisconsin to plan for	•	•														
advisory council																
Convene STEM Advisory																
Council		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Award competitive grants		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Support STEM pilot projects in																
participating LEAs		•	•	•		•				•	•					•
Expand Project Lead the Way		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Target undergraduate science																
and mathematics majors to enter		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
teaching																
Increase Advanced Placement																
course taking by training high		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
schools staff																

Priority 3: Invitational Priority – Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (not scored)

The Secretary is particularly interested in applications that include practices, strategies, or programs to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (prekindergarten through third grade) by enhancing the quality of preschool programs. Of particular interest are proposals that support practices that (i) improve school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive); and (ii) improve the transition between preschool and kindergarten.

The State is invited to provide a discussion of this priority in the text box below, but such description is optional. Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length, if any: Two pages

Priority 3: Invitational Priority – Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes

Innovations in early childhood

Wisconsin is a national leader in the collaborative development and effective implementation of a statewide, comprehensive early childhood system, and has the infrastructure in place to implement further needed reforms. From the establishment of the country's first kindergarten in the 1856 to the passage of legislation making kindergarten mandatory in 2009; and from our State's fiscal commitment to 4K, to our unique collaborations among early childhood education providers, a number of initiatives pioneered in Wisconsin have resulted in our state being at the forefront of comprehensive, high quality education and care.

Accelerating this work with Race to the Top funds is possible only because of Wisconsin's progressive history of early childhood education. Recognizing the importance of investing in Wisconsin's future, Governor Doyle introduced his KidsFirst agenda in 2004. KidsFirst was a comprehensive agenda to invest in Wisconsin's future by improving the lives of the state's children through ensuring that Wisconsin's children are ready for success; are safe at home, in school, and in their communities; have the opportunity to be raised by strong families; and grow up healthy. As part of KidsFirst, the Governor proposed improving and expanding access to early childhood programs from child-care to four-year-old kindergarten. Today, six years after the introduction of this agenda, many of the Governor's goals in KidsFirst have been realized.

One of the most cutting-edge innovations of the KidsFirst agenda has been the use of technology and data system to streamline services and improve efficiency. Wisconsin has a unique streamlined application system known as ACCESS, where individuals can apply for Medicaid, Foodshare and some related benefits on-line on a single application. Wisconsin Shares, the State's child care program, will be added to this tool in late January 2010, enabling individuals who apply for childcare to apply for Foodshare and healthcare concurrently. This integrated service model leverages technology in a usable manner, expanding access to crucial services and setting the tone for greater service integration throughout Milwaukee.

However, Wisconsin's early childhood innovations long predate impressive data systems. In fact, Wisconsin is one of the first and only states to fund four-year-old kindergarten (4K) though our primary State aid formula. This fundamental, systemic commitment to early childhood education has propelled Wisconsin forward as a national leader in pre-kindergarten access. This year, over 38,000 Wisconsin children are participating in free, universal 4K in 333 school districts (over 80%). Notably, y\this is double the number of school districts that offered 4K during the 2001-02 school year.

Wisconsin has forged innovative "community approaches" to 4K, a unique collaboration among school districts, Head Start centers, and child-care centers in over 100 school districts in Wisconsin. Through these innovations, 4K teachers, who hold bachelor's degrees and are licensed through the state, are meeting parent and community needs and serving students in locations outside of the traditional school building. Community approaches substantially increase the availability of shared professional development for teachers and child-care providers.

To measure its success, Wisconsin participated in the National Center for Early Development and Learning study of State-Wide Early Education Programs (SWEEP). One of five states to be studied, SWEEP findings showed Wisconsin 4K students were above the national average on three of the four academic skills assessed. The SWEEP study found improvement in all four dimensions of children's social skills: assertiveness, frustration tolerance, task orientation, and peer social skills. Overall, both poor and non-poor students attending 4K programs in Wisconsin gained academic, language and literacy, and social skills.

Collaborations at the local level in Wisconsin's 4K communication approaches are mirrored by unprecedented collaboration at the state level. The Wisconsin Early Childhood Collaborating Partners network, comprised of over 40 agencies, associations, and programs, focuses on aligning Wisconsin communities, agencies, associations, and state government to work together as a system of high quality comprehensive early childhood services for every child and family who wants them.

Through these strong partnerships, Wisconsin developed and implemented statewide Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards (WMELS), which are used by early childhood education programs across the state to prepare children from birth to through first grade for academic readiness and success. These standards, based on developmental expectations grounded in research and best practice, form the basis for Wisconsin's early childhood education and care. Over 70 professionals are available to provide training on the standards, which are considered a national model.

To further underscore the importance of a cohesive approach to early childhood and care, Governor Doyle and the Legislature created a new Wisconsin Department of Children and Families (WDCF), an agency whose sole focus is promoting the economic and social well-being of Wisconsin children and families. Among the goals of the new department are to ensure that families have access to quality early care and education. Notably, WDCF has responsibility and oversight for Wisconsin's child-care centers and the Wisconsin Shares child-care subsidy program. Additionally, Wisconsin has placed a high priority on ensuring that families in need of financial assistance for child-care are able to access the Wisconsin Shares program. In over a decade, there has been no waiting list for this program, despite significant fiscal pressures.

Under the direction of the Governor, WDCF has also developed a Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) for child-care providers across the state. The QRIS will require all providers who receive payments under Wisconsin Shares to be rated. Centers will be provided with training and technical assistance to improve their ratings and eventually, reimbursement will be tied to quality rating. This system affords parents the tools they need to make decisions about placement of their children and allows the State to pay providers on a sliding scale, based upon performance.

In October 2008, stemming from reauthorization of Head Start, Governor Doyle created the Governor's State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care (ECAC). The 30-member group, co-chaired by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Secretary of WDCF, is focused on creating a statewide system for assessing the quality and availability of early childhood education as well as the developing programs and services for children from birth to age five, particularly improving access to and participation in high quality early childhood education for low-income children. The Council is currently applying for ARRA funding to improve coordination and collaboration among early childhood care and education programs and services through the Administration for Children and Families' State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care funds. In addition, the group is charged with developing a plan to establish a unified data collection system for public early childhood services throughout the state, an effort reinforced by efforts underway in the WDPI's longitudinal data system (LDS).

Improvements have been made at the state level to align the patchwork of funding available for early childhood education. State agencies have collaborated around seven different federal funding streams to align system development and implementation efforts related to state/regional collaboration, WMELS, poverty/homelessness, professional development, early childhood professional development, and others. Six regions are supported collaboration coaches and three other process coaches provide leadership in content areas. In addition, with funding through the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA), Wisconsin is working collaboratively to enhance the array of services and programs available to children with disabilities from birth-three and in school settings.

Race to the Top is an opportunity to accelerate Wisconsin's work to expand successful systems and partnerships and provide greater access to quality care to Wisconsin children. Key statewide initiatives would include:

- Expand the 4K start –up grant program to serve more districts and more children, expand current models to community settings with child-care or Head Start, hire administrators to implement community approaches, reduce 4K class size, improve teacher-child ratios, and purchase materials to enhance program quality.
- Implement professional development, training, and/or technical assistance for district and community early childhood partners on topics such as Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards, social or emotional development, inclusive environments for young children, transition processes, early literacy, Dual Language Learners, best practices, etc. This could be in addition to or in conjunction with the training and technical assistance in the QRIS system.
- Explore or implement program evaluation methods such as the Early Childhood Rating Scale or CLASS in school and community early childhood settings.
- Support local or regional early childhood collaboration councils to network within the community, develop shared visions for young children, and explore partners to maximize resources.
- Align RtI and PBIS with early childhood education programs.
- Further develop systems for the transition to school including: summer orientation programs, outreach to child-care and Head Start, community wide transition processes, special events for

parents, and how to work with other community providers to assure comprehensive assessment upon school entry.

With a specific focus on improving early childhood education in the Milwaukee Public School (MPS) District, Wisconsin can make great strides in reducing or eliminating the achievement gaps before a child begins kindergarten. With additional funding, Wisconsin could implement several initiatives in Milwaukee that support early childhood and care, including:

- Home visiting programs that begin with pregnancy and continue until the child is 5 years old.
- Establishment of the QRIS five star rating system for all child-care centers to provide information to parents and policy-makers that supports the availability and use of high-quality child-care programs. Targeted training, support and technical assistance would be provided to centers to achieve higher standards.
- Hiring of neighborhood "navigators" to assist residents in targeted neighborhoods with navigating and accessing a variety of services that can support early childhood outcomes, including health care, financial supports, housing assistance, nutrition programs, etc.
- Expansion of 4K and community learning center programs serving young children to reach more children.

Priority 4: Invitational Priority – Expansion and Adaptation of Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (not scored)

The Secretary is particularly interested in applications in which the State plans to expand statewide longitudinal data systems to include or integrate data from special education programs, English language learner programs, early childhood programs, at-risk and dropout prevention programs, and school climate and culture programs, as well as information on student mobility, human resources (*i.e.*, information on teachers, principals, and other staff), school finance, student health, postsecondary education, and other relevant areas, with the purpose of connecting and coordinating all parts of the system to allow important questions related to policy, practice, or overall effectiveness to be asked, answered, and incorporated into effective continuous improvement practices.

The Secretary is also particularly interested in applications in which States propose working together to adapt one State's statewide longitudinal data system so that it may be used, in whole or in part, by one or more other States, rather than having each State build or continue building such systems independently.

The State is invited to provide a discussion of this priority in the text box below, but such description is optional. Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length, if any: Two pages

Priority 4: Invitational Priority – Expansion and Adaptation of Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems

The State's Longitudinal Data System

The State of Wisconsin understands that a full-featured, well-designed statewide longitudinal data system (LDS) is central to our success in achieving the improvements identified throughout this application We also understand that central to any LDS is the need for a clean, consistent, well-designed student level data warehouse. Because of this, the State continues to build on the data warehouse that is already in place, expanding on the datasets and subject areas available in the SLDS. Each expansion of these datasets results in richer available information and new possibilities for analysis.

Already, the data warehouse includes the LEA master data, student master data, Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examination (WKCE) data (summative assessment), English language proficiency (ELL) data, ACT data, Advanced Placement data, attendance data, discipline data, 4-year old kindergarten data and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) child count data. All are linked by a unique student identifier and conformed dimensions as defined by Ralph Kimball in *The Data Warehouse Toolkit*.

To expand the ability to track student mobility beyond K-12, the State will purchase data from the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) to track student college enrollment and integrate this data into the LDS in the second quarter of 2010. The incorporation of this data will expand the State's LDS to enable K-16 student tracking. Data from the Wisconsin Student Locator System will improve K-12 mobility data and is planned for early 2010.

In addition to incorporating NSC data, the State is also integrating datasets on vocational education and the state's technical colleges. The Vocational Education Enrollment Reporting System (VEERS) data collection will be integrated into the statewide LDS providing additional K-16 data and a more complete picture of higher education participation in the state.

Work has already begun investigating the best way to merge data from an existing data warehouse on school finance with LDS data. This is a first step for the State in exploring how to best capture school level data such as school climate, expenditures, and organizational structure. This is part of an ongoing effort at the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction to collect data that is meaningful and beneficial to a wide variety of stakeholders seeking a more complete understanding of the state's educational system.

The State's LDS III application, if approved, will generate data on teacher and principal professional development and licensing as well as pre-K student information. Teacher data will be incorporated into the LDS, and pre-K student data will be linked closely to the existing LDS.

In the next two years, the State will also investigate the incorporation of data from the Student Information Management System (SIMS) to LEAs to collect data on intervention activities taken for individual students. This data will complement the existing student level attendance data in the LDS to give administrators, principals, and educators the ability to target students in need of extra attention early enough to effectively intervene.

Wisconsin's LDS already possesses a well-developed ability to track student mobility using a unique student identifier that tracks students throughout the K-12 system. By the first quarter of 2011, the State will have

incorporated course-level data for every student in the LDS. This student-to-course linkage will be complemented by teacher-student linkages that will enable the State to further investigate the successful transition from high school to higher education.

To improve the adoption and use of LDS data by officials at the LEAs and promote a more thorough use of data to drive decisions at the state level, the State is committed to a campaign of capacity building in data literacy. In addition to the professional development activities described throughout the application (see C(2) and C(3)(ii) and C(3)(iii)), the State is also committed to building relationships with external partners to explore new directions to expand the LDS and use the data within the LDS. By committing to developing a strong working relationship with the research community and partnering with other state agencies, research groups, and internal analysts, the State demonstrates its commitment to ensuring that data contained in the LDS is used to substantively shape policy decisions and serve as a driver for reform.

Budget: Indirect Cost Information

To request reimbursement for indirect costs, please answer the following questions:

Does the State have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement approved by the F government?	ederal
$\begin{array}{cc} YES \\ NO \end{array} \bigcirc$	
If yes to question 1, please provide the following information:	
Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (mm/dd/yyyy):	
From: <u>7 / 1 / 2009</u> To: <u>6 / 30 / 2010</u>	
Approving Federal agency: <u>X</u> EDOther (<i>Please specify agency</i>):	

Directions for this form:

- 1. Indicate whether or not the State has an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement that was approved by the Federal government.
- 2. If "No" is checked, ED generally will authorize grantees to use a temporary rate of 10 percent of budgeted salaries and wages subject to the following limitations:
 (a) The grantee must submit an indirect cost proposal to its cognizant agency within 90 days after ED issues a grant award notification; and
 (b) If after the 90-day period, the grantee has not submitted an indirect cost proposal to its cognizant agency, the grantee may not charge its grant for indirect costs until it has negotiated an indirect cost rate agreement with its cognizant agency.

If "Yes" is checked, indicate the beginning and ending dates covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement. In addition, indicate whether ED, another Federal agency (Other) issued the approved agreement. If "Other" was checked, specify the name of the agency that issued the approved agreement.

BUDGET SUMMARY

Budget Summary Table

The Budget Summary Table for Wisconsin's Race to the Top proposal includes the budget totals for each budget category and each year of the grant. These line items are derived by adding together the line items from each of the Project-Level Budget Tables.

Bi (Evi	Budget Part I: Summary Budget Table (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))												
Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total								
1. Personnel	\$ 3,637,564	\$ 3,688,082	\$ 3,676,582	\$ 3,676,582	\$ 14,678,810								
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ 1,463,318	\$ 1,566,525	\$ 1,566,525	\$ 1,566,525	\$ 6,128,491								
3. Travel	\$ 224,000	\$ 228,200	\$ 226,050	\$ 226,050	\$ 904,300								
4. Equipment	\$ 125,750	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$ 125,750								
5. Supplies	\$ 341,360	\$ 146,610	\$ 159,360	\$ 172,110	\$ 819,440								
6. Contractual	\$ 6,595,875	\$ 9,601,250	\$ 12,653,125	\$ 10,561,592	\$ 39,411,842								
7. Training Stipends	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-								
8. Other	\$ 560,000	\$ 1,297,500	\$ 1,010,000	\$ 772,500	\$ 3,640,000								
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 12,947,867	\$ 16,528,167	\$ 19,291,642	\$ 16,975,359	\$ 65,743,035								
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 381,119	\$ 415,615	\$ 398,311	\$ 384,826	\$ 1,579,872								
11.Funding for Involved LEAs ¹	\$ 135,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 540,000								
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ 17,283,246	\$ 17,283,246	\$ 7,533,246	\$ 7,533,246	\$ 49,632,984								
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$ 30,747,232	\$ 34,362,028	\$ 27,358,199	\$ 25,028,431	\$ 117,495,891								
14. Funding Subgranted to Participating LEAs (50% of Total Grant) ²	\$ 34,130,952	\$ 34,130,952	\$ 34,130,952	\$ 34,130,952	\$ 136,523,809								
15. Total Budget (lines 13-14)	\$ 64,878,184	\$ 68,492,981	\$ 61,489,152	\$ 59,159,384	\$ 254,019,700								

Table 1 – Summary Budget Table

¹ Nine LEAs (Dover #1, Friess Lake, Linn J4, Norris, North Cape, North Lake, Richmond, Rubicon J6, Stone Bank) are ineligible for Title I funding. As such, our plan is to award these involved LEAs the \$60,000 'floor' for a total of \$540,000 over the four year grant period is they agree to participate and implement their RTTT Final Work Plans.

² All participating LEAs are to be awarded, at a minimum, \$60,000 or \$60 per pupil, whichever is greater, over the four year grant period for participation and implementation of their Exhibit I Final Work Plans. The additional cost of this above 50% of \$254 million is \$9,523,809. We have combined this \$9,523,809 to the 50% of \$254m that will be awarded to Participating LEAs, leading to a figure of \$136,523,809. This combined amount represents 58% of our total RTTT funding request.

Budget Overview

Table 2 – Funding request by major project area

Project Title	Funding Amount	Budget Detail Table #
Funding Subgranted to Participating LEAs (50% of total grant distributed through Title I formula)	\$ 127,000,000	N/A
Additional Funding Subgranted to Participating LEAs (\$60k or \$60 per pupil, minimum floor)	\$ 9,523,809	N/A
Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ 540,000	N/A
Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant Program	\$ 19,000,000	1
Exhibit II for six large Urban LEAs (Beloit, Kenosha, Green Bay, Madison, Milwaukee, Racine)	\$ 30,132,984	2

Wisconsin is seeking a Race to the Top grant award of 254 million from the federal government (budget line 15 of the Budget Summary Table). Figure 1 – Overview of Wisconsin's RTTT Budget below graphically represents the breakdown of this amount by key budgetary element. Table 2 – Funding request by major project areaabove highlights the associated criteria these initiatives leverage against as well as the relevant detailed budget table sections, where the research, goals, strategies and tactics within Wisconsin's plan are outlined in full.

Of the \$254 million amount, \$127 million/ 50% will be allocated directly to participating LEAs on the basis of the Title I formula to support the reform efforts outlined in Exhibit I of the MOU. Additionally, to ensure the participation of the large number of smaller-sized LEAs in Wisconsin, \$9,523,809/ 4% of the State portion of the total award will be used to fund a minimum 'funding floor' of \$60,000 or \$60 dollars per pupil (whichever is greater) for all participating LEAs. The directed Title I funding of \$127 million plus the minimum funding floor of \$\$9,523,809 for participating LEAs equals the \$136,523,809 highlighted in budget line 14 of the Budget Summary Table. Additionally, the funding floor includes nine participating districts that are not currently eligible for Title I funding (involved LEAs, as per the Race to the Top definitions) and is outlined in the budget line 11 of the Budget Summary table. This accommodation equates to \$540,000 / 0.2% of the requested Race to the Top grant funds.

For all LEAs (except Beloit, Kenosha, Green Bay, Madison, Milwaukee and Racine) interested in participating in the Exhibit II activities outlined in Wisconsin's MOU, the State has created the 'Wisconsin Achieves' Competitive Grant Program (see Appendix 7 for more information). This grant program will be funded via \$19 million from the State's portion of the award (7% of the total award) and administered by the OEII, as outlined in section (A)(2).

For their participation in and implementation of the additional required activities in Exhibit II for the six large urban LEAS, Kenosha, Green Bay, Madison, Milwaukee and Racine (the five biggest LEAs, all located in urban areas and suffering from large achievement gaps) and Beloit (which is a district identified for improvement under NCLB) have been allocated an additional \$166 per pupil, equating to \$30,132,984 or 12% of the total award sought. This higher level of funding reflects the additional emphasis the State has placed on supporting these districts as part of the concerted, highly focused effort to drive Wisconsin's educational reform agenda where it is needed most to close the achievement gap.

Combined, the \$19 million Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant plus the \$30,132,984 targeted at the six urban districts and \$500,000 in competitive grants for STEM (Priority 2) equates to \$49,632,984 of supplemental funding for participating LEAs, as reflected in budget line 12 of the Budget Summary Table.

The remainder of the \$254 million (\$67,868,328 / 27% of the award) sought by Wisconsin will be used to fund the broader statewide initiatives and state plan activities, as outlined in the following section.



\$254 Million Race to the Top

Figure 1 – Overview of Wisconsin's RTTT Budget

State Plan Budget Elements

The \$67,868,328 portion remaining of the \$254 million is split across five main reform areas (standards and assessments, data, effective teachers and principals and turning around struggling schools) as well as the broad overall commitment to State success, as laid out in the State plan (please see Appendix 4 for more information).

Figure 2 reflects the breakdown of these elements, which are discussed in greater detail in the following section.

Figure 2 – Overview of the State Reform Plan Budget



\$68 Million State Plan

Project Level Detail

Project Title	Fur	nding Amount	Associated with criteria	Budget Detail Table #
Office of Education Innovation and Improvement	\$	5,168,424	(A)(2)	3
External Accountability Provisions	\$	4,100,000	(A)(2)(i)(c)	4
Common Core Curriculum	\$	2,894,429	(B)(1)	5
Benchmark Assessments	\$	11,541,748	(B)(2)	6
Professional Development and Training Around Data to Improve Instruction	\$	3,354,811	(C)(2) and (C)(3)	7
Value-Added Analysis and Reporting	\$	500,000	(C)(2) and (C)(3)	8
Teacher and Principal Mentoring and Coaching	\$	10,610,805	(D)	9
Model Evaluation Systems for Teachers and Principals	\$	3,015,060	(D)	10
Preservice Teacher Performance Assessment	\$	200,000	(D)	11
Expanding Urban Teacher Training	\$	1,458,000	(D)	12
Turning Around the Struggling Schools	\$	2,736,876	(E)	13
Response to Intervention	\$	8,056,754	(E)(2)	14
WINS (Wisconsin Initiative for Neighborhood Schools)	\$	10,000,000	(E)(2)	15
Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM)	\$	4,186,000	Priority 2	16
TOTAL	\$	67,822,907		

The following sub sections go into greater detail on the budgetary elements of the key projects that form the states plan. **Error! Reference source not found.**outlines the projects which have detailed budget data associated with them within this application. It also relates each project to the relevant selection criteria portions of this application and the pages where mention of the project may be found. Each project (and / or sub-elements of the project) also has an associated, detailed implementation plan that highlight key goals, activities, responsible parties and timings within the appropriate selection criteria portion of the application.

Project 1: Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant Program

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant Program Associated with Criteria: (A)(1)(i) (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))													
ProjectProjectProjectProjectProjectTotalBudget CategoriesYear 1 (a)Year 2 (b)Year 3 (c)Year 4 (d)(e)													
1. Personnel	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-			
2. Fringe Benefits	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-			
3. Travel	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-			
4. Equipment	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-			
5. Supplies	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-			
6. Contractual	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-			
7. Training Stipends	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-			
8. Other	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-			
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-			
10. Indirect Costs*	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-			
11.Funding for Involved LEAs	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-			
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$	9,500,000	\$	9,500,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$	19,000,000			
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$	9,500,000	\$	9,500,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$	19,000,000			

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category. Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

Budget Part II: Detailed Level Project Budget Table - Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant Program

The Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant Program is the key mechanism with which Wisconsin will allocate funds to support LEAs in efforts to go above and beyond in addressing the achievement and graduation gap.

As a competitive grant program, 100 percent of the \$19 million allocated to this project is supplemental LEA funding, as shown in budget line 12 of Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget **Error! Reference source not found.** above. The costs of administrating this grant program is covered in the operational costs of the OEII (Office of Educational Innovation and Improvement), as discussed in section (A)(2) of the application and in **Error! Reference source not found.**.

The funds will be distributed in the first two years of the grant, reflecting both the aggressive pace of implementation that Wisconsin is adopting as well as the need to ensure that participating LEAs have the funds in place to achieve the goals and benchmarks laid out in their Final Work Plans. However, this proposed phasing of the distribution of funds is our interim projection and may change once we have fully agreed all Final Work Plans with the participating LEAs.

Note: Beloit, Kenosha, Green Bay, Madison, Milwaukee and Racine, are not eligible for the Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant program, but will receive an additional \$166 per pupil under Exhibit II—please (A)(1)(i) of this application.

For further information, please also reference Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget **Error! Reference source not found.**in the following two pages.

I. Personnel Total Costs PY Total Costs PY Total Costs PY Total Costs PY Total Costs Total Costs Total Costs Total Costs Total Costs PY 3	4 Total Project Cost
	- \$ -
	- \$ -
	- \$ -
	- \$ -
	- \$ -
Total Personnel \$ - \$ - \$	- \$ -
2. Fringe Benefits Position Title Fringe Rate Total Costs PY Total	d Costs PY Total Project 4 Cost
	- \$ -
	- \$ -
	- \$ -
	- \$ -
Total Fringe Benefits \$ - \$ - \$	- \$ -
3. Travel Trip Purpose and Description Cost Per Trip QTY, PY1 QTY, PY2 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY4 1 2 PY 3	4 Total Project Cost
	- \$ -
	- \$ -
	- \$ -
	- \$ -
	- \$ -
Total Travel Costs \$ - \$ - \$ - \$	- \$ -
Total Costs PY Total Costs PY Total Costs PY Total Costs PY	I Costs PY Total Project
4. Equipment Item Description Unit Cost QTY, PY1 QTY, PY2 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY4 1 2 PY 3	4 Cost
	- \$ -
	- \$ -
	- \$ -
Total Equipment Costs \$ - \$ - \$ - \$	- \$ -
Total Costs PY Total Costs PY Total Costs PY	I Costs PY Total Project
5. Supplies Item description Unit Cost QTY, PY1 QTY, PY2 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY4 1 2 PY 3	4 Cost
	- \$ -
<u>\$</u> - \$ - \$ - \$	- \$ -
<u>\$</u> - \$ - \$ - \$	- \$ -
Total Supply Costs \$ - \$ - \$	- \$ -
Total Costs PY	al Costs PY Total Project
6. Contractual Item Description & Purpose or Relation to the Project 1 2 PY 3	4 Cost
	- \$ -
	- \$ -
	- \$ -
	- \$ -
Total Contractual Expenses \$ - \$ - \$	- \$ -
Total Costs PY	I Costs PY Total Project
7. Training Stipends Description and Purpose Unit Cost QTY, PY1 QTY, PY2 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY4 1 2 PY 3	4 Cost
	- \$ -
	- \$ -
	- \$ -

1 \$19 M Competitive

							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
8. Other	Type or Category & Purpose	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Other Expenses						\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
10. Indirect Costs	Organization	Rate					1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Indirect Costs						\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
											1
11. Funding for Involved							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
LEAs	Activity Description & Purpose	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Other Expenses						\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
12. Supplemental Funding							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
for Participating LEAs	Project	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
	'Wisconsin Achieves' Competitive Grant Program						\$ 9,500,000	\$ 9,500,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 19,000,000
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Subgrant						\$ 9,500,000	\$ 9,500,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 19,000,000

Budget 2: Exhibit II for six large Urban LEAs (Beloit, Kenosha, Green Bay, Madison, Milwaukee, Racine)

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table Exhibit II for six large Urban LEAs (Beloit, Kenosha, Green Bay, Madison, Milwaukee, Racine) Associated with Criteria: (A)(1)(i), (A)(1)(ii) (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))													
Project Budget CategoriesProject Year 1 (a)Project Year 2 (b)Project Year 3 (c)Project Year 4 (d)Total (e)													
1. Personnel	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-			
2. Fringe Benefits	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-			
3. Travel	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-			
4. Equipment	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-			
5. Supplies	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-			
6. Contractual	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-			
7. Training Stipends	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-			
8. Other	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-			
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-			
10. Indirect Costs*	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-			
11.Funding for Involved LEAs	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-			
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ 7,5	533,246	\$ 7	533,246	\$ 7,5	533,246	\$ 7,5	33,246	\$ 30),132,984			
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$ 7,5	533,246	\$ 7,	533,246	\$ 7,5	533,246	\$ 7,5	33,246	\$ 30),132,984			

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category. Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

Budget Part II: Detailed Level Project Budget Table - Office of Education Innovation and Improvement

Beloit, Kenosha, Green Bay, Madison, Milwaukee and Racine are key urban LEAs that face significant achievement gap issues. To address this, these LEAs will receive an additional \$166 per pupil for implementing their version of Exhibit II of the Wisconsin MOU. Together, this equates to \$30,132,984 or 12% of the total \$254 million being sought.

Beloit, Kenosha, Green Bay, Madison and Racine all signed the same version of Exhibit II, which requires a number of significant and demanding key reform initiatives, while Milwaukee's version of Exhibit II incorporated a few additional reforms initiatives specific to addressing the needs and demands of Milwaukee Public School students. All other LEAs are covered by one other version of Exhibit II, funding for which comes from the \$19 million Wisconsin Competes Competitive Grant Program, as discussed in the previous paragraph. Further details of this aspect of Wisconsin's Race to the Top plan are covered in sections (A)(1)(i) and (A)(1)(ii) of this application.

A funding level of \$166 per pupil was arrived at based on detailed analysis of the total projected total costs of all the initiatives outlined in Exhibit II for all of the six LEAs. We recognize that each LEA is different and will have different starting points on the key initiatives and our initial costings endeavored to take this into account. We also recognize that a number of factors (such as potential economies of scale for the largest district, Milwaukee) and LEA specific issues may come into play when the Final Work Plans are fully costed out. However, we believe that the Exhibit II requirements are roughly proportional in scale and need of financial support versus the size and pupil populations of each of the LEAs and do not envision deviating from a single per pupil funding level across the six.

Being a clear per pupil calculated funding formula, administration is relatively simple and 100% of the \$30,132,984 million allocated to this project is supplemental funding, as shown in budget line 12 of Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget **Error! Reference source not found.** above. The costs of administrating this grant are covered in the operational costs of the OEII (Office of Educational Innovation and Improvement), as discussed in section (A)(2) of the application and in **Error! Reference source not found.**

The funds are projected to be distributed over the course of the four years of the grant. However, this proposed phasing of the distribution of funds is our interim projection and may change once we have fully agreed all Final Work Plans with the six participating LEAs.

Funding levels and specific allocation projections have been provided, split by district, based on their 2008 / 2009 pupil numbers. While initial analysis suggests that the \$30,132,984 would likely be split against the four key reform areas of decreasing the achievement gap, making successful transitions, early childhood education and STEM roughly 35%, 35%, 20% and 10% respectively, further analysis is required to identify more accurate allocations across the key focus areas once the Final Work Plans have been agreed with the participating LEAs.

For further information, please also reference Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Error! Reference source not found.

											·
							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
1. Personnel	Title and Position Description	Base Salary	% FTE PY 1	% FTE PY 2	% FTE PY 3	% FTE PY 4	1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							s -	\$ -	s -	s -	\$ -
				1			\$ -	\$ _	\$ -	\$ _	\$
							¢	¢	ç	¢	¢
		-		-			3 -	э -	3 -	3 -	ຸງ -
								<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	\$ -
	Total Personnel						ş -	\$ -	ş -	ş -	ş -
							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
2. Fringe Benefits	Position Title	Fringe Rate					1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
0		0					s -	\$ -	s -	s -	\$ -
							¢	¢	¢	¢	¢
							3 - 6	а –	ວ - ເ	а -	ງ - ¢
							3 -	3 -	s -	s -	s -
								\$ -	ş -	ş -	\$ -
	Total Fringe Benefits						ş -	ş -	\$-	ş -	\$-
							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
3 Travel	Trin Purnose and Description	Cost Per Trip	OTV PV1	OTV PV2	OTV PV3	OTV PV4	1	2	PV 3	4	Cost
5. 11400	The Fulpose and Description	cost i ci inp	211,111	Q11,112	Q11,115	Q11,114	¢	<u>م</u>	¢ 115	- -	¢
				-			\$ -	s -	s -	\$ - ^	،
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	s -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Travel Costs						\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		1	1	1			m			m . 1	
							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
4. Equipment	Item Description	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							s -	\$ -	s -	s -	\$ -
	Total Equipment Costs						\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							Ŧ	Ŧ	Ŧ	Ŧ	-
		1		1	1	1					
							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
5. Supplies	Item description	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
				-	-	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	s -	\$ -	\$ -
							s -	\$ -	s -	\$ -	\$
	Total Supply Costs				1	1	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$.
	Total Supply Costs						Ŷ	Ŷ	Ŷ	Ŷ	Ŷ
					1						
							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
6. Contractual	Item Description & Purpose or Relation to the Proje	ct					1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							s -	\$ -	s -	s -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ _	\$ -	\$ _	\$
					1	1		÷ ¢	ý S	- -	÷ -
	Total Contractual Frances				1	1	<u>ہ</u> -	ф -	ې - د	۰ م	 ድ
	i otar Contractual Expenses						ə -	р -	ə -	э -	ъ -
							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
7. Training Stipends	Description and Purpose	Unit Cost	OTY, PY1	OTY, PY2	OTY, PY3	OTY, PY4	1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
				,			\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
		1	+	1	1	1	÷ -	φ •	÷ ¢	¢	φ •
			+				ۍ - د	φ -	а С	ф -	ф
								<u> </u>	<u> </u>		<u> </u>
	Total Training						\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	<u> </u>	\$.

2 \$30 M Big 6

							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
8. Other	Type or Category & Purpose	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Other Expenses						\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
10. Indirect Costs	Organization	Rate					1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Indirect Costs						ş -	\$ -	\$-	ş -	\$-
11. Funding for Involved							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
LEAs	Activity Description & Purpose	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							<u></u> -	<u>\$</u> -	<u>\$</u> -	<u>s</u> -	<u>\$</u> -
	Tetal Other Frances						<u>s</u> -	<u>\$</u> -	<u>\$</u> -	<u>s</u> -	<u>\$</u> -
	Total Other Expenses						÷ ۲	э -	э -) -	ə -
			1	-							1
									T (10)		T (ID) ()
12. Supplemental Funding		U-24 Cont	OTX DX1	OTV DVA	OTV DV2	OTV DVA	Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
for Participating LEAs	LEA Milwaykaa Dublia Sabaala	Unit Cost	Q11,P11	Q11,P12	Q11,P13	Q11,P14	1 © 2542212	£ \$ 2542212	PY 3	4	Cost
	Milwaukee Public School District						\$ 3,343,312	\$ 3,343,312	\$ 3,343,312	\$ 3,343,312	\$ 14,175,240
	Kanasha Unified School District			-			\$ 1,010,384	\$ 1,010,384	\$ 1,010,384	\$ 1,010,384	\$ 4,000,550
	Racine Unified School District			+			\$ 978.638	\$ 945,038	\$ 978.638	\$ 945,038	\$ 3,780,152
	Green Bay Area Public Schools			+	+		\$ 853,780	\$ 853 780	\$ 853,780	\$ 853,780	\$ 3,415,118
	School District of Beloit						\$ 295,895	\$ 295,895	\$ 295,895	\$ 295,895	\$ 1 183 580
	Total Subgrant	1	1	1	1	1	\$ 7,533,246	\$ 7,533,246	\$ 7,533,246	\$ 7,533,246	\$ 30,132,984
							. , , .	. ,, .	. , , .	. ,, .	. , . , .

Project 3: Office of Education Innovation and Improvement

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table												
Office of Education Innovation and Improvement												
Associated with Criteria: (A)(2)												
(Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))												
ProjectProjectProjectProjectTotalBudget CategoriesVeer 1 (a)Veer 2 (b)Veer 3 (a)Veer 4 (d)(a)												
Budget Categories	Year 1 (a)	Year 2 (b)	Year 3 (c)	Year 4 (d)	(e)							
1. Personnel	\$ 681,447	\$ 681,447	\$ 681,447	\$ 681,447	\$ 2,725,788							
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ 293,022	\$ 293,022	\$ 293,022	\$ 293,022	\$ 1,172,089							
3. Travel	\$ 85,250	\$ 85,250	\$ 85,250	\$ 85,250	\$ 341,000							
4. Equipment	\$ 27,750	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 27,750							
5. Supplies	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 240,000							
6. Contractual	\$ 60,750	\$ 60,750	\$ 60,750	\$ 60,750	\$ 243,000							
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -							
8. Other	\$ 35,000	\$ 35,000	\$ 35,000	\$ 35,000	\$ 140,000							
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 1,243,219	\$ 1,215,469	\$ 1,215,469	\$ 1,215,469	\$ 4,889,627							
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 70,948	\$ 69,283	\$ 69,283	\$ 69,283	\$ 278,798							
11.Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -							
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -							
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$ 1,314,167	\$ 1,284,752	\$ 1,284,752	\$ 1,284,752	\$ 5,168,424							

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15. Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category. Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

Budget Part II: Detailed Level Project Budget Table - Office of Education Innovation and Improvement (OEII)

Set up of the OEII is critical within the success of the Wisconsin Race to the Top plan and this aspect of our proposal / application is covered in significant detail in section (A)(2) of the application and also throughout the selection criteria sections.

Detailed job descriptions and requirements, organization charts and operating procedures for the OEII have already been developed, meaning that while the timescales for implementation are aggressive, they are more than achievable.

Our costing are based on standard WDPI pay scales and fringe rates and also reflect our budget experience and understanding gained from setting up similar, if smaller, departments within the WDPI.

Of final note, while funding provisions beyond the four year grant period are unclear at this time, it would be our intention to endeavor to continue to fund this department internally post 2013.

For further information, please also reference Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table 8 in the following two pages.

1 Personnel	Title and Position Description	Rase Salary	% FTF PV 1	% FTF PV 2	% FTF PV 3	% FTF PV 4	Total Cost	5 Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Project
I. I Ersonner	The and Posterioptical Determination of the statewide Race to the Top reform efforts. The director will work directly with the Assistant State Superintendent for Reading	Dase balary	/0110111	/0112112	/0112110	/011211.					Cust
	on Wisconsin's Race to the Top reform efforts.		10000	1000	10000						÷
	El. (. C. miltert (7): Percides the terising and	\$ 92,240	100%	100%	100%	100	% \$ 92,24	0 \$ 92,240	\$ 92,240	\$ 92,240	\$ 368,960
	Education Consultant (7): Provides the training and technical assistance to districts and schools in their area. They will work directly with LEAs to ensure compliance with the conditions outlined in the Race to the Top state grant and the LEAs' work plans.	\$ 80,006	700%	700%	700%	700	% \$ 560,04	2 \$ 560,042	\$ 560,042	\$ 560,042	\$ 2,240,168
	Office Operations Associate: Provides clerical support to consultants and director; will maintain files and records; schedule conferences, meetings, and travel; as well as ensure timely processing of expenditures.	\$ 29,165	100%	100%	100%	100	% \$ 29,16	5 \$ 29,165	\$ 29,165	\$ 29,165	\$ 116,660
											\$ -
	Total Personnel						\$ 681,44	7 \$ 681,447	\$ 681,447	\$ 681,447	\$ - \$ 2,725,788
		•				•			•		
							Total Cost	s Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Project
2. Fringe Benefits	Position Title	Fringe Rate					PY 1	PY 2	3	PY 4	Cost
	Director Education Consultant (7)	437	e l				\$ 39,00	03 \$ 39,003 0 \$ 240,818	\$ 39,003	\$ 39,003	\$ 158,055
	Office Operations Associate	430	D				\$ 12.54	1 \$ 12.541	\$ 12.541	\$ 12 541	\$ 50.164
	Office Operations Associate		D				\$ 12,5	\$ 12,541	¢ 12,541	\$ 12,541	\$ 50,104
							\$ -	s -	\$ -	s -	ş \$
	Total Fringe Benefits			1	I		\$ 293,02	2 \$ 293,022	\$ 293,022	\$ 293,022	\$ 1,172,089
											,
3. Travel	Trip Purpose and Description	Cost Per Trip	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	Total Cost PY 1	s Total Costs PY 2	Total Costs PY 3	Total Costs PY 4	Total Project Cost
Basis for estimates: \$0.50											
per mile	Director: 70 statewide trips per year (300 miles per trip)	\$15	70	70	70	70) \$ 10,50	0 \$ 10,500	\$ 10,500	\$ 10,500	\$ 42,000
	Director: 2 nationwide trips per year	\$2,00	0 2	2	2		2 \$ 4,00	0 \$ 4,000	\$ 4,000	\$ 4,000	\$ 16,000
	Education Consultants: 70 statewide trips per year (200 miles per trip)	\$10	0 700	700	700	70	\$ 70,00	0 \$ 70,000	\$ 70,000	\$ 70,000	\$ 280,000
	Office Program Associate: 5 statewide trips per year (300 miles per trip)	\$15	5 5	5	5		5 \$ 75	50 \$ 750	\$ 750	\$ 750	\$ 3,000
							\$	- \$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Travel Costs						\$ 85,2:	50 \$ 85,250	\$ 85,250	\$ 85,250	\$ 341,000
4. Equipment	Item Description	Unit Cost	OTY, PY1	OTY, PY2	ОТҮ, РҮЗ	OTY, PY4	Total Cost PY 1	s Total Costs PY 2	Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY 4	Total Project Cost
	Laptop computer	\$ 1,500	9	0	0	x - <i>i</i>	0 \$ 13,50	0 \$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,500
	Laser printer	\$ 1,000	9	0	0		0 \$ 9,00	0 \$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,000
	LCD projector	\$ 750	7	0	0		0 \$ 5,25	- 0 0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,250
	Total Equipment Costs						\$ 27,75	50 \$ -	\$-	\$-	\$ 27,750
							Total Cost	s Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Project
5. Supplies	Item description	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	3	PY 4	Cost
	Instructional materials	\$ 30,000	1	1	1		1 \$ 30,00	0 \$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 120,000
	Office supplies	\$ 30,000	1	1	1		1 \$ 30,00	0 \$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 120,000
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	LOLAI SUDDIV COSIS						5 60.00	0 5 60.000	5 60.000	5 60.000	5 240.000

3 OEII

6. Contractual	Item Description & Purpose or Relation to the Project						Total Costs PY 1	Total Costs PY 2	Total Costs PY 3	Total Costs PY 4	Total Project Cost
Basis for estimates: \$6,750	Website and internet support						\$ 60.750	\$ 60.750	\$ 60.750	\$ 60.750	\$ 243,000
per FTE for website and	······································						\$ -	s -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
internet support per year.							s -	s -	s -	s -	\$ -
							\$ -	s -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Contractual Expenses						\$ 60.750	\$ 60.750	\$ 60.750	\$ 60.750	\$ 243,000
	····· ···· ·							,	,	,	
			1				Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PV	Total Costs	Total Project
7 Training Stinends	Description and Purpose	Unit Cost	OTV PV1	OTV PV2	OTV PV3	OTV PV4	PV 1	PV 2	3	PV 4	Cost
7. Training Superios	Description and I drpose	Clift Cost	Q11,111	Q11,112	Q11,115	Q11,114	\$	\$ 112	¢ S	\$ 114	s cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	<u> </u>	\$ -
							\$	\$	¢ ¢	\$	\$
	Total Training			-			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	s - s -	\$ -
	Total Training						Ψ -	φ -	Ψ -	φ -	φ -
		1	1		1	1	Tatal Casta	Tatal Casta	Tatal Casta DV	Total Conta	Total Dualant
9 Other	Tumo on Cotogony, & Punnoso	Unit Cost	OTV DV1	OTV DV2	OTV DV3	OTV DV4	Total Costs	Total Costs		Total Costs	Total Project
a. Ouler	Deinstin -	Unit Cost	Q11,111	Q11,112	Q11, F15	Q11,114	¢ 22.500	£ 22,500	\$ 22,500	£ 22,500	¢ 120.000
	Printing						\$ 52,500	\$ 32,300	\$ 52,500	\$ 32,300	\$ 150,000
	Postage						\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 10,000
	Tatal Other Engineer						⇒ - ¢ 25.000	5 - ¢ 25.000	5 - ¢ 25.000	3 - ¢ 25.000	5 - ¢ 140.000
	Total Other Expenses						\$ 33,000	\$ 35,000	\$ 33,000	\$ 33,000	\$ 140,000
		1				-	The field of the	TALC	T + I C + DV	TALC	T (1 D
		n .					Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Project
10. Indirect Costs	Organization	Rate			-		PY 1	PY 2	3	PY 4	Cost
	WI Department of Public Instruction	6%	b				\$ 70,948	\$ 69,283	\$ 69,283	\$ 69,283	\$ 278,798
Note: No indirect charged							5 -	5 -	\$ -	<u>\$</u>	\$ -
for contractual costs	Total Indirect Costs						\$ 70,948	\$ 69,283	\$ 69,283	\$ 69,283	\$ 278,798
				I			-r				
11. Funding for Involved							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Project
LEAs	Activity Description & Purpose	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	3	PY 4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Other Expenses						\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$ -
12. Supplemental											
Funding for Participating							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Project
LEAs	Item	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	3	PY 4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Subgrant				·		\$ -	\$-	\$ -	\$ -	\$-

Project 4: External Accountability Provisions

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table External Accountability Provisions Associated with Criteria: (A)(2)(i)(c) (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))												
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)			Project Year 2 (b)		Project Year 3 (c)		Project Year 4 (d)		Total (e)		
1. Personnel	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-		
2. Fringe Benefits	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-		
3. Travel	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-		
4. Equipment	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-		
5. Supplies	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-		
6. Contractual	\$	1,700,000	\$	800,000	\$	800,000	\$	800,000	\$	4,100,000		
7. Training Stipends	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-		
8. Other	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-		
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$	1,700,000	\$	800,000	\$	800,000	\$	800,000	\$	4,100,000		
10. Indirect Costs*	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-		
11.Funding for Involved LEAs	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-		
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-		
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$	1,700,000	\$	800,000	\$	800,000	\$	800,000	\$	4,100,000		

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15. Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category. Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

Budget Part II: Detailed Level Project Budget Table - External Accountability Provisions

A key element of the Wisconsin plan is the utilization of an external audit / consulting / accountability firm or firms, as outlined in sections (A)(2)(i)(C) of this application. Our assumptions are based on nonbinding estimates provided by a reputable national consulting firm familiar with Wisconsin's RTTT application and the specifics of the requirements of this function within Wisconsin's broader reform plans.

Based on a blended hourly rate that reflects a mix of junior and senior consultants / staff, our estimate of billable hours of circa 675 in year one reflects our assumption that we would strive to utilize such a firm heavily during the first 90 days of the grant period, gaining valued capacity and capability while we develop and agree Final Work Plans with all participating LEAs. We would envisage billable hours reducing in years two, three and four to circa 450 to cover just the auditing, reporting and accountability functions of this role.

In addition to billable rates, standard consulting terms and conditions usually include an additional percentage of costs to cover expenses, travel and other miscellaneous costs. Our calculations assume a rate of 13% in addition to the \$300 per hour to cover such incidentals.

Implied in our projections are the benefits (in terms of learning curve and knowledge base) of using the same firm over the course of the grant period, for both the initial '90 day' activities and the auditing and reporting elements of this aspect of the plan. However, our plans and projections do not currently preclude us from contracting with a variety of firms and / or organizations over the grant period and it would be our intention within 72 hours of a Race to the Top award to issue a competitive RFP, in line with state procurement policies, which enables us to identify the best and most cost effective partners and solutions to fulfill this key aspect of our plan.

The costs of managing and administrating this vendor are covered in the operational costs of the OEII (Office of Educational Innovation and Improvement) and are within the existing accounts payable and administrative functions of the WDPI, as discussed in section (A)(2) of the application and in **Error! Reference source not found.** Therefore, all costs are contractual.

For further information, please also reference Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget on the following two pages.
4 External Acct

1 Personnel	Title and Position Description	Base Salary	% FTF DV 1	% FTF PV 2	% ETE DV 3	% FTF PV /	Total Costs	Fotal Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
1. I ersonner	The and Tosicion Description	Dase Salary	70 F 1 E 1 1 1	70 F IE I I 2	70 FIE11 5	70 F I L I I 4	2 2	112	\$	•	s cost
							s - s	-	s -	s -	ş - \$ -
							\$ - \$	-	\$ -	÷ -	÷ \$ -
							\$ - \$	-	\$ -	s -	\$ -
							\$ - \$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Personnel	•					\$-\$	-	\$ -	\$-	\$-
							Total Costs 1	Fotal Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
2. Fringe Benefits	Position Title	Fringe Rate					PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ - \$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ - \$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ - \$	-	<u>\$</u> -	<u>s</u> -	s -
	Total Evinge Benefite						\$ - \$ ¢ ¢	-	<u>s</u> -	\$ - ¢	5 - ¢
	Total Filinge Benefits						a - a		ə -	ə -	ş -
	<u> </u>						Total Costs 7	Fotol Costa	Total Costs	Total Costs BV	Total Project
3 Travel	Trin Purnose and Description	Cost Per Trin	OTV PV1	OTV PV2	OTV PV3	OTV PV4	PV 1	PV 2	PV 3		Cost
5. 114/01	The rule of the post and Description	cost fer frip	Q11,111	Q11,112	Q11,115	Q11,114	\$ - \$		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ - \$	-	\$ -	÷ -	÷ \$ -
							\$ - \$	-	\$ -	s -	\$ -
							\$ - \$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ - \$	-	\$ -	s -	\$ -
	Total Travel Costs						\$-\$	-	\$-	\$-	\$-
							Total Costs	Fotal Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
4. Equipment	Item Description	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ - \$	-	\$ -	<u>s</u> -	\$0
							\$ - \$ ¢ ¢	-	<u>s</u> -	\$ - ¢	\$0
	Total Equipment Costs						s - s	-		s -	\$0
	Total Equipment Costs						φ - φ		φ -	φ -	φυ
							Total Costs 7	Fotal Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PV	Total Project
5. Supplies	Item description	Unit Cost	OTY, PY1	OTY, PY2	OTY, PY3	OTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
						• /	\$ - \$	-	\$ -	s -	\$ -
							\$ - \$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ - \$	-	\$ -	s -	\$ -
	Total Supply Costs	·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				\$-\$	-	\$-	\$-	\$-
							Total Costs	Fotal Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
6. Contractual	Item Description & Purpose or Relation to the Project						PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
	Costed on the basis of 6 consultants at a blended rate of \$300 per	hour plus 13% exp	enses, 675 hours ye	ar 1, and 450 hours	years 2, 3 and 4		\$ 1,700,000 \$	800,000	\$ 800,000	\$ 800,000	\$ 4,100,000
							\$ - \$	-	\$ -	s -	s -
							3 - 3 6 6	-	3 - s	 -	s -
	Total Contractual Expenses						\$ 1.700.000 \$	800.000	\$ 800.000	\$ 800,000	\$ 4,100,000
							,,	,	,	,	,,
							Total Costs	Fotal Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
7. Training Stipends	Description and Purpose	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ - \$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ - \$	-	\$ -	s -	\$ -
							\$ - \$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Training						\$-\$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$-

4 External Acct

							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
8. Other	Type or Category & Purpose	Unit Cost	OTY, PY1	OTY, PY2	OTY, PY3	OTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
	- JFr an emiliarly an employed		Q ,	x ,	Q ,	x ,	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Other Expenses						\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							+	Ŧ	+	Ŧ	Ŧ
			1	1		1	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PV	Total Project
10 Indinest Costs	Organization	Data					DV 1	DV 2	DV 2		Cost
10. multett Costs	Organization	Katt					۹۲۲ ۲	¢ 112	\$	،	¢ Cost
							ວ - ເ	9 - e	ວ - ເ	э - с	ց - «
	Total Indirect Costs						ф -	s -	s -	s -	յ - «
	Total multer costs						у -	у -	φ -	ф -	ş -
				1		1	T () G (m () G (
11. Funding for Involved							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
LEAs	Activity Description & Purpose	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Other Expenses						\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
12. Supplemental Funding							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
for Participating LEAs	Item	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Subgrant						\$ -	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-

Project 5: Common Core Curriculum

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table														
		Common	Core	Curriculum										
Associated with Criteria: (B)(1) (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))														
(Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))														
Project Budget CategoriesProject Year 1 (a)Project Year 2 (b)Project 														
1. Personnel	\$	160,012	\$	240,018	\$	240,018	\$	240,018	\$	880,066				
2. Fringe Benefits	\$	68,805	\$	103,208	\$	103,208	\$	103,208	\$	378,428				
3. Travel	\$	7,500	\$	11,250	\$	11,250	\$	11,250	\$	41,250				
4. Equipment	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-				
5. Supplies	\$	7,500	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	7,500				
6. Contractual	\$	150,875	\$	301,750	\$	452,625	\$	603,500	\$	1,508,750				
7. Training Stipends	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-				
8. Other	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-				
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$	394,692	\$	656,226	\$	807,101	\$	957,976	\$	2,815,994				
10. Indirect Costs*	\$	14,629	\$	21,269	\$	21,269	\$	21,269	\$	78,435				
11.Funding for Involved LEAs	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-				
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-				
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$	409,321	\$	677,494	\$	828,369	\$	979,244	\$	2,894,429				

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category. Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

Budget Part II: Detailed Level Project Budget Table - Common Core Curriculum

The critical requirement of Wisconsin plan for the development and implementation of a Common Core Curriculum is outlined in section (B1) and (B2) of this application. Our cost projections are based on a detailed understanding of the proposed budgets and implementation plans of the MOSAIC consortium, of which we are a lead state.

Because the majority of this effort will be made via the consortium, the majority of the costs of this project are contractual. Equally, as the pace of implementation increases and the Common Core Curriculum comes closer to fruition, our contractual obligations increase in size, reflected in the increase in annual costs of the contract with MOSAIC over the grant period.

Our understanding of the requirements of being a lead state in this consortium have also allowed us to fully specify and cost out the additional resources required within the WDPI to successfully implement this project. Outline job descriptions and costs of the people and additional resources required are provided below in the project level detailed budget and reflect current WDPI pay scales and fringe rates.

The Common Core Curriculum budget does not contain any funds for training per se as some aspects of the training requirement are covered by the professional development and training around data to improve instruction budget (see XXX). Additionally, the requirements of Exhibit I of the Wisconsin MOU require participating LEAs to invest in training for their human capital in order to ensure successful implementation of this initiative state wide.

5 Core Stds

							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
1. Personnel	Title and Position Description	Base Salary	% FTE PY 1	% FTE PY 2	% FTE PY 3	% FTE PY 4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
	Education Consultant (2): Provides content and grade-level										
	expertise to guide the work of educator groups in the creation										
	of model curricular units, classroom assessments, and										
	development of benchmark assessment test modules. These										
	positions include two each reading and mathematics										
	consultant at both elementary and secondary levels. These										
	positions will collectively address both curriculum										
	development and assessment development.										
		\$ 80,006	100%	200%	200%	200%	\$ 80,006	\$ 160,012	\$ 160,012	\$ 160,012	\$ 560,042
	Data Consultant: Provides data analysis work and will work										
	with state and district IT staff on systems-level issues related										
	to computer-delivered platforms of MOSAIC curriculum and										
	benchmark assessments.	\$ 80,006	100%	100%	100%	100%	\$ 80,006	\$ 80,006	\$ 80,006	\$ 80,006	\$ 320,024
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$-
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Personnel						\$ 160,012	\$ 240,018	\$ 240,018	\$ 240,018	\$ 880,066
							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
2. Fringe Benefits	Position Title	Fringe Rate					PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
	Education Consultant (2)	43%					\$ 34,403	\$ 68,805	\$ 68,805	\$ 68,805	\$ 240,818
	Data Consultant	43%					\$ 34,403	\$ 34,403	\$ 34,403	\$ 34,403	\$ 137,610
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Fringe Benefits						\$ 68,805	\$ 103.208	\$ 103.208	\$ 103.208	\$ 378.428
	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						+	+,	φ 100,200	φ 100,200	φ 576,426
							+	+,	¢ 100,200	¢ 100,200	\$ 576,426
							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
3. Travel	Trip Purpose and Description	Cost Per Trip	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	Total Costs PY 1	Total Costs PY 2	Total Costs PY 3	Total Costs PY 4	Total Project Cost
3. Travel Basis for cost estimates:	Trip Purpose and Description	Cost Per Trip	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	Total Costs PY 1	Total Costs PY 2	Total Costs PY 3	Total Costs PY 4	Total Project Cost
3. Travel Basis for cost estimates: \$0.50 per mile cost and \$100/	Trip Purpose and Description	Cost Per Trip	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	Total Costs PY 1	Total Costs PY 2	Total Costs PY 3	Total Costs PY 4 \$ 3,750	Total Project Cost
3. Travel Basis for cost estimates: \$0.50 per mile cost and \$100/ night at a hotel	Trip Purpose and Description Education and Data Consultants (100 miles per trip) Hotel costs for trips exceeding 90 miles	Cost Per Trip \$50 \$100	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	Total Costs PY 1 \$ 2,500 \$ 5,000	Total Costs PY 2 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500	Total Costs PY 3 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500	Total Costs PY 4 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500	Total Project Cost \$ 13,750 \$ 27,500
3. Travel Basis for cost estimates: \$0.50 per mile cost and \$100/ night at a hotel	Trip Purpose and Description Education and Data Consultants (100 miles per trip) Hotel costs for trips exceeding 90 miles	Cost Per Trip \$50 \$100	QTY, PY1 50 50	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	Total Costs PY 1 \$ 2,500 \$ 5,000	Total Costs PY 2 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500	Total Costs PY 3 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500	Total Costs PY 4 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500	Total Project Cost \$ 13,750 \$ 27,500
3. Travel Basis for cost estimates: \$0.50 per mile cost and \$100/ night at a hotel	Trip Purpose and Description Education and Data Consultants (100 miles per trip) Hotel costs for trips exceeding 90 miles	Cost Per Trip \$50 \$100	QTY, PY1 50 50	QTY, PY2 75 75	QTY, PY3 75 75	QTY, PY4	Total Costs PY 1 \$ 2,500 \$ 5,000 \$ - \$	Total Costs PY 2 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ \$ - \$	Total Costs PY 3 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$	Total Costs PY 4 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ \$ - \$	Total Project Cost \$ 13,750 \$ 27,500 \$ -
3. Travel Basis for cost estimates: \$0.50 per mile cost and \$100/ night at a hotel	Trip Purpose and Description Education and Data Consultants (100 miles per trip) Hotel costs for trips exceeding 90 miles	Cost Per Trip \$50 \$100	QTY, PY1 50 50	QTY, PY2 75 75	QTY, PY3 75 75	QTY, PY4 75 75	Total Costs PY 1 \$ 2,500 \$ 5,000 \$ - \$ - \$ -	Total Costs PY 2 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ - \$ -	Total Costs PY 3 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ -	Total Costs PY 4 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ - \$	Total Project Cost \$ 13,750 \$ 27,500 \$ - \$ -
 3. Travel Basis for cost estimates: \$0.50 per mile cost and \$100/ night at a hotel 	Trip Purpose and Description Education and Data Consultants (100 miles per trip) Hotel costs for trips exceeding 90 miles Total Travel Costs	Cost Per Trip \$50 \$100	QTY, PY1 50 50	QTY, PY2 75 75	QTY, PY3 75 75	QTY, PY4 75 75	Total Costs PY 1 \$ 2,500 \$ 5,000 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 7,500	Total Costs PY 2 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ -\$ \$ -\$ \$ -\$ \$ -\$ \$ -\$ \$ 11,250	Total Costs PY 3 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	Total Costs PY 4 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	Total Project Cost \$ 13,750 \$ 27,500 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -
3. Travel Basis for cost estimates: \$0.50 per mile cost and \$100/ night at a hotel	Trip Purpose and Description Education and Data Consultants (100 miles per trip) Hotel costs for trips exceeding 90 miles Total Travel Costs	Cost Per Trip \$50 \$100	QTY, PY1 50 50	QTY, PY2 75 75	QTY, PY3 75 75	QTY, PY4 75 75	Total Costs PY 1 \$ 2,500 \$ 5,000 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	Total Costs PY 2 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	Total Costs PY 3 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 11,250	Total Costs PY 4 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ \$ - \$ - \$ \$ - \$ - \$ \$ 11,250 \$ - \$	Total Project Cost \$ 13,750 \$ 27,500 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -
3. Travel Basis for cost estimates: \$0.50 per mile cost and \$100/ night at a hotel	Trip Purpose and Description Education and Data Consultants (100 miles per trip) Hotel costs for trips exceeding 90 miles Total Travel Costs	Cost Per Trip \$50 \$100	QTY, PY1 50 50	QTY, PY2 75 75	QTY, PY3 75 75	QTY, PY4 75 75	Total Costs PY 1 \$ 2,500 \$ 5,000 \$ - \$ 5,000 \$ - \$ - \$ 7,500	Total Costs PY 2 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ 7,500 \$ -\$ \$ 11,250	Total Costs PY 3 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ -5 \$ 11,250	Total Costs PY 4 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ 11,250 -	Total Project Cost \$ 13,750 \$ 27,500 \$ -
 3. Travel Basis for cost estimates: \$0.50 per mile cost and \$100/ night at a hotel 	Trip Purpose and Description Education and Data Consultants (100 miles per trip) Hotel costs for trips exceeding 90 miles Total Travel Costs	Cost Per Trip \$50 \$100	QTY, PY1 50 50	QTY, PY2 75 75	QTY, PY3 75 75	QTY, PY4	Total Costs PY 1 \$ 2,500 \$ 5,000 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 7,500 Total Costs W 1	Total Costs PY 2 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 11,250 Total Costs	Total Costs PY 3 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ - <td>Total Costs PY 4 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -</td> <td>Total Project Cost \$ 13,750 \$ 27,500 \$ - <t< td=""></t<></td>	Total Costs PY 4 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	Total Project Cost \$ 13,750 \$ 27,500 \$ - <t< td=""></t<>
3. Travel Basis for cost estimates: \$0.50 per mile cost and \$100/ night at a hotel	Trip Purpose and Description Education and Data Consultants (100 miles per trip) Hotel costs for trips exceeding 90 miles Total Travel Costs Item Description	Cost Per Trip \$50 \$100 Unit Cost	QTY, PY1 50 50 QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2 75 75 QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3 75 75 QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	Total Costs PY 1 \$ 2,500 \$ 5,000 \$ - \$ 5,000 \$ - \$ 7,500 Total Costs PY 1	Total Costs PY 2 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ 11,250 Total Costs \$ 92 \$ -	Total Costs PY 3 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$	Total Costs PY 4 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ -	Total Project Cost \$ 13,750 \$ 27,500 \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ 41,250 Total Project Cost
3. Travel Basis for cost estimates: \$0.50 per mile cost and \$100/ night at a hotel	Trip Purpose and Description Education and Data Consultants (100 miles per trip) Hotel costs for trips exceeding 90 miles Total Travel Costs Item Description	Cost Per Trip \$50 \$100 Unit Cost	QTY, PY1 50 50 QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2 75 75 QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3 75 75 QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4 75 75 QTY, PY4	Total Costs PY 1 \$ 2,500 \$ 5,000 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 7,500 Total Costs PY 1 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 7,500	Total Costs PY 2 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 11,250 Total Costs PY 2 \$ -	Total Costs PY 3 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ - \$ 11,250 Total Costs PY 3 \$ - \$ 12,250	Total Costs PY 4 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ - \$ 11,250 Total Costs PY 4 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	Total Project Cost \$ 13,750 \$ 27,500 \$ 27,500 \$ - \$ 41,250 Total Project Cost \$ -
3. Travel Basis for cost estimates: \$0.50 per mile cost and \$100/ night at a hotel	Trip Purpose and Description Education and Data Consultants (100 miles per trip) Hotel costs for trips exceeding 90 miles Total Travel Costs Item Description	Cost Per Trip \$50 \$100 Unit Cost	QTY, PY1 50 50 QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2 75 75 QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3 75 75 QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	Total Costs PY 1 \$ 2,500 \$ 5,000 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	Total Costs PY 2 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ - \$ 11,250 Total Costs PY 2 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	Total Costs PY 3 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ 11,250 Total Costs PY 3 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5	Total Costs PY 4 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ - \$ 11,250 Total Costs PY 4 \$ - \$ 11,250	Total Project Cost \$ 13,750 \$ 27,500 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -
3. Travel Basis for cost estimates: \$0.50 per mile cost and \$100/ night at a hotel	Trip Purpose and Description Education and Data Consultants (100 miles per trip) Hotel costs for trips exceeding 90 miles Total Travel Costs Item Description Total Legistreent Costs	Cost Per Trip \$50 \$100 Unit Cost	QTY, PY1 50 50 QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2 75 75 QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3 75 75 QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4 75 75 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Total Costs PY 1 \$ 2,500 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - Total Costs PY 1 - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	Total Costs PY 2 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	Total Costs PY 3 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 11,250 Total Costs PY 3 \$ -	Total Costs PY 4 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 11,250 Total Costs PY 4 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	Total Project Cost \$ 13,750 \$ 27,500 \$ - \$ - \$ 41,250 Total Project Cost \$ -
3. Travel Basis for cost estimates: \$0.50 per mile cost and \$100/ night at a hotel	Trip Purpose and Description Education and Data Consultants (100 miles per trip) Hotel costs for trips exceeding 90 miles Total Travel Costs Item Description Total Equipment Costs	Cost Per Trip \$50 \$100 Unit Cost	QTY, PY1 50 50 QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2 75 75 QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3 75 75 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4 75 75 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Total Costs PY 1 \$ 2,500 \$ 5,000 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	Total Costs PY 2 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ 11,250 Total Costs PY 2 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	Total Costs PY 3 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 11,250 Total Costs PY 3 \$ -	Total Costs PY 4 \$ 3,750 \$ \$ 7,500 \$ \$ 7,500 \$ \$ 7,500 \$ \$ 5 - \$ 11,250 Total Costs PY 4 \$ \$ 11,250 Total Costs PY \$ 5 - \$ 5 - \$ 5 - \$ 5 - \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$	Total Project Cost \$ 13,750 \$ 27,500 \$ - \$ 41,250 Total Project Cost \$ -
3. Travel Basis for cost estimates: \$0.50 per mile cost and \$100/ night at a hotel	Trip Purpose and Description Education and Data Consultants (100 miles per trip) Hotel costs for trips exceeding 90 miles Total Travel Costs Item Description Total Equipment Costs	Cost Per Trip \$50 \$100 Unit Cost	QTY, PY1 50 50 QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2 75 75 QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	Total Costs PY 1 \$ 2,500 \$ 5,000 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	Total Costs PY 2 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 11,250 Total Costs PY 2 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	Total Costs PY 3 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ 11,250 Total Costs PY 3 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5	Total Costs PY 4 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 11,250 Total Costs PY 4 \$ - \$ 11,250	Total Project Cost \$ 13,750 \$ 27,500 \$ -
3. Travel Basis for cost estimates: \$0.50 per mile cost and \$100/ night at a hotel	Trip Purpose and Description Education and Data Consultants (100 miles per trip) Hotel costs for trips exceeding 90 miles Total Travel Costs Item Description Total Equipment Costs	Cost Per Trip \$50 \$100 Unit Cost	QTY, PY1 50 50 QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2 75 75 QTY, PY2 QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3 75 75 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	Total Costs PY 1 \$ 2,500 \$ -	Total Costs PY 2 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ \$ 5 - \$ - \$ \$ 11,250 Total Costs PY 2 \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ - \$	Total Costs PY 3 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ -	Total Costs PY 4 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ - \$ \$ \$ 11,250 \$ Total Costs PY 4 \$ - \$ -	Total Project Cost \$ 13,750 \$ 27,500 \$ - \$ \$ 41,250 Total Project Cost \$ - \$
 J. Travel Basis for cost estimates: \$0.50 per mile cost and \$100/ night at a hotel 5. Supplies 	Trip Purpose and Description Education and Data Consultants (100 miles per trip) Hotel costs for trips exceeding 90 miles Total Travel Costs Item Description Total Equipment Costs Item description	Cost Per Trip S50 S100 Unit Cost Unit Cost	QTY, PY1 50 50 QTY, PY1 QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2 75 75 QTY, PY2 QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3 75 75 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4 75 75 QTY, PY4 QTY, PY4	Total Costs PY 1 \$ 2,500 \$ 5,000 \$ - \$ - \$ 7,500 Total Costs PY 1 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 7,500 Total Costs PY 1 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	Total Costs PY 2 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ -	Total Costs PY 3 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ -	Total Costs PY 4 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ -	Total Project Cost \$ 13,750 \$ 27,500 \$ 27,500 \$ - \$ - \$ 41,250 Total Project Cost \$ - \$ - \$ - <tr< td=""></tr<>
 3. Travel Basis for cost estimates: \$0.50 per mile cost and \$100/night at a hotel 5. Supplies 	Trip Purpose and Description Education and Data Consultants (100 miles per trip) Hotel costs for trips exceeding 90 miles Total Travel Costs Item Description Total Equipment Costs Item description Laptop computers	Cost Per Trip \$50 \$100 Unit Cost Unit Cost \$ 2,500	QTY, PY1 50 50 QTY, PY1 QTY, PY1 3	QTY, PY2 75 75 QTY, PY2 QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3 75 75 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4 75 75 QTY, PY4 QTY, PY4 QTY, PY4	Total Costs PY 1 \$ 2,500 \$ 5,000 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	Total Costs PY 2 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ - \$ -	Total Costs PY 3 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ 7,500 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ 11,250 Total Costs PY 3 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -5 \$ -7	Total Costs PY 4 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 11,250 Total Costs PY 4 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	Total Project Cost \$ 13,750 \$ 27,500 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 41,250 Total Project Cost \$ -
 3. Travel Basis for cost estimates: \$0.50 per mile cost and \$100/night at a hotel 5. Supplies 	Trip Purpose and Description Education and Data Consultants (100 miles per trip) Hotel costs for trips exceeding 90 miles Total Travel Costs Item Description Total Equipment Costs Item description Laptop computers	Cost Per Trip \$50 \$100 Unit Cost Unit Cost \$ 2,500	QTY, PY1 50 50 QTY, PY1 QTY, PY1 3	QTY, PY2 75 75 QTY, PY2 QTY, PY2 QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3 75 75 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4 75 75 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Total Costs PY 1 \$ 2,500 \$ -	Total Costs PY 2 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ \$ 5 - \$ - \$ \$ 11,250 Total Costs PY 2 \$ \$ - \$	Total Costs PY 3 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$	Total Costs PY 4 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ 11,250 \$ - Total Costs PY 4 \$ - \$ -	Total Project Cost \$ 13,750 \$ 27,500 \$ 27,500 \$ - \$ 41,250 Total Project Cost \$ - \$ 7,500
 3. Travel Basis for cost estimates: \$0.50 per mile cost and \$100/ night at a hotel 5. Supplies 	Trip Purpose and Description Education and Data Consultants (100 miles per trip) Hotel costs for trips exceeding 90 miles Total Travel Costs Item Description Total Equipment Costs Item description Laptop computers	Cost Per Trip \$50 \$100 Unit Cost Unit Cost \$ 2,500 \$	QTY, PY1 50 50 QTY, PY1 QTY, PY1 3	QTY, PY2 75 75 QTY, PY2 QTY, PY2 QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3 75 75 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4 75 75 QTY, PY4 QTY, PY4 QTY, PY4	Total Costs PY 1 \$ 2,500 \$ -	Total Costs PY 2 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ 11,250 Total Costs PY 2 \$ -	Total Costs PY 3 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ -	Total Costs PY 4 \$ 3,750 \$ 7,500 \$ -	Total Project Cost \$ 13,750 \$ 27,500 \$ 27,500 \$ -

5 Core Stds

6 Contractual	Item Description & Purness or Relation to the Proje	ot					Total Costs PV 1	Total Costs	Total Costs PV 3	Total Costs PY	Total Project Cost
0. contractual	Content Description & Fur pose of Relation to the Froje								115	-	COM
	Contract with MOSAIC formative/benchmark consortium for o	contributing to and a	accessing a compu	terized bank of instr	uctional support mater	als shared across	\$ 55,000	\$ 110,000	\$ 165,000	\$ 220,000	\$ 550,000
	states, around a common core set of standards.						\$ 55,000	\$ 110,000	\$ 105,000	\$ 220,000	\$ 550,000
	Contract with MOSAIC formative/benchmark consortium for o	contributing to and a	accessing a compu	terized bank of benc	hmark assessments sha	ared across states,	\$ 55,000	\$ 110,000	\$ 165,000	\$ 220,000	\$ 550,000
							\$ 55,000	\$ 110,000	\$ 105,000	\$ 220,000	\$ 550,000
	Contract with MOSAIC formative/benchmark consortium for t	he multi-state devel	opment and use of	f professional develo	pment modules to supp	port the	¢ 21.075	6 (2.750	¢ 05.625	¢ 107.500	¢ 210.750
	implementation of common curriculum, common assessments,	and use of data to in	nform instruction.				\$ 31,875	\$ 65,750	\$ 95,625	\$ 127,500	\$ 318,750
	Meeting space room rental and meals for regional institutes an Total Controctual Expansion	d summer academie	S				\$ 9,000	\$ 18,000	\$ 27,000	\$ 56,000	\$ 90,000
	Total Contractual Expenses						\$ 150,675	\$ 301,730	\$ 432,023	\$ 005,500	\$ 1,506,750
		1	r	1	1				m . 1 G .	The second	
	L						Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
7. Training Stipends	Description and Purpose	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
							<u>\$</u> -	s -	<u>\$</u> -	ş -	\$ -
							<u></u> -	s -	<u></u> -	ş -	\$ -
							<u>\$</u> -	\$ -	<u>\$</u> -	\$ -	<u>\$</u> -
	Total Training						\$ -	s -	\$ -	ş -	\$-
							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
8. Other	Type or Category & Purpose	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$-
							\$ -	s -	\$ -	\$-	\$ -
							\$ -	s -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	s -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Other Expenses	•					\$-	\$-	\$ -	\$-	\$-
							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
10. Indirect Costs	Organization	Rate					PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
Note: No indirect charged for	WI Department of Public Instruction	6%					\$ 14,629	\$ 21,269	\$ 21,269	\$ 21,269	\$ 78,435
contractual costs	^						\$ -	s -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Indirect Costs	1	1	1	1		\$ 14,629	\$ 21,269	\$ 21,269	\$ 21,269	\$ 78,435
11. Funding for Involved							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
LEAs	Activity Description & Purpose	Unit Cost	OTY, PY1	OTY, PY2	OTY, PY3	OTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
	···· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·										\$ -
											\$ -
											Ŧ
							s -	s -	\$ -	s -	\$ -
	Total Other Expenses	1	1	1	1		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	š -	\$ -
12 Supplemental Funding		1	1		1		Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PV	Total Project
for Participating I FAs	Itam	Unit Cost	OTV PV1	OTV PV2	OTV PV3	OTV PV4	DV 1	DV 2	DV 3		Cost
tor rarucipating DEAS		Cint COst	211,111	211,112	211,115	211,117	\$ 111	\$ 112	\$ 115	• •	¢ CUSI
							ф - \$	9 - 6	ф - \$	э - С	ф - С
				-			9 - 6	9 9	9 - 6	9 - 6	ф –
	Total Subgrant	1	1	1			\$ _	<u>ب</u>	\$ _	φ - \$	÷ -
	- Jun Jungadille						Ψ -	Ψ -	Ψ -	Ψ -	Ψ -

Project 6: Benchmark Assessments

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table												
	Benchma	ark Assessments										
	Associated v	with Criteria: (B)(2)										
	(Evidence for selec	tion criterion (A)(2)	(i)(d))									
	Project	Project	Project	Project	Total							
Budget Categories Year 1 (a) Year 2 (b) Year 3 (c) Year 4 (d) (e) 1 D 1 0.01 0.0												
1. Personnel	\$ 721,852	\$ 881,864	\$ 881,864	\$ 881,864	\$ 3,367,444							
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ 310,396	\$ 379,202	\$ 379,202	\$ 379,202	\$ 1,448,001							
3. Travel	\$ 48,650	\$ 56,150	\$ 56,150	\$ 56,150	\$ 217,100							
4. Equipment	\$ 35,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 35,000							
5. Supplies	\$ 12,750	\$ 25,500	\$ 38,250	\$ 51,000	\$ 127,500							
6. Contractual	\$ 603,500	\$ 1,207,000	\$ 1,810,500	\$ 2,414,000	\$ 6,035,000							
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$-	\$ -	\$ -	\$-							
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -							
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 1,732,148	\$ 2,549,716	\$ 3,165,966	\$ 3,782,216	\$ 11,230,045							
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 67,719	\$ 80,563	\$ 81,328	\$ 82,093	\$ 311,703							
11.Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -							
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -							
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$ 1,799,867	\$ 2,630,278	\$ 3,247,293	\$ 3,864,308	\$ 11,541,748							

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category. Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

Budget Part II: Detailed Level Project Budget Table – Benchmark Assessments

Another critical element of Wisconsin's reform plan is the development and implementation of new, internationally benchmarked, rigorous assessments, as outlined throughout the application and most specifically in section (B) of this application.

Our cost projections are based on a detailed understanding of the proposed budgets and implementation plans of the MOSAIC consortium, of which we are a lead state.

Because the majority of this effort will be made via the consortium, the majority of the costs of this project are contractual. Equally, as the pace of implementation increases and the Benchmark Assessments come closer to fruition, our contractual obligations increase in size, reflected in the increase in annual costs of the contract with MOSAIC over the grant period.

Our understanding of the requirements of being a lead state in this consortium have also allowed us to fully specify and cost out the additional resources required within the WDPI to successfully implement this project. Outline job descriptions and costs of the people and additional resources required are provided below in the project level detailed budget and reflect current WDPI pay scales and fringe rates.

The Benchmark Assessments budget does not contain any funds for training per se as some aspects of the training requirement are covered by the professional development and training around data to improve instruction budget (see XXX). Additionally, the requirements of Exhibit I of the Wisconsin MOU require participating LEAs to invest in training for their human capital in order to ensure successful implementation of this initiative state wide.

1. Personnel	Title and Position Description	Base Salary	% FTE PY 1	% FTE PY 2	% FTE PY 3	% FTE PV 4	Total PV	Costs	Total Costs PV 2	Total Costs PV 3	Total Costs PY	Total Project Cost
11 I CIBONNEI	Director: the overall leadership of the assessment work, as	Duse Suitry	, 0112111	, 0112112	, vii Ei i c	/0112111					·	Cust
	part of the overall responsibilities of the Office of											
	Educational Accountability. The director will work directly											
	with the WWWWDPI's Race to the Top director in											
	providing timely information on the work of the Wisconsin											
	MOSAIC team, and will coordinate work with the Director											
	of Content and Learning.											
		In-kind	100%	100%	100%	100%	\$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Assistant Director: Coordinates the day to day work of the											
	Wisconsin MOSAIC consultants. The assistant director will											
	be responsible for ensuring that project goals and timelines											
	are being met, maintaining quality control in services, and											
	working as the main liaison to the MOSAIC consortium.	¢ 02.240	1000	1000/	1000	1000	¢		¢ 02.240	¢ 02.240	¢ 02.240	
		\$ 92,240	100%	100%	100%	100%	\$	92,240	\$ 92,240	\$ 92,240	\$ 92,240	\$ 368,960
	Education Consultant (6): Provides content and grade-level											
	expertise to guide the work of educator groups in the creation											
	development of handbmark assassment test modules. These											
	nositions include two each reading and mathematics											
	consultant at both elementary and secondary levels. These											
	positions will collectively address both curriculum											
	development and assessment development.											
		\$ 80.006	400%	600%	600%	600%	\$ 3	20.024	\$ 480.036	\$ 480.036	\$ 480.036	\$ 1.760.132
	Data Consultant (3): Provides data analysis work and will					000/0	+ •		+,	+,		,
	work with state and district IT staff on systems-level issues											
	related to computer-delivered platforms of MOSAIC											
	curriculum and benchmark assessments.	\$ 80,006	300%	300%	300%	300%	\$ 2	40,018	\$ 240,018	\$ 240,018	\$ 240,018	\$ 960,072
	Office Operations Associate: Provides clerical support to											
	consultants, coordinator and director; will maintain files and											
	records; schedule conferences, meetings, and travel; as well											
	as ensure timely processing of expenditures.											
		\$ 29,165	100%	100%	100%	100%	\$	29,165	\$ 29,165	\$ 29,165	\$ 29,165	\$ 116,660
	Education Specialist: Provides database, web, and data											
	support to the team and works with MOSAIC consortia staff											
	to coordinate curricular and assessment components housed											
	in the common electronic system.	\$40,405	100%	100%	100%	100%	\$	40,405	\$ 40,405	\$ 40,405	\$ 40,405	\$ 161,620
	Total Personnel						\$ 7	21,852	\$ 881,864	\$ 881,864	\$ 881,864	\$ 3,367,444
							Total	Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
2. Fringe Benefits	Position Title	Fringe Rate					PY	(1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
	Director	In-kind					\$	-	(0 0	0 0	\$ -
	Assistant Director	43%					\$	39,663	\$ 39,663	\$ 39,663	\$ 39,663	\$ 158,653
	Education Consultant (6)	43%					\$ 1	37,610	\$ 206,415	\$ 206,415	\$ 206,415	\$ 756,857
	Data Consultant (3)	43%					\$ 1	03,208	\$ 103,208	\$ 103,208	\$ 103,208	\$ 412,831
	Office Operations Associate	43%					\$	12,541	\$ 12,541	\$ 12,541	\$ 12,541	\$ 50,164
	Education Specialist	43%					\$	17,374	\$ 17,374	\$ 17,374	\$ 17,374	\$ 69,497
	Total Fringe Benefits						\$ 3	510,396	\$ 379,202	\$ 379,202	\$ 379,202	\$ 1,448,001
		1		1		1		~			m	
2		C I D T	OTV DV1	OTV DV2	OTV DV2	OTV DVA	Total	Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	1 otal Project
3. Travel	Trip Purpose and Description	Cost Per Trip	Q1Y, PY1	Q1Y, PY2	Q1Y, PY3	QTY, PY4	P1	750	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
Basis for cost estimates:	Director- statewide trips (300 miles per trip)	\$150	5	5	5	5	\$	/50	\$ 750	\$ 750	\$ 750	\$ 3,000
\$0.50 per mile cost and	Director- consortia and national trips	\$2,000	6	6	6	6	э	12,000	\$ 12,000 ¢ 750	\$ 12,000	\$ 12,000	a 48,000
\$100/ night at a hotel	Assistant Director- statewide trips (300 miles per trip)	\$150	5	5	5	5	\$	750	\$ 750	\$ 750	\$ 750	\$ 3,000
	Assistant Director- national trips	\$2,000	3	3	3	3	\$	6,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 24,000
	Education and Data Consultants (100 miles and C	¢50	175	225	225	225	¢	0 750	¢ 11.250	¢ 11.250	¢ 11.250	¢ 42,500
	Ducation and Data Consultants (100 miles per trip)	\$50	1/5	225	225	225	э	6,750	ə 11,250	ə 11,250	ə 11,250	ə 42,500
	Frogram Assistant and Education Specialist- statewide	\$150	-			-	¢	000	¢ 000	¢ 000	¢ 000	\$ 2,000
	Hotel costs for trips exceeding 90 miles (all staff)	\$150	105	245	245	245	s s	900	⇒ 900 \$ 24,500	\$ 900	\$ 900 \$ 24,500	\$ 3,600 \$ 93,000
	Total Travel Costs	\$100	193	243	243	243	\$	48.650	\$ <u>56,150</u>	\$ 56,150	\$ 56,150	\$ 217.100
							4	,			- 20,150	

6 Benchmark Assessments

4. Equipment	Item Description	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	Total Costs PY 1	Total Costs PY 2	Total Costs PY 3	Total Costs PY 4	Total Project Cost
	Laptop computers	\$ 2,500	12	- /	- /		\$30,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$30,000
	Laser Printers	\$ 1,000	2				\$2,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,000
	LCD projectors	\$ 750	4				\$3,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,000
	Total Equipment Costs			•	•	•	\$35,000)\$ -	\$-	\$ -	\$35,000
							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
5. Supplies	Item description	Unit Cost	OTY, PY1	OTY, PY2	OTY, PY3	OTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
Cost per person per regional	Instructional materials	\$ 10	1.275	2.550	3.825	5.100	\$ 12,750	\$ 25,500	\$ 38,250	\$ 51,000	\$ 127,500
institute and summer			-,	_,	-,	-,	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
academy= \$10							\$ -	\$ -	s -	s -	\$ -
uouuoinij= \$10	Total Supply Costs						\$ 12,750	\$ 25,500	\$ 38,250	\$ 51,000	\$ 127,500
							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PV	Total Project
6 Contractual	Item Description & Purpose or Relation to the Proje	ct					PV 1	PV 2	PV 3	4	Cost
0. Contractual	Contract with MOSAIC formative handbrook concertium for	contributing to and		onigod honly of insta	notional aumout ma	toniala abanad			115	,	Cost
	across states, around a common core set of standards	contributing to and	accessing a compu	crized bank of filsu	uctional support ma	iteriais shared	\$ 220,000	\$ 440,000	\$ 660,000	\$ 880.000	\$ 2,200,000
	Contract with MOSAIC formative/henchmark consortium for	contributing to and	accessing a compu	arized bank of band	hmark accacemente	charad across	φ 220,000	φ 440,000	\$ 000,000	\$ 000,000	\$ 2,200,000
	states around a common core set of standards	contributing to and	accessing a compu	crized bank of bene	annark assessments	shared across	\$ 220,000	\$ 440,000	\$ 660,000	\$ 880,000	\$ 2,200,000
	Contract with MOSAIC formative/henchmark concortium for	the multi state dev	alonmant and use of	professional develo	mmant modulae to e	upport the	\$ 220,000	\$ 110,000	\$ 000,000	\$ 000,000	\$ 2,200,000
	implementation of common curriculum, common assessments	and use of data to	inform instruction	professional develo	phient modules to s	upport me	\$ 127.500	\$ 255,000	\$ 382,500	\$ 510,000	\$ 1,275,000
	Meeting space room rental and meals for regional institutes an	d summer academi	es				\$ 36,000	\$ 72,000	\$ 108,000	\$ 144,000	\$ 360,000
	Total Contractual Expenses	di summer academi	63				\$ 603,500	\$ 1,207,000	\$ 1.810.500	\$ 2.414.000	\$ 6.035.000
	FF						+	+ -,=,	+ -,,	+ _,,	+ 0,000,000
						r	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PV	Total Project
7 Training Stinanda	Description and Purpose	Unit Cost	OTV DV1	OTV DV2	OTV DV2	OTV DV4	DV 1	DV 2	DV 2		Cost
7. Training Superios	Description and Furpose	Ollit Cost	Q11,111	Q11,112	Q11,115	Q11,114	\$	\$	¢ 115	4 ¢	¢ Cost
							9 - 6	ф -	ه -	э - с	
								ф –	ф –	э - с	
	Total Training						\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	s - s -
							Ŧ	Ŧ	Ŧ	Ŧ	Ŧ
						T	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PV	Total Project
8 Other	Turne on Cotogony, & Dunness	Unit Cost	OTV DV1	OTV DV2	OTV DV2	OTV DV4	DV 1	DV 2	DV 2		Cost
a. Other	Type of Category & Furpose	Ollit Cost	Q11,111	Q11,112	Q11,115	Q11,114	\$	\$	¢ 115	4 ¢	¢ Cost
							9 - 6	ф -	ه -	э - с	
	Total Other Expenses						\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ <u>-</u>
	Total Otiki Expenses						Ψ -	Ψ -	φ -	Ψ -	φ -
						1	Total Costa	Total Conta	Total Coata	Tatal Casta DV	Total Duciest
10 Indinest Casts	Organization	Data					Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs		Total Project
10. Indirect Costs	WI Department of Bublic Instruction	Kate					¢ 67.710	F12	¢ 01.220	4 ¢ 92.002	¢ 211.702
Note: No indirect charged for	wit Department of Fublic Instruction	070					\$ 07,719	\$ 80,505	\$ 01,320 ¢	\$ 62,093	\$ 511,705
contractual costs	Total Indirect Costs						\$ 67.719	\$ 80.563	\$ 81 328	\$ 82.093	\$ 311 703
	Total multer costs						φ 0/,/1/	φ 00,505	φ 01,520	φ 02,095	φ 511,705
						r	T-4-LO-4-	The fail of the	Tetal Cente	T-4-LC-4-DV	T. (.) D
11. Funding for Involved			OTH DUI	OTH DUA	OTH DUA	OTH DIA	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
LEAS	Activity Description & Purpose	Unit Cost	Q14, PY1	QTY, PY2	Q1Y, PY3	Q1Y, PY4	PYI	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	s -	> -	s -	<u> </u>
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	<u>\$</u> -
	Total Other Free areas						\$ -	5 -	\$ -	\$ -	<u>\$</u> -
	Total Outer Expenses						φ -	φ	φ -	φ	φ
	r	-					T + 1.0	m () ()	T () G	m . 1	T () D ()
12. Supplemental Funding	x .		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
tor Participating LEAs	Item	Unit Cost	Q1Y, PY1	QTY, PY2	Q1Y, PY3	QTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
							\$ -	<u> </u>	<u>></u> -	<u> </u>	<u>s</u> -
	Total Submont						5 -	5 -	5 -	<u> </u>	5 -
	i otai Subgrant						а -	ə -	ф -	р -	ф -

Project 7: Professional Development and Training Around Data to Improve Instruction

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table Professional Development and Training Around Data to Improve Instruction Associated with Criteria: (C)(2) and (C)(3)														
(Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))														
Project Budget CategoriesProject Year 1 (a)Project Year 2 (b)Project Year 3 (c)Project Year 4 (d)Total (e)														
1. Personnel	\$ 160,012	\$ 160,012	\$ 160,012	\$ 160,012	\$ 640,048									
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ 68,805	\$ 68,805	\$ 68,805	\$ 68,805	\$ 275,221									
3. Travel	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 20,000									
4. Equipment \$ 7,000 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 7,000														
5. Supplies	\$ 27,360	\$ 27,360	\$ 27,360	\$ 27,360	\$ 109,440									
6. Contractual	\$ 560,000	\$ 560,000	\$ 560,000	\$ 560,000	\$ 2,240,000									
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -									
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -									
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 828,177	\$ 821,177	\$ 821,177	\$ 821,177	\$ 3,291,709									
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 16,091	\$ 15,671	\$ 15,671	\$ 15,671	\$ 63,103									
11.Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -									
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -									
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$ 844,268	\$ 836,848	\$ 836,848	\$ 836,848	\$ 3,354,811									

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category. Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

Budget Part II: Detailed Level Project Budget Table - Professional Development and Training Around Data to Improve Instruction

Another critical element of Wisconsin's reform plan is professional development and training around data in order to improve instruction and enable the successful implementation of large statewide initiatives such as the Common Core Curriculum and the new Benchmark Assessments. Specifics around this part of Wisconsin's plan are outlined in section (B) and (C) of this application .

Our cost projections are based on a detailed understanding of the proposed budgets and implementation plans of the MOSAIC consortium, of which we are a lead state and of the costs of providing professional development and of contracting out with suitable third parties and partner organizations.

Because the majority of this effort will be made via partner organizations, the majority of the costs of this project are contractual. This in part reflects our desire to move forward with these initiatives as quickly as possible. Thanks to the availability of Race to Top funds, we will be able to accelerate the pace and scale of the broader plans we already have in place, possibly bringing them to fruition three years earlier than currently planned.

Our understanding of the requirements of being a lead state in this consortium have also allowed us to fully specify and cost out the additional resources required within the WDPI to successfully implement this project. Outline job descriptions and costs of the people and additional resources required are provided below in the project-level detailed budget and reflect current WDPI pay scales and fringe rates.

7 Data Pro Dev

							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
1. Personnel	Title and Position Description	Base Salary	% FTE PY 1	% FTE PY 2	% FTE PY 3	% FTE PY 4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
	Director: Provides the overall leadership of the assessment										
	work, as part of the overall responsibilities of the Office of										
	Educational Accountability. The director will work directly										
	timely information on the work of the Wisconsin MOSAIC										
	team and will coordinate work with the Chief Information										
	Officer.										
		To block					¢	¢	¢	¢	~
		In-kind					э -	ə -	ъ -	э -	3 -
	Education Consultant (2): Provides content expertise on the										
	outputs to teachers and guide the implementation of										
	professional development around MOSAIC eLearning										
	Portfolios and the reporting interface.										
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	\$80.006	200%	200%	200%	200%	\$ 160.012	\$ 160.012	\$ 160.012	\$ 160.012	\$ 640.048
		\$00,000	20070	20070	20070	20070	\$ 100,012	\$ 100,012	\$ 100,012	\$ 100,012	\$ 040,040
								ф -	ф -		
							э - с	э - с	ф -	 с	3 - e
	Total Personnel		-			ļ	\$ 160.012	\$ 160.012	\$ 160.012	\$ 160.012	\$ 640.048
							φ 100,012	φ 100,012	\$ 100,012	φ 100,012	φ 040,040
		1		1	1	T	T () C (T () C (T () C (T (ID • (
	D 141 THA	n · n /					Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
2. Fringe Benefits	Position 1 itle	Fringe Rate					PYI	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
	Director	In-kind					\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Education Consultants (2)	43%					\$ 68,805	\$ 68,805	\$ 68,805	\$ 68,805	\$ 275,221
							\$ -	\$ -	s -	\$ -	s -
							\$ -	\$ -	<u>\$</u> -	<u>\$</u> -	<u>s</u> -
	Total Fringe Benefits						\$ 68,805	\$ 68,805	\$ 68,805	\$ 68,805	\$ 275,221
		1		r	I.	1	r		1	T	
							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
3. Travel	Trip Purpose and Description	Cost Per Trip	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
Basis for cost estimates:											
\$0.50 per mile cost	Consultants- statewide trips to LEAs (200 miles per trip)	\$100	50	50	50	50	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 20,000
							\$-	\$ -	\$-	\$ -	\$ -
							\$-	\$-	\$-	\$ -	\$ -
							\$-	\$-	\$-	\$ -	\$ -
							\$-	\$-	\$-	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Travel Costs						\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 20,000
							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
4. Equipment	Item Description	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
	Laptop computers	\$ 2,500	2	0	0	0	\$5,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,000
	Laser Printers	\$ 1,000	2	0	0	0	\$2,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,000
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$0
	Total Equipment Costs						\$ 7,000	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$7,000
							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
5. Supplies	Item description	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
Basis for cost estimates:	Instructional materials	\$ 10	2,736	2,736	2,736	2,736	\$ 27,360	\$ 27,360	\$ 27,360	\$ 27,360	\$ 109,440
Cost per person per							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	s -	s -
workshop= \$10							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Supply Costs						\$ 27,360	\$ 27,360	\$ 27,360	\$ 27,360	\$ 109,440
							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
6. Contractual	Item Description & Purpose or Relation to the Projec	t					PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
	Final end and final end of the final end							1		1	
	Contract with yandor ad/or contract via MOSAIC concortium to	n develon professio	nal development mo	dulee and supporting	a el earnina Portfoli	o interface	\$ 560,000	\$ 560,000	\$ 560,000	\$ 560,000	\$ 2 240 000
	conduct what vendor advor conduct via websield consolituin o	s acreiop protessio	aar ac veropment mo	autes and supporting	5 cractining i oftioli	o mierrace.	\$ -	\$ 500,000	\$	\$	\$
							\$	2	\$	s	s -
							φ -	÷ -	φ = •	-	с. С
	Total Contractual Expenses						\$ \$ 560,000	\$ 560,000	\$ 560,000	\$ 560,000	\$ 2,240,000

7 Data Pro Dev

							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PV	Total Project
7. Training Stipends	Description and Purpose	Unit Cost	OTY, PY1	OTY, PY2	ОТY , РY3	OTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
0	· · ·		•				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	s -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Training						\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
8. Other	Type or Category & Purpose	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	s -	s -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Other Expenses					·	\$ -	\$ -	\$-	\$ -	\$ -
							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
10. Indirect Costs	Organization	Rate					PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
Note: No indirect charged	WI Department of Public Instruction	6%	ó				\$ 16,091	\$ 15,671	\$ 15,671	\$ 15,671	\$ 63,103
for contractual costs							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Indirect Costs						\$ 16,091	\$ 15,671	\$ 15,671	\$ 15,671	\$ 63,103
11. Funding for Involved							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
LEAs	Activity Description & Purpose	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	ş -
	Total Other Expenses						\$-	\$ -	\$ -	\$-	\$-
12. Supplemental Funding							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
for Participating LEAs	Item	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	s -	s -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	s -	s -
		I	1				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	<u>\$</u> -
	Total Subgrant						\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	s -	ş -

Project 8: Value-Added Analysis and Reporting

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table Value-Added Analysis and Reporting Associated with Criteria: (C)(2) and (C)(3) (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))														
Project Budget CategoriesProject Year 1 (a)Project Year 2 (b)Project Year 3 (c)Project Year 4 (d)Total (e)														
1. Personnel	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-				
2. Fringe Benefits	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-				
3. Travel \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -														
4. Equipment \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -														
5. Supplies	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-				
6. Contractual	\$	125,000	\$	125,000	\$	125,000	\$	125,000	\$	500,000				
7. Training Stipends	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-				
8. Other	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-				
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$	125,000	\$	125,000	\$	125,000	\$	125,000	\$	500,000				
10. Indirect Costs*	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-				
11.Funding for Involved LEAs	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-				
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-				
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$	125,000	\$	125,000	\$	125,000	\$	125,000	\$	500,000				

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

Budget Part II: Detailed Level Project Budget Table - Value-Added Analysis and Reporting

The continued provision and development of value-added growth reporting within Wisconsin is covered in detail in section (C) of this application.

Our cost projections are based on a detailed non-binding projections provided to us by a nationally known and leading value-added data and analysis provider that we already work with closely and has a deep and thorough understanding of our current and potential future needs in this area.

We hope to accelerate the levels of investment in value-added data during the period of the grant even further than currently laid out here. However, in the early years of our Race to the Top implementation we will maintain our high levels of focus on steps towards achieving the high quality Common Core Curriculum and rigorous, internationally benchmarked assessments so that later years of the Race to the Top grant period will form the strong foundation on which to lay a broader and larger development, provision and effective usage of value-added data across the state.

All costs within this budget are contractual. Administration of this investment is covered within the existing cost structure of the WDPI.

		_					Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
1. Personnel	Title and Position Description	Base Salary	% FTE PY 1	% FTE PY 2	% FTE PY 3	% FTE PY 4	1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	s -	\$ -	<u>s</u> -	\$ -
							\$ -	s -	s -	\$ -	\$ -
							¢ -	5 - ¢	3 - ¢	\$ -	5 - ¢
							а – с	3 - ¢	3 - ¢	3 - ¢	3 - ¢
	Total Personnel						\$ -	s -	s - \$ -	s - \$ -	3 6
	Total Tersoniki						Ψ -	Ψ -	Ψ -	Ψ -	Ψ -
2. Fringe Benefits	Position Title	Fringe Rate					Total Costs PY 1	Total Costs PY 2	Total Costs PY 3	Total Costs PY	Total Project Cost
							\$ -	s -	\$ -	\$ -	s -
							\$ -	ş -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	ş -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	s -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Fringe Benefits	•	•		•		\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
3. Travel	Trip Purpose and Description	Cost Per Trip	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$-	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Travel Costs						\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$-
		1	1	1	1						
		N NG A		OTAL DAVA	OTV DV2		Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
4. Equipment	Item Description	Unit Cost	Q14, P¥1	Q14, P42	Q14, P43	Q14, P44	¢	2 ¢	e PY 3	4 ¢	Cost
				-	-		ۍ د د		 -	 -	\$0 \$0
							գ – «	ۍ - د	ۍ - د	э - «	30
	Total Equipment Costs						\$ -	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0
										•	
							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
5. Supplies	Item description	Unit Cost	OTY, PY1	OTY, PY2	OTY, PY3	OTY, PY4	1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
	real real real real real real real real		•				\$ -	s -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Supply Costs						\$ -	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
6. Contractual	Item Description & Purpose or Relation to the Proje	ct					1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
	Contract with a value-added service provider to provide train	ing, support and exp	ertise to participation	ng districts to expan	d analysis and repor	ting.	\$ 125,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 500,000
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	<u>\$</u> -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	i otar Contractual Expenses						э 125,000	ə 125,000	ə 125,000	ə 125,000	ə 500,000
		1	1	1		1	Total Coats BY	Total Casta DV	Total Cast:	Total Costs DV	Total Dusic -4
7 Training Stinands	Description and Purpose	Unit Cost	OTV DV1	OTV DV2	OTV DV3	OTV DV4	1 otal Costs PY		1 otal Costs		Lotal Project
7. Framing Supenus	Description and 1 m pose	Cint COst	Q11,111	Q11,112	Q11,115	211,114	1	\$	¢ 113	+ \$	s Cusi
							φ <u>-</u>	s -	\$	ф —	\$
	<u></u>			1	1		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Training	1	1	1		1	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
8. Other	Type or Category & Purpose	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Other Expenses						\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
		-							-		
							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
10. Indirect Costs	Organization	Rate					1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Indirect Costs						\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
11. Funding for Involved							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
LEAs	Activity Description & Purpose	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Other Expenses						\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
12. Supplemental Funding							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
for Participating LEAs	Item	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Subgrant						\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-

Project 9: Teacher and Principal Mentoring and Coaching

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table Teacher and Principal Mentoring and Coaching Associated with Criteria: (D) (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d)) Project Project Project													
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)								
1. Personnel	\$ 189,671	\$ 132,171	\$ 120,671	\$120,671	\$ 563,184								
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ 46,944	\$ 46,944	\$ 46,944	\$46,944	\$ 187,774								
3. Travel	\$ 7,100	\$ 6,050	\$ 3,900	\$3,900	\$ 20,950								
4. Equipment	\$ 6,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,500								
5. Supplies	\$ 12,500	\$ 12,500	\$ 12,500	\$12,500	\$ 50,000								
6. Contractual	\$ 162,500	\$ 2,144,500	\$ 5,001,000	\$2,441,607	\$ 10,551,500								
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -								
8. Other	\$ 40,000	\$ 77,500	\$ 40,000	\$2,500	\$ 160,000								
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 465,215	\$ 2,419,665	\$ 5,225,015	\$2,441,607	\$ 10,551,500								
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 18,163	\$ 16,510	\$ 13,441	\$11,191	\$ 59,304								
11.Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -								
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -								
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$ 483,377	\$ 2,436,174	\$ 5,238,455	\$ 2,452,797	\$ 10,610,805								

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years. *If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

Budget Part II: Detailed Level Project Budget Table - Teacher and Principal Mentoring and Coaching

Based on the critical elements of coaching and mentoring within the Wisconsin plan, we will support our reform efforts through enhanced provision of Teacher and Principal Mentoring and Coaching. These areas are covered in detail in section (D) of this application.

Our cost projections are based on both costings and non-binding proposals provided by both national and local organizations and not-forprofits who have proven track records in this area. Therefore, these costs will be contractual.

In addition, the WDPI will increase its current resources in this area to develop even greater capacity and capability. Our cost projections for this aspect of our plan are based on our understanding of the scope of work we wish to undertake, the current WDPI cost structures and what we believe is the minimum budget and resources we require in order to successfully implement these reform initiatives.

9 Mentors and Coaches

							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
1. Personnel	Title and Position Description	Base Salary	% FTE PY 1	% FTE PY 2	% FTE PY 3	% FTE PY 4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
	Director: Provide direct leadership for the project. The director										
	will work directly with the WWWWDPI's OEII director in										
	providing timely information on the work of the project	In Kind					\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Consultant: Coordinate planning and development efforts for										
	the project; provide training and technical assistance to LEAs.										
		\$ 80,006	100%	100%	100%	100%	\$ 80,006	\$ 80,006	\$ 80,006	\$ 80,006	\$ 320,024
	Office Operations Associate: Provide clerical support to										
	consultant, and director; will maintain files and records;										
	schedule conferences, meetings, and travel; as well as ensure										
	timely processing of expenditures.	\$ 29,165	100%	100%	100%	100%	\$ 29,165	\$ 29,165	\$ 29,165	\$ 29,165	\$ 116,660
		Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4					
	Stakeholder Work Team: Stipends (\$200/day) plus mileage										
	and meals x 25 people for one meeting = $$10,000$ /meeting		-								
		\$ 10,000	7	2	1	1	\$ 70,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 110,000
	Stakeholder Work Team: Substitute pay (approximatley 15	e 1.500	-	2			e 10.500	e 2.000	¢ 1.500	¢ 1.500	¢ 16.500
	people x \$100/day = \$1,500/meeting)	\$ 1,500	/	2	1	1	\$ 10,500	\$ 3,000	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 16,500
	Total Personnel						\$ 189,071	\$ 152,171	\$ 120,071	\$ 120,071	\$ 505,184
		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
2. Fringe Benefits	Position Title	Fringe Rate					PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
	Director	In Kind					\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Consultant	43%					\$ 34,403	\$ 34,403	\$ 34,403	\$ 34,403	\$ 137,610
	Office Operations Associate	43%	1				\$ 12,541	\$ 12,541	\$ 12,541	\$ 12,541	\$ 50,164
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Fringe Benefits						\$ 46,944	\$ 46,944	\$ 46,944	\$ 46,944	\$ 187,774
							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
3. Travel	Trip Purpose and Description	Cost Per Trip	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
Basis for cost estimates: \$0.50	Director - statewide travel 300 miles per trip	\$150) 7	2	1	1	\$ 1,050	\$ 300	\$ 150	\$ 150	\$ 1,650
per mile cost	Consultant - national trip NTC training	\$2,000) 1	1			\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,000
	Consultant - statewide travel 300 miles per trip	\$150	20	20	20	20	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 12,000
	Office Associate - statewide travel 300 miles per trip	\$150) 7	5	5	5	\$ 1,050	\$ 750	\$ 750	\$ 750	\$ 3,300
	· ·						\$ -	s -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Travel Costs			1	1	1	\$ 7,100	\$ 6,050	\$ 3,900	\$ 3,900	\$ 20,950
										. ,	. ,
					1		Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PV	Total Project
4 Equipment	Item Description	Unit Cost	OTV PV1	OTV PV2	OTV PV3	OTV PV4	PV 1	PV 2	PV 3	4	Cost
ii Equipinent	Deskton computers including monitors and printers for	enit cost	Q,	Q ,	Q11,110	Q ,					COST
	consultant and office operations associate	\$ 2,500					\$ 5,000	¢	¢	¢	\$5.000
	Lenten computer with wireless conshilities to he wad	\$ 2,500	2	-			\$ 5,000	а —	ф -	3 -	\$5,000
	during with work team and for training	\$ 1,500	1				\$ 1.500	¢	¢	¢	\$1.500
	during with work team and for training	\$ 1,500					\$ 1,500		 с		\$1,500
	Total Fauinment Costs	1					\$ 6500	\$ -	\$ -	s -	\$6 500
	Total Equipment Costs						\$ 0,500	φ -	ф -	ф <u>-</u>	\$0,500
	[1	1				T () C (T + 1 C +	T () C (T (1 D) (
a r	T. 1	T 200		OTH DUA	OTH DUA		Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
5. Supplies	Item description	Unit Cost	QIY,PYI	Q14, P42	Q14, P43	Q11,P14	PYI	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
	Office supplies	\$ 30,000	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500	\$ 30,000
	Instructional materials	\$ 20,000	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 20,000
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	5 -	5 -
	Total Supply Costs						ə 12,500	\$ 12,500	ə 12,500	ə 12,500	ə 50,000
	h						1	1	1	1	
							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
6. Contractual	Item Description & Purpose or Relation to the Projec	t					PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
	Work Team Meeting expenses (25 people x breaks, lunch, roo	m fee =\$1000 per d	ay)				\$ 70,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000	\$ 74,000
	Contract for the development of resource tools, online learning	community and web	ased applications fo	r training, and mento	oring curriculum dev	elopment	\$ 50,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 254,092	\$ 4,304,092
	Contract for facilitation costs for mentor training, mentor acade	mies, and coaching i	nstitutes				\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 5,100,000
	Contract for writers for publications and editor						\$ 42,500	\$ 42,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 85,000
	Total Contractual Expenses						\$ 162,500	\$ 2,144,500	\$ 5,001,000	\$ 2,255,092	\$ 9,563,092

							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
7. Training Stipends	Description and Purpose	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$-
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$-
	Total Training						\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$-
							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
8. Other	Type or Category & Purpose	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
	Printing - publication costs	\$ 150,000	0.25	0.5	0.25		\$ 37,500	\$ 75,000	\$ 37,500	\$ -	\$ 150,000
	Postage	\$ 10,000	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 10,000
	Total Other Expenses						\$ 40,000	\$ 77,500	\$ 40,000	\$ 2,500	\$ 160,000
							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
10. Indirect Costs	Organization	Rate					PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
Note: No indirect charged for	WI Department of Public Instruction	6%					\$ 18,163	\$ 16,510	\$ 13,441	\$ 11,191	\$ 59,304
contractual costs							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$-
	Total Indirect Costs						\$ 18,163	\$ 16,510	\$ 13,441	\$ 11,191	\$ 59,304
11. Funding for Involved							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
LEAs	Activity Description & Purpose	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$-
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$-
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$-
	Total Other Expenses						\$-	\$ -	\$-	\$-	\$-
12. Supplemental Funding							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
for Participating LEAs	Item	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$-
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Subgrant						\$ -	\$-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Project 10: Model Evaluation Systems for Teachers and Principals

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table Model Evaluation Systems for Teachers and Principals Associated with Criteria: (D) (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))															
Project Budget CategoriesProject Year 1 (a)Project Year 2 (b)Project Year 3 (c)Project Year 4 (d)Total (e)															
Personnel \$ 154,000 \$ 22,000 \$ 22,000 \$ 22,000 \$ 220,000															
2. Fringe Benefits	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-					
3. Travel \$ 6,000 \$ - \$ - \$ 6,000															
4. Equipment	4. Equipment \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -														
5. Supplies	\$	3,750	\$	3,750	\$	3,750	\$	3,750	\$	15,000					
6. Contractual	\$	225,000	\$	1,374,000	\$	575,000	\$	575,000	\$	2,749,000					
7. Training Stipends	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-					
8. Other	\$	2,500	\$	2,500	\$	2,500	\$	2,500	\$	10,000					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$	391,250	\$	1,402,250	\$	603,250	\$	603,250	\$	3,000,000					
10. Indirect Costs*	\$	9,975	\$	1,695	\$	1,695	\$	1,695	\$	15,060					
11.Funding for Involved LEAs	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-					
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$	401,225	\$	1,403,945	\$	604,945	\$	604,945	\$	3,015,060					

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category. Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

Budget Part II: Detailed Level Project Budget Table - Model Evaluation Systems for Teachers and Principals

Based on the critical elements of coaching and mentoring within the Wisconsin plan, we will support our reform efforts through enhanced provision of Model Evaluation Systems for Teachers and Principals. These areas are covered in detail in section (D) of this application .

Our cost projections are based on both costings and non-binding proposals provided by both national and local organizations and not-forprofits who have proven track records in this area. Therefore, these costs will be contractual.

In addition, the WDPI will increase on its current resources in this area to develop even greater capacity and capability. Our cost projections for this aspect of our plan are based on our understanding of the scope of work we wish to undertake, the current WDPI cost structures and what we believe is the minimum budget and resource we require in order to successfully implement these reform initiatives.

10 Model Teacher Eval

								Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
1. Personnel	Title and Position Description	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4		PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
	Teacher Stakeholder Work Team: Stipends (\$200/day) plus											
	mileage and meals x 25 people for one meeting =											
	\$10,000/meeting	\$ 10,000	7	1	1		1 \$	5 70,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 100,000
	Teacher Stakeholder Work Team: Substitute pay											
	(approximatley 15 people x \$100/day = \$1,500/meeting)	\$ 1,500	7	1	1		1 \$	5 10,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 15,000
	Prinicpal Stakeholder Work Team: Stipends (\$200/day) plus											
	mileage and meals x 25 people for one meeting =											
	\$10,000/meeting	\$ 10,000	7	1 1	1		1 \$	5 70,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 100,000
	Principal Stakeholder Work Team: Substitute pay											
	(approximatley 5 people x \$100/day = \$500/meeting)	\$ 500	7	1	1		1 \$	\$ 3,500	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 5,000
							\$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Personnel						\$	5 154,000	\$ 22,000	\$ 22,000	\$ 22,000	\$ 220,000
				-r	1	r	- 1		r			
								Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
2. Fringe Benefits	Position Title	Fringe Rate						PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$	- 6	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$	- 6	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$	· -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$	- 6	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Fringe Benefits	•		•			\$	· -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$-
								Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
3. Travel	Trip Purpose and Description	Cost Per Trip	OTY, PY1	OTY, PY2	OTY, PY3	OTY, PY4		PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
	Travel costs for experts to present products	\$6,00	0	1			\$	6,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,000
			-				S	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	s -
							ŝ	- -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							s	- -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							ŝ	- -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Travel Costs				1	1	ŝ	6.000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6.000
							-					,
						1	1	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Caste PV	Total Project
								10000	10000	1000 C0000		
4 Equipment	Item Description	Unit Cost	OTV PV1	OTV PV2	OTV PV3	OTV PV4		PV 1	PV 2	PV 3		Cost
4. Equipment	Item Description	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	s	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
4. Equipment	Item Description	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, РY3	QTY, PY4	\$	PY 1 -	PY 2 \$ - \$ -	PY 3 \$ - \$ -	4 \$ - \$ -	Cost \$0
4. Equipment	Item Description	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	\$	PY 1	PY 2 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$	PY 3 \$ - \$ - \$ -	4 \$ - \$ - \$ -	Cost \$0 \$0 \$0
4. Equipment	Item Description	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	\$ \$	PY 1	PY 2 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$	PY 3 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$	4 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	Cost \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0
4. Equipment	Item Description Total Equipment Costs	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	\$ \$ \$	PY 1	PY 2 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	PY 3 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$	4 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	Cost \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0
4. Equipment	Item Description Total Equipment Costs	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	\$ \$ \$	PY 1 	PY 2 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - Total Costs	PY 3 \$ - \$ - \$ - Total Costs	4 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	Cost S0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 Total Project
4. Equipment	Item Description Total Equipment Costs Item description	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	\$ \$ \$	PY 1 	PY 2 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - Total Costs PV 2	PY 3 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ Total Costs PV 3	4 \$	Cost Cost \$00 \$00 Total Project Cost
4. Equipment 5. Supplies	Item Description Total Equipment Costs Item description Office supplies	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	\$ \$ \$	PY 1 	PY 2 \$ - \$ - \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	PY 3 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$	4 \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ -	Cost \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 Total Project Cost \$ \$ 15,000
4. Equipment 5. Supplies	Item Description Total Equipment Costs Item description Office supplies	Unit Cost Unit Cost \$ 15,000	QTY, PY1 QTY, PY1 0.25	QTY, PY2 QTY, PY2 0.25	QTY, PY3 QTY, PY3 0.25	QTY, PY4 QTY, PY4 0.2:	\$ \$ \$ \$ 5 \$	PY 1	PY 2 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$	PY 3 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$	4 \$ -\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ -\$ Total Costs PY 4 \$ 3,750	Cost \$0 \$0 \$0 Total Project Cost \$ 15,000
 Equipment Supplies 	Item Description Total Equipment Costs Item description Office supplies	Unit Cost Unit Cost \$ 15,000	QTY, PY1 QTY, PY1 QTY, PY1 0.25	QTY, PY2 QTY, PY2 QTY, PY2 0.25	QTY, PY3 QTY, PY3 0.25	QTY, PY4 QTY, PY4 0.2:	\$ \$ \$ 5 \$	PY 1	PY 2 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$	PY 3 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - Total Costs PY 3 \$ 3,750 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$	4 \$ -\$ \$ \$ -\$ \$ -\$ \$ -\$ -\$ -\$ -\$ -\$ -\$ -\$ -\$ -\$	Cost \$0 \$0 \$0
4. Equipment 5. Supplies	Item Description Total Equipment Costs Item description Office supplies Total Sumple Costs	Unit Cost Unit Cost \$ 15,000	QTY, PY1 QTY, PY1 0.25	QTY, PY2 QTY, PY2 0.25	QTY, PY3 QTY, PY3 0.25	QTY, PY4 QTY, PY4 0.2:	5 \$ \$	PY 1	PY 2 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	PY 3 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$	4 \$	Cost \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 Total Project Cost \$15,000 \$- \$15,000
4. Equipment 5. Supplies	Item Description Total Equipment Costs Item description Office supplies Total Supply Costs	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1 QTY, PY1 0.25	QTY, PY2 QTY, PY2 0.25	QTY, PY3 QTY, PY3 0.25	QTY, PY4 QTY, PY4 0.2:	5 S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	PY 1	PY 2 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$	PY 3 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - Total Costs PY 3 \$ 3,750 \$ - \$ 3,750	4 \$	Cost S0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$15,000 \$
4. Equipment 5. Supplies	Item Description Total Equipment Costs Item description Office supplies	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1 QTY, PY1 0.25	QTY, PY2 QTY, PY2 0.25	QTY, PY3 QTY, PY3 0.25	QTY, PY4 QTY, PY4 0.2:	5 \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	PY 1	PY 2 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	PY 3 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ Total Costs PY 3 \$ 3,750 \$ - \$ 3,750 Total Costs Costs - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	4 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - - 5 - - 5 - - 5 - - 5 - - 5 - - 5 - - 5 - - 5 - - 5 - - 5 - - 5 - - - 5 - - - 5 - - - 5 - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Cost \$0 \$0 \$0
 4. Equipment 5. Supplies 	Item Description Total Equipment Costs Item description Office supplies Total Supply Costs Item Description & Description	Unit Cost Unit Cost \$ 15,000	QTY, PY1 QTY, PY1 0.25	QTY, PY2 QTY, PY2 0.25	QTY, PY3 QTY, PY3 0.25	QTY, PY4 QTY, PY4 0.2:	\$ \$ \$ \$ 5 \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	PY 1	PY 2 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	PY 3 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ Total Costs PY 3 \$ 3,750 \$ - \$ - \$ Total Costs PY 4	4 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	Cost Cost \$0
 4. Equipment 5. Supplies 6. Contractual 	Item Description Total Equipment Costs Item description Office supplies Total Supply Costs Item Description & Purpose or Relation to the Project Competitive studies are given by the supplement of the supple	Unit Cost Unit Cost \$ 15,000	QTY, PY1 QTY, PY1 0.25	QTY, PY2 QTY, PY2 0.25	QTY, PY3 QTY, PY3 0.25	QTY, PY4	\$ \$ \$ \$ 5 \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	PY 1	PY 2 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	PY 3 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	4 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	Cost Cost \$0
 4. Equipment 5. Supplies 6. Contractual 	Item Description Total Equipment Costs Item description Office supplies Total Supply Costs Item Description & Purpose or Relation to the Project Contract with outside expert(s)	Unit Cost Unit Cost \$ 15,000	QTY, PY1 QTY, PY1 0.25	QTY, PY2 QTY, PY2 0.25	QTY, PY3 QTY, PY3 0.25	QTY, PY4 QTY, PY4 0.2:	5 S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	PY 1	PY 2 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 3,750 \$ - \$ 3,750 \$ - \$ 3,750 Total Costs PY 2 \$ 3,750 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	PY 3 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ Total Costs PY 3 \$ - \$ 3,750 \$ - \$ 3,750 Total Costs PY 3 \$ 175,000 \$ \$ 175,000 \$ \$ 9 0,000 \$ 5 0	4 5 5 5 5 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 7 5 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	Cost S0 \$0 \$0
 4. Equipment 5. Supplies 6. Contractual 	Item Description Total Equipment Costs Item description Office supplies Total Supply Costs Item Description & Purpose or Relation to the Project Contract with outside expert(s) Contract for the development of and/or use of teacher and princ	Unit Cost Unit Cost S 15,000 t t	QTY, PY1 QTY, PY1 0.25	QTY, PY2 QTY, PY2 0.25	QTY, PY3 QTY, PY3 0.25	QTY, PY4	5 S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	PY 1 5 - 5 - 6 - 70tal Costs PY 1 5 - 5 - 6 3,750 Total Costs PY 1 6 3,750 Total Costs PY 1 6 3,750 Total Costs PY 1 6 3,750	PY 2 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 3,750 Total Costs - \$ 3,750 Total Costs - \$ 3,750 Total Costs - \$ 175,000 \$ 1,199,000	PY 3 . \$ - . \$ - . \$ - . . Total Costs PY 3 . . \$. . . \$ 3,750 . . . Total Costs PY 3 . . . \$ 175,000 \$ 400,000 .	4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	Cost Cost \$0
 4. Equipment 5. Supplies 6. Contractual 	Item Description Total Equipment Costs Item description Office supplies Total Supply Costs Item Description & Purpose or Relation to the Project Contract with outside expert(s) Contract for the development of and/or use of teacher and princ	Unit Cost Unit Cost \$ 15,000 t t	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2 QTY, PY2 0.25 oting tools	QTY, PY3 QTY, PY3 0.25	QTY, PY4	5 S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	PY 1	PY 2 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 3,750 \$ - \$ 3,750 Total Costs PY 2 \$ \$ 175,000 \$ 1,199,000	PY 3 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 3,750 \$ 3,750 Total Costs PY 3 \$ 3,750 \$ 175,000 \$ 400,000 \$ -	4 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	Cost Cost \$0
 4. Equipment 5. Supplies 6. Contractual 	Item Description Total Equipment Costs Item description Office supplies Total Supply Costs Item Description & Purpose or Relation to the Project Contract with outside expert(s) Contract for the development of and/or use of teacher and prime Total Contract to the Lympner:	Unit Cost Unit Cost S 15,000 t t	QTY, PY1 QTY, PY1 0.25	QTY, PY2 QTY, PY2 0.25 oting tools	QTY, PY3 QTY, PY3 0.25	QTY, PY4 QTY, PY4 0.2:	5 \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	PY 1	PY 2 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 3,750 Total Costs PY 2 \$ 1,75,000 \$ 1,199,000 \$ - \$ -	PY 3 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 3,750 \$ - \$ 3,750 \$ - \$ 3,750 \$ 175,000 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	4 5 5 5 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 7 5 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	Cost Cost \$0
 4. Equipment 5. Supplies 6. Contractual 	Item Description Total Equipment Costs Item description Office supplies Total Supply Costs Item Description & Purpose or Relation to the Project Contract with outside expert(s) Contract for the development of and/or use of teacher and princ Total Contractual Expenses	Unit Cost Unit Cost S 15,000 t t	QTY, PY1 QTY, PY1 0.25 vols, training and pil	QTY, PY2 QTY, PY2 0.25	0TY, PY3 0.25	QTY, PY4	5 \$ \$ 5 \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	PY 1	PY 2 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 3,750 \$ - \$ - \$ 3,750 Total Costs - \$ - \$ 175,000 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	PY 3 - <td>4 5 - 5 5 - 5 5 - 5 5 - 5 5 - 5 5 - 7 5 - 7</td> <td>Total Project Cost \$0 \$0 \$0</td>	4 5 - 5 5 - 5 5 - 5 5 - 5 5 - 5 5 - 7 5 - 7	Total Project Cost \$0 \$0 \$0
 4. Equipment 5. Supplies 6. Contractual 	Item Description Total Equipment Costs Item description Office supplies Total Supply Costs Item Description & Purpose or Relation to the Project Contract with outside expert(s) Contract for the development of and/or use of teacher and prince Total Contractual Expenses	Unit Cost Unit Cost S 15,000 t t	QTY, PY1 QTY, PY1 0.25 0.25 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50 0.50	QTY, PY2 QTY, PY2 0.25 oting tools	QTY, PY3 QTY, PY3 0.25	QTY, PY4	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	PY 1	PY 2 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 3,750 Total Costs PY 2 \$ 3,750 Total Costs PY 2 \$ 3,750 S 1,199,000 \$ - \$ 1,374,000	PY 3 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 3,750 Total Costs - \$ 3,750 Total Costs - \$ 3,750 \$ 175,000 \$ 400,000 \$ - \$ 575,000	4 \$	Cost Cost \$0
 4. Equipment 5. Supplies 6. Contractual 	Item Description Total Equipment Costs Item description Office supplies Total Supply Costs Item Description & Purpose or Relation to the Project Contract with outside expert(s) Contract for the development of and/or use of teacher and princ Total Contractual Expenses	Unit Cost Unit Cost S 15,000 t t	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2 QTY, PY2 0.25 oting tools	QTY, PY3 QTY, PY3 0.25	QTY, PY4	5 \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	PY 1	PY 2 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 3,750 \$ - \$ 3,750 Total Costs PY 2 \$ 175,000 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 1,374,000 Total Costs -	PY 3 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 3,750 \$ - \$ 3,750 \$ - \$ 3,750 \$ - \$ 3,750 \$ - \$ 3,750 \$ - \$ 3,750 \$ - \$ 3,750 \$ - \$ 5,75,000 \$ Total Costs \$ Total Costs	4 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5	Total Project Cost S0 \$0 \$0 </td
 4. Equipment 5. Supplies 6. Contractual 7. Training Stipends 	Item Description Total Equipment Costs Item description Office supplies Total Supply Costs Item Description & Purpose or Relation to the Project Contract with outside expert(s) Contract for the development of and/or use of teacher and princ Total Contractual Expenses Description and Purpose	Unit Cost Unit Cost S 15,000 t Unit Cost Unit Cost	QTY, PY1 QTY, PY1 0.25 000, training and pil	QTY, PY2 QTY, PY2 0.25 oting tools	QTY, PY3 QTY, PY3 0.25 QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	5 \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	PY 1	PY 2 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 3,750 Total Costs - \$ - \$ - \$ 175,000 \$ - <td>PY 3 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 3,750 Total Costs - \$ 3,750 Total Costs - \$ 175,000 \$ 175,000 \$ - \$<!--</td--><td>Total Costs PY 4 \$</td><td>Total Project Cost \$0 \$0 \$0<!--</td--></td></td>	PY 3 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 3,750 Total Costs - \$ 3,750 Total Costs - \$ 175,000 \$ 175,000 \$ - \$ </td <td>Total Costs PY 4 \$</td> <td>Total Project Cost \$0 \$0 \$0<!--</td--></td>	Total Costs PY 4 \$	Total Project Cost \$0 \$0 \$0 </td
 4. Equipment 5. Supplies 6. Contractual 7. Training Stipends 	Item Description Total Equipment Costs Item description Office supplies Total Supply Costs Item Description & Purpose or Relation to the Project Contract with outside expert(s) Contract for the development of and/or use of teacher and princt Ortal Contractual Expenses Description and Purpose	Unit Cost Unit Cost S 15,000 t Unit Cost Unit Cost	QTY, PY1 QTY, PY1 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.25	QTY, PY2 QTY, PY2 0.25 oting tools	QTY, PY3 QTY, PY3 0.25	QTY, PY4 QTY, PY4 0.2:	5 \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	PY 1	PY 2 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 3,750 Total Costs PY 2 \$ 3,750 Total Costs PY 2 \$ 1,199,000 \$ - \$ 1,374,000 Total Costs PY 2 \$ - \$ 1,374,000	PY 3 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 3,750 Total Costs PY 3 \$ 3,750 Total Costs PY 3 \$ 175,000 \$ - \$ 575,000 Total Costs PY 3 \$ - \$ 575,000	4 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	Cost Cost \$0
 4. Equipment 5. Supplies 6. Contractual 7. Training Stipends 	Item Description Total Equipment Costs Item description Office supplies Total Supply Costs Item Description & Purpose or Relation to the Project Contract with outside expert(s) Contract for the development of and/or use of teacher and princ Total Contractual Expenses Description and Purpose	Unit Cost Unit Cost t Unit Cost Unit Cost	QTY, PY1 QTY, PY1 QTY, PY1 QTY, PY1 QTY, PY1 QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2 QTY, PY2 0.25 0.25 0.25	QTY, PY3 QTY, PY3 0.25 QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4 QTY, PY4 0.2: QTY, PY4	5 \$ \$ 5 \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	PY 1	PY 2 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 3,750 \$ - \$ 3,750 Total Costs PY 2 \$ 175,000 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 1,374,000 Total Costs PY 2 \$ - \$ -	PY 3 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 3,750 \$ - \$ 3,750 \$ - \$ 3,750 \$ - \$ 3,750 \$ - \$ 3,750 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	4 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	Total Project Cost S0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000
 4. Equipment 5. Supplies 6. Contractual 7. Training Stipends 	Item Description Total Equipment Costs Item description Office supplies Total Supply Costs Item Description & Purpose or Relation to the Project Contract with outside expert(s) Contract for the development of and/or use of teacher and princ Total Contractual Expenses Description and Purpose n	Unit Cost Unit Cost S 15,000 t Unit Cost Unit Cost	QTY, PY1 QTY, PY1 0.25 00k, training and pil QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2 QTY, PY2 0.25 oting tools	QTY, PY3 0.25 QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	5 \$ 5 \$ 5 \$ 5 \$ 5 \$ 5 \$ 5 \$ 5 \$	PY 1	PY 2 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 3,750 Total Costs - \$ - \$ - \$ 175,000 \$ - \$ 1774,000 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	PY 3 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 3,750 Total Costs - \$ 3,750 Total Costs - \$ 175,000 \$ 175,000 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	Total Costs PY 4 \$	Total Project Cost \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000 \$0 \$0,000

10 Model Teacher Eval

							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
8. Other	Type or Category & Purpose	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
	Postage	\$ 5,00	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	\$ 1,250	\$ 1,250	\$ 1,250	\$ 1,250	\$ 5,000
	Printing	\$ 5,00	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	\$ 1,250	\$ 1,250	\$ 1,250	\$ 1,250	\$ 5,000
	Total Other Expenses						\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 10,000
							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
10. Indirect Costs	Organization	Rate					PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
Note: No indirect charged for	WI Department of Public Instruction	6	%				\$ 9,975	\$ 1,695	\$ 1,695	\$ 1,695	\$ 15,060
contractual costs							\$ -	\$-	\$ -	\$ -	\$-
	Total Indirect Costs						\$ 9,975	\$ 1,695	\$ 1,695	\$ 1,695	\$ 15,060
11. Funding for Involved							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
LEAs	Activity Description & Purpose	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$-	\$ -	\$ -	\$-
							\$ -	\$-	\$ -	\$ -	\$-
							\$ -	\$-	\$ -	\$ -	\$-
	Total Other Expenses						\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
12. Supplemental Funding							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
for Participating LEAs	Item	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$-
	Total Subgrant						\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$-

Project 11: Preservice Teacher Performance Assessment

	Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table Preservice Teacher Performance Assessment Associated with Criteria: (D) (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d)) Project Project Project Project Project Total														
Project Budget CategoriesProject Year 1 (a)Project Year 2 (b)Project Year 3 (c)Project Year 4 (d)Total (e)															
1. Personnel	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-					
2. Fringe Benefits	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-					
3. Travel	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-					
4. Equipment	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-					
5. Supplies	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-					
6. Contractual	\$	-	\$	-	\$	100,000	\$	100,000	\$	200,000					
7. Training Stipends	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-					
8. Other	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$	-	\$	-	\$	100,000	\$	100,000	\$	200,000					
10. Indirect Costs*	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-					
11.Funding for Involved LEAs	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-					
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$	-	\$	-	\$	100,000	\$	100,000	\$	200,000					

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category. Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

Budget Part II: Detailed Level Project Budget Table – Preservice Teacher Performance Assessment

Based on the critical elements of coaching and mentoring within the Wisconsin plan, we will support our reform efforts through enhanced provision of Preservice Teacher Performance Assessment. These areas are covered in detail in section (D) of this application .

Our cost projections are based on both costings and non-binding proposals provided by both national and local organizations and not-forprofits who have proven track records in this area.

All costs within this budget are contractual. Administration of this investment is covered within the existing cost structure of the WDPI.

11 Preservice Teacher Assess

1 Personnel	Title and Position Description	Base Salary	% FTF PV 1	% FTF DV 2	% FTF PV 3	% FTF DV A	Total Costs PV 1	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
1. Tersonner	The and I oshion Description	Dase Salary	70 F1E111	70 F IE I I 2	70 F IE I I 5	70111114	\$.	\$.	\$.	-	S -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$-
							s -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Personnel		·	*	÷		\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$ -
							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
2. Fringe Benefits	Position Title	Fringe Rate					PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
							s -	\$ -	\$ - ¢	\$ -	\$ -
							3 - S	3 - S	3 - S	3 - S	3 - e
							s -	\$ -	s -	s -	s -
	Total Fringe Benefits	-		-	1	-	\$-	\$-	\$ -	\$-	\$-
	.									•	
							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
3. Travel	Trip Purpose and Description	Cost Per Trip	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
							s -	\$ -	\$-	\$ -	\$-
							\$ -	\$-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Travel Conta						<u>s</u> -	\$ -	\$ -	<u>s</u> -	\$ -
	Total Travel Costs						ş -	ə -	\$ -	ə -	3 -
			1				Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs DV	Total Project
4. Equipment	Item Description	Unit Cost	OTY. PV1	OTV. PV2	OTV. PV3	OTY, PY4	PV 1	PY 2	PV 3		Cost
n Equipment		ciat cost	Q ,	Q,	Q,	Q,	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$0
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$0
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$0
	Total Equipment Costs						\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0
		1			1				1		
							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
5. Supplies	Item description	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
							s -	\$ -	\$ -	s -	<u>s</u> -
							s -	5 - ¢	5 - ¢	\$ - ¢	5 - e
	Total Supply Costs	_					<u> </u>	s -	<u> </u>	s -	<u> </u>
							Ŷ	Ŷ	Ŷ	Ŷ	Ŷ
							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
6. Contractual	Item Description & Purpose or Relation to the Pro	oject					PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
	Following the completion of the development phase, these	unds will be used to a	ccelerate the niloti	ng and implementation	on of the preservice	assessment tool					
	Funding will be provided for student teachers from Alverno	College, University of	of Wisconsin-Madis	son and University of	f Wisconsin-Eau Cl	air, all current					
	program participants, to field test the preservice assessment	tool currently being o	leveloped by the Co	ouncil of Chief State	School Officers (Co	CSSO) and					
	American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (A	ACTE) national partn	ership. Additional	educator preparation	n programs will be a	added based on					
	available funding.						S -	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 200,000
							3 - 6	3 - \$	ə - ¢	ə -	ə -
							s -	\$ -	s -	s -	s -
	Total Contractual Expenses						\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 200,000
	L								,		
							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
7. Training Stipends	Description and Purpose	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							S -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Training						\$ -	\$ -	ş -	\$ -	ş -

11 Preservice Teacher Assess

8. Other	Type or Category & Purpose	Unit Cost	OTY, PY1	OTY, PY2	OTY, PY3	OTY, PY4	Total Costs Total Costs Total Costs Total Costs Total Costs Total Projec PY 1 PY 2 PY 3 4 Cost Cost </th <th>:t</th>	:t
or other	Type of Category & Lapose	e int cost	Q,	Q,	Q.1.,1.10	Q,.		_
							\$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$	-
	Total Other Expenses						\$ - \$ - \$ - \$	-
								_
							Total Costs Total Costs Total Costs Total Costs PY Total Projec	:t
10. Indirect Costs	Organization	Rate					PY 1 PY 2 PY 3 4 Cost	_
Note: No indirect charged for							<u>s - s - s - s</u>	-
contractual costs								-
	Total Indirect Costs						<u> </u>	-
								_
11. Funding for Involved							Total Costs Total Costs Total Costs Total Costs PY Total Projec	:t
LEAs	Activity Description & Purpose	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	PY1 PY2 PY3 4 Cost	_
							<u>s - s - s - s</u>	-
				-	-		<u> </u>	-
	Total Other Expenses							-
	Total Other Expenses						\$ -\$ -\$ -\$	-
12 G L	h	1	1	1	1	1		-
12. Supplemental Funding	T4	T. H. C. H	OTV DV1	OTV DVA	OTV DV2	OTN DX4	Total Costs Total Costs Total Costs Total Costs PY Total Projec	ı
for Participating LEAS	Item	Unit Cost	Q11, P11	Q14, P12	Q11,P13	Q11,P14	PYI PY2 PY3 4 Cost	\rightarrow
								-
								-
	Total Subgrant	1	1	1	1	1	3 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 6 - 6 - 6 - 6 - 6	-
	i otai Subgrant						φ - φ - φ - φ	-

Project 12: Expanding Urban Teacher Training

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table Expanding Urban Teacher Training Associated with Criteria: (D) (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))														
Budget Categories	Projec Year 1	t (a)	Projec Year 2	rt (b)	Projec Year 3	2t (c)	Proje Year 4	ect (d)	Т	otal (e)				
1. Personnel	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-				
2. Fringe Benefits	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-				
3. Travel	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-				
4. Equipment	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-				
5. Supplies	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-				
6. Contractual	\$ 285,000		\$ 285,000		\$ 285,000		\$ 285,000)	\$ 1,140),000				
7. Training Stipends	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-				
8. Other	\$	-	\$ 100,000		\$ 100,000		\$ 100,000	,	\$ 300,0	000				
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 285,000		\$ 385,000		\$ 385,000		\$ 385,000)	\$ 1,440),000				
10. Indirect Costs*	\$	-	\$ 6,000		\$ 6,000		\$ 6,000		\$ 18,00	00				
11.Funding for Involved LEAs	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-				
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-				
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$ 285,000		\$ 391,000		\$ 391,000		\$ 391,000)	\$ 1,458	3,000				

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category. Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years. *If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

Budget Part II: Detailed Level Project Budget Table – Expanding Urban Teacher Training

Based on the critical elements of coaching and mentoring within the Wisconsin plan, we will support our reform efforts through enhanced provision of Teacher and Principal Mentoring and Coaching. These areas are covered in detail in section (D) of this application .

Our cost projections are based on both costings and non-binding proposals provided by both national and local organizations and not-forprofits who have proven track records in this area and existing experience contracting with such organizations.

All costs within this budget are contractual. Administration of this investment is covered within the existing cost structure of the WDPI.

							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
1. Personnel	Title and Position Description	Base Salary	% FTE PY 1	% FTE PY 2	% FTE PY 3	% FTE PY 4	1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Personnel						s -	\$-	\$-	ş -	\$-
		1	1	1							
							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
2. Fringe Benefits	Position Title	Fringe Rate					1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
			-				s -	\$ -	\$ -	<u>s</u> -	\$ -
							<u>s</u> -	<u>\$</u> -	<u>\$</u> -	<u>\$</u> -	<u>s</u> -
			-				s -	\$ -	\$ -	<u>s</u> -	\$ -
	Total Eringa Danafita						<u>s</u> -	\$ -	\$ - ¢	<u>s</u> -	\$ -
	Total Fringe Benefits						ə -	ə -	ə -	ð -	ə -
			1			1			T () C (
2	The Democratic dimensional Democratic dimensional dimension	Cost Door Today	OTX DX1	OTV DV2	OTV DV2	OTX DX4	Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
3. Travel	Trip Purpose and Description	Cost Per Trip	Q14, P41	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	Q14, P44	Î	2	PY 3	4	Cost
							s -	\$ -	<u>\$</u> -	s -	\$ -
							s -	\$ -	<u>\$</u> -	s -	\$ -
							s -	\$ -	<u>\$</u> -	s -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	<u>\$</u> -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Traval Casta						s -	5 - ¢	3 - ¢	s -	5 - ¢
	Total Travel Costs						ş -	а -	р -	ş -	ş -
		1	1	1	1	1	T-t-LCt-DV	T-4-1 C4- DV	T-4-1 Ct-	Tetel Ceste DV	Tetal Devilent
4 Eminment	Itom Description	Unit Cost	OTV DV1	OTV DV2	OTV DV2	OTV DVA	1 otal Costs P Y		Total Costs	1 otal Costs P 1	Total Project
4. Equipment	Item Description	Unit Cost	Q11,F11	Q11,F12	Q11,F15	Q11,F14	۱ د	4 ¢	¢ F13	4 ¢	Cost
			-				9 - 6	а – с	ф -	э - с	\$0 \$0
							3 - S	ه -	ф – \$	3 - S	\$0
	Total Equipment Costs						\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	ş -	\$0 \$0
							•	+	+	+	+-
							Total Costs PV	Total Costs PV	Total Costs	Total Costs PV	Total Project
5. Supplies	Item description	Unit Cost	OTY. PV1	OTY, PY2	OTY, PY3	OTV. PV4	1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
et supplies	item description	emi cost	Q,	Q ,	211,110	Q,	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Supply Costs						\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
6. Contractual	Item Description & Purpose or Relation to the Project	zt					1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
	Contract which an openantization to structure to the a suggest										
	experience.	\$ 285.000	\$ 285,000	\$ 285,000	\$ 285.000	\$ 1,140,000					
	orperionee.	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	s -	\$ -
	Total Contractual Expenses							\$ 285,000	\$ 285,000	\$ 285,000	\$ 1,140,000
							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
7. Training Stipends	Description and Purpose	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
•							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
			1		1		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Training						\$ -	\$-	\$ -	\$-	\$ -

12Expand Urban Teacher Training

							Total Costs PY Total Costs I		Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
8. Other	Type or Category & Purpose	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
	Establish a competitive grant program to provide										
	funding to support programs that recruit prospective										
	secondary and post secondary students interested in										
	urban teaching and / or retain those students or current										
	teachers in an urban setting.	\$10,000	0	10	10	10	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 300,000
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Other Expenses						ş -	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 300,000
		_					Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
10. Indirect Costs	Organization	Rate				_	1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
Note: No indirect charged	WI Department of Public Instruction	6%					\$ -	\$ 6,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 18,000
for contractual costs	Tetal Indiana Conta						<u>\$</u> -	<u>\$</u>	\$ -	<u>\$</u>	\$ -
	Total Indirect Costs						ə -	\$ 6,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 18,000
11. Funding for Involved		N N G 4	0757 5571	OTV DVA	OTV DVA		Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
LEAS	Activity Description & Purpose	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	Q1¥, P¥3	Q14, P44	Î	2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	<u>\$</u> -	s -	<u>\$</u> -
							\$ -	\$ -	<u>\$</u> -	\$ -	<u>s</u> -
	Total Other Expenses						\$ - ¢	s -	3 - ¢	s -	s -
	Total Other Expenses						ş -	ş -	ф -	ş -	ş -
						r					
12 Supplemental Funding							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Caste DV	Total Project
for Participating LEAs	Item	Unit Cost	OTV PV1	OTV PV2	OTV PV3	OTV PV4	PV 1	PV 2	PV 3	4	Cost
for Furtherpaung 22215		cint cost	Q ,	Q,	Q11,110	Q ,	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	s	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	ş -	\$ -
						ł	s -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Subgrant						\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Project 13: Turning Around the Struggling Schools

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table Turning Around the Struggling Schools Associated with Criteria: (E) (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))											
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)		Project Year 2 (b)		Project Year 3 (c)		Project Year 4 (d)			Total (e)	
1. Personnel	\$	380,000	\$	380,000	\$	380,000	\$	380,000	\$	1,520,000	
2. Fringe Benefits	\$	163,400	\$	163,400	\$	163,400	\$	163,400	\$	653,600	
3. Travel	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
4. Equipment	\$	11,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	11,000	
5. Supplies	\$	5,000	\$	5,000	\$	5,000	\$	5,000	\$	20,000	
6. Contractual	\$	100,000	\$	100,000	\$	100,000	\$	100,000	\$	400,000	
7. Training Stipends	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
8. Other	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$	659,400	\$	648,400	\$	648,400	\$	648,400	\$	2,604,600	
10. Indirect Costs*	\$	33,564	\$	32,904	\$	32,904	\$	32,904	\$	132,276	
11.Funding for Involved LEAs	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$	692,964	\$	681,304	\$	681,304	\$	681,304	\$	2,736,876	

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category. Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

Budget Part II: Detailed Level Project Budget Table – Turning Around the Struggling Schools

Addressing swiftly and decisively the issue of the struggling schools in Wisconsin is a top priority within the states plan. Our goals, plans and strategies in this area are covered in detail in section (E) of this application.

Our cost projections are based on both costings and non-binding proposals provided by both national and local organizations and not-forprofits who have proven track records in this area and existing experience contracting with such organizations.

In addition, the WDPI will increase on its current resources and expertise in this area by seeking to recruit individuals with specific experience and proven ability in all aspects of turning around struggling schools. Our cost projections for this aspect of our plan are based on our understanding of the scope of work we wish to undertake, the current WDPI cost structures and what we believe is the minimum budget and resource we require in order to successfully implement these reform initiatives.
1 Personnel	Title and Position Description	Roso Solory	94 FTF DV 1	94 FTE DV 2	9/. FTF DV 3	94 FTF DV A	Total Cos	ts	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
1. Fersonner	Filine and Fosition Description	s 60.000	70 FIL FI 1	70 FIE FI 2	70 FIE FI 3	70 FIL FI 4	F11 \$ 200.0	00 6	F1 2	F1 3	* 200.000	£ 1,200,000
	Research Alliance Development Coordinator - This position Research Alliance Development Coordinator - This position will be responsible for bringing together key stakeholders to develop the framework for creating and supporting an external entity that would research Milwaukee Public Schools and inform the public and policymakers on key initiatives. Party modeled on the role of the Chicago Consortium of School Research, this person will also draw on	\$ 60,000	300%	300%	30076	300%	<u>\$ 500,0</u>	00 3	3 300,000	\$ 500,000	3 300,000	3 1,200,000
	the strengths of the existing research efforts in Milwaukee.											
		\$ 80,000	100%	100%	100%	100%	\$ 80,0	00 \$	80,000	\$ 80,000	\$ 80,000	\$ 320,000
							\$	- 3	-	s -	5 - ¢	5 - c
							\$		-	s -	s -	s -
	Total Personnel			1			\$ 380,0	00 \$	380,000	\$ 380,000	\$ 380,000	\$ 1,520,000
							. ,			. ,		. , ,
2. Fringe Benefits	Position Title	Fringe Rate					Total Cos PY 1	ts	Total Costs PY 2	Total Costs PY 3	Total Costs PY 4	Total Project Cost
	Education Consultant	43%					\$ 129,0	00 \$	5 129,000	\$ 129,000	\$ 129,000	\$ 516,000
	Research Alliance Development Coordinator	43%					\$ 34,4	00 \$	34,400	\$ 34,400	\$ 34,400	\$ 137,600
							\$	- \$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Evinge Deposits						\$ 162.4	- 5	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Fringe Benefits						\$ 103,4	00 ş	5 105,400	\$ 105,400	\$ 105,400	\$ 055,000
		1	1				Total Cas	ta	Total Costa	Total Costs	Total Coata BV	Total Project
3. Travel	Trin Purnose and Description	Cost Per Trin	OTY PV1	OTY PY2	OTV PV3	OTV. PV4	PV 1	IS	PY 2	PV 3		Total Project
01114/01	The Turpose and Description	cost i ci i i i p	2,	211,112	211,110	Q ,	\$	- 5		\$ -	s -	\$ -
							\$	- \$	- ii	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$	- \$	- i	\$-	s -	s -
							\$	- \$		\$-	\$ -	s -
							\$	- \$		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Travel Costs						\$	- 3		، -	\$ -	\$ -
4 Equipment	Item Description	Unit Cost	OTY PV1	OTY PV2	OTY PV3	OTV PV4	Total Cos PV 1	ts	Total Costs PV 2	Total Costs PV 3	Total Costs PY	Total Project
n Equipment	Laptop computers	\$ 1.500	6	211,112	Q11,110	Q ,	\$ 9.0	00 \$		\$ -	s -	\$ 9,000
	Laser Printers	\$ 1,000	2				\$ 2,0	00 \$	i -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,000
							\$	- \$	- i	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Equipment Costs			•			\$ 11,0	00 \$		\$-	\$ -	\$ 11,000
												-
E. Comer Proc	The second states	Unit Cost	OTV DV1	OTV BV2	OTV DV2	OTV DVA	Total Cos	ts	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
5. Supplies	Office supplies	Unit Cost	Q11,P11	Q11,P12	Q11,P13	Q11, P14	\$ 50	00 5	FY 2	\$ 5,000	4 \$ 5,000	Cost \$ 20,000
	Once suppries						\$ 5,0	- \$	5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 20,000
							\$	- \$	-	\$-	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Supply Costs						\$ 5,0	00 \$	5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 20,000
6. Contractual	Item Description & Purpose or Relation to the Project	ct					Total Cos PY 1	ts	Total Costs PY 2	Total Costs PY 3	Total Costs PY 4	Total Project Cost
	Consulting						\$ 100,0	00 \$	5 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 400,000
							\$	- \$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$	- 5	-	\$ -	<u>s</u> -	<u>s</u> -
	Total Contractual Expenses						\$ \$ 100.0	- 3		\$ 100 000	\$ 100.000	\$ 400,000
	Total Colui actual Expenses						ş 100,0	00 4	5 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 400,000
		1	1				Total Cos	ts	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PV	Total Project
7. Training Stipends	Description and Purpose	Unit Cost	OTY, PY1	OTY, PY2	OTY, PY3	OTY, PY4	PY 1		PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
			~ /	~ /	~ / -	- /	\$	- \$	- 6	\$ -	\$-	\$ -
							\$	- \$	- -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$	- \$		\$ -	\$ -	s -
	Total Training						\$	- \$		s -	ş -	ş -

13 MPS Turnaround

							Tot	al Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
8. Other	Type or Category & Purpose	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	1	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$-
							\$	-	\$-	\$ -	s -	s -
	Total Other Expenses						\$	-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
							Tot	al Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
10. Indirect Costs	Organization	Rate					1	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
Note: No indirect charged	WI Department of Public Instruction	6%					\$	33,564	\$ 32,904	\$ 32,904	\$ 32,904	\$ 132,276
for contractual costs							\$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$-
	Total Indirect Costs						\$	33,564	\$ 32,904	\$ 32,904	\$ 32,904	\$ 132,276
11. Funding for Involved							Tot	al Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
LEAs	Activity Description & Purpose	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	1	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$-
							\$		\$ -	\$ -	s -	s -
							\$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Other Expenses						\$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$-
12. Supplemental												
Funding for Participating							Tot	al Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
LEAs	Item	Unit Cost	OTY, PY1	OTY, PY2	OTY, PY3	OTY, PY4	1	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
			•	C /		•	\$	-	s -	s -	s -	s -
					+	1	\$	-	s -	\$ -	s -	s -
							\$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	s -
	Total Subgrant	1	1	1	-	1	\$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							-		-	-	*	Ŧ

Project 14: Response to Intervention

	Bud	get Part II: Pr	ojec	ct-Level Budge	t Ta	ble		
		Response	e to	Intervention				
		Associated v	vith	Criteria: (E)(2)				
	(Ev	idence for selec	tion	criterion (A)(2)	(i)(d	())		
Budget Categories		Project Year 1 (a)		Project Year 2 (b)		Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$	1,190,570	\$	1,190,570	\$	1,190,570	\$ 1,190,570	\$ 4,762,280
2. Fringe Benefits	\$	511,945	\$	511,945	\$	511,945	\$ 511,945	\$ 2,047,780
3. Travel	\$	64,500	\$	64,500	\$	64,500	\$ 64,500	\$ 258,000
4. Equipment	\$	38,500	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	\$ 38,500
5. Supplies	\$	12,500	\$	12,500	\$	12,500	\$ 12,500	\$ 50,000
6. Contractual	\$	83,250	\$	83,250	\$	83,250	\$ 83,250	\$ 333,000
7. Training Stipends	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$	32,500	\$	32,500	\$	32,500	\$ 32,500	\$ 130,000
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$	1,933,765	\$	1,895,265	\$	1,895,265	\$ 1,895,265	\$ 7,619,560
10. Indirect Costs*	\$	111,031	\$	108,721	\$	108,721	\$ 108,721	\$ 437,194
11.Funding for Involved LEAs	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$	2,044,796	\$	2,003,986	\$	2,003,986	\$ 2,003,986	\$ 8,056,754

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category. Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

Budget Part II: Detailed Level Project Budget Table – Response to Intervention

Establishing an RtI organization within the WDPI is critical to the success of the Wisconsin Race to the Top plan and this aspect of our proposal / application is covered in significant detail in section E2 of the application.

Detailed job descriptions and requirements, organization charts and operating procedures for the Wisconsin RtI center have already been developed, meaning that while the timescales for implementation are aggressive, they are more than achievable.

Our costings are based on standard WDPI pay scales and fringe rates and also reflect our budget experience and understanding gained from setting up similar, if smaller, departments within the WDPI.

Of final note, while funding provisions beyond the four year grant period are unclear at this time, it would be our intention to endeavor to continue to fund this department internally post 2013.

For further information, please also reference Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table on the following two pages.

I. Presented Thie and Pathin Description The Sharp % FTE PV 1 % FTE PV 2 % FTE PV 4 PV 1 PV 2 PV 3 4 Core Restore 2-roots in the Statuting of the St								Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
Prince Provide the determination of the full Statution Information on the work of the ST Determination of the Statution Information of the Work of the ST Determination of the Statution Information of the Work of the ST Determination of the Statution Information of the Work of the ST Determination of the Statution Information of the Work of the ST Determination of the Statution Information of the Work of the ST Determination of the Statution Information of the Work of the ST Determination of the Statution Information of the Work of the ST Determination of the Statution Information of the Work of the ST Determination of the Statution Information of the Statution of the Statution of the Statution Information of the Statution of the Statution of the Statution Information of the Statution of the Statution Information of the Statution of the	1. Personnel	Title and Position Description	Base Salary	% FTE PY 1	% FTE PY 2	% FTE PY 3	% FTE PY 4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
Assumption In the second state of the Tricinal states in the second state of the tricinal state states in the second states in the second state of the		Director: Provides the direct leadership of the RtI Technical										
Number Activity of Direction of production of productio		Assistance Center. The director will work directly with the										
Name Name <th< td=""><td></td><td>www.WDPF's Race to the Top director in providing timely</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<>		www.WDPF's Race to the Top director in providing timely										
Suspend Description Instant Instant <td></td> <td>Information on the work of the Rti Technical Assistance</td> <td>Ter John J</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>¢</td> <td>e</td> <td>¢</td> <td>e</td> <td>¢</td>		Information on the work of the Rti Technical Assistance	Ter John J					¢	e	¢	e	¢
A Frequencies Impossible of control (control (contro) (control (control (control (cont) (control (control (Arritered Director Constitute da la te darre da fela	In-kind					э -	s -	3 -	2 -	\$ -
Prime Benefit Prime Be		Assistant Director: Coordinates the day to day work of the										
Pringe Beerfs Solution (S) rows for the solution of the solution		responsible for ensuring that districts and schools are being										
Interview Interview Subject to the state of state		provided necessary services, maintaining quality control in										
store store <th< td=""><td></td><td>services, and placement of staff to meet the needs of districts</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<>		services, and placement of staff to meet the needs of districts										
Consultant (3). Provides the training and exclusion in a state of the interest, the interest of the acceleration of the interest of the acceleration of the acceler		and schools.	\$92.240	100%	100%	100%	100%	\$ 92.240	\$ 92.240	\$ 92.240	\$ 92.240	\$ 368.960
Arrend Subscience of disting and shook in large array will apply and a state a disting and disting andis and disting and disting and disting andis disting and disting a		Consultant (13): Provides the training and technical	+, _,					+		+ ,_,	÷ ,=,=	,
Active view ILEX in the development and include on an optimum to the development of the program water as an an include on a notice that an an entitied in the development of the program water and include on an optimum to an optimum toptimum to an optimum to an optimum to an optim		assistance to districts and schools in their area. They will										
Implementation of R1 grogmans avail as at a scripted S0000 1300v		work directly with LEAs in the development and										
Bit of an an origin basis, social (2): Privales deficial synport Status <		implementation of RtI programs as well as act as a critical										
Office Operation Associate (2): Provide derival support in consultance, meeting, and track, as well supports in consultance, meeting, and track as well supports in the constance of the constance of the constance of track as well supports in the constress in thereconstance of track as well supports in the constanc		friend on an ongoing basis.	\$80,000	1300%	1300%	1300%	1300%	\$ 1,040,000	\$ 1,040,000	\$ 1,040,000	\$ 1,040,000	\$ 4,160,000
Image: source intervent will minimal file and procedix is block conference. Will minimal minimal moreadix is block conference. Will minimal fil		Office Operations Associate (2): Provides clerical support to										
Approprint Span (s)		consultants, coordinator and director; will maintain files and										
A status they present of expenditures. 539.16 2001 2001 2001 2001 533.30		records; schedule conferences, meetings, and travel; as well										
Total Personnel Sol, 10 Sol, 2001 2000 20		as ensure timely processing of expenditures.										
Ioid if resonie Fringe Hendits Fringe Rate Ioid / P Total Costs Total Costs </td <td></td> <td>T (I D)</td> <td>\$29,165</td> <td>200%</td> <td>200%</td> <td>200%</td> <td>200%</td> <td>\$ 58,330</td> <td>\$ 58,330</td> <td>\$ 58,330</td> <td>\$ 58,330</td> <td>\$ 233,320</td>		T (I D)	\$29,165	200%	200%	200%	200%	\$ 58,330	\$ 58,330	\$ 58,330	\$ 58,330	\$ 233,320
1. Fringe Benefits Position Title Fringe Rate In - kind India Costs Total Cos		1 otal Personnel						\$ 1,190,570	\$ 1,190,570	\$ 1,190,570	\$ 1,190,570	\$ 4,762,280
2. Pringe Benefits Position Title Fringe Rate Image: Construct on the stand of the stan				1	1	1	1					
2. Pringe Benefits Position Title Pringe Mate Pringe Mate Pringe Mate Pringe Mate Cost Assistant Director In-Kain In-Kain S 39,663 \$ 39,603 \$ 30,063 \$ 108,204 \$ 108,204 \$ 108,204 \$ 108,204 \$ 108,204 \$ 108,204 \$ 108,204 \$ 108,204 \$ 108,204 \$ 108,20<								Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
Jurceior In-kmd Image: State	2. Fringe Benefits	Position Title	Fringe Rate					PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
Assistant Director 43% 1 3 30.05 5 39.000 5 39.000		Director	In-kind					* 20.472	* 20.552	* 20.552		\$ -
Consultant (1.3) 4.3% S 447,200 S 417,200 S 417,200 <td></td> <td>Assistant Director</td> <td>43%</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>\$ 39,663</td> <td>\$ 39,663</td> <td>\$ 39,663</td> <td>\$ 39,663</td> <td>\$ 158,653</td>		Assistant Director	43%					\$ 39,663	\$ 39,663	\$ 39,663	\$ 39,663	\$ 158,653
Image: Trans Assistant (2) 4.3% (3) 2.5,082 (3) 2.5,092 (3) 2.5,092 (3) (5) <t< td=""><td></td><td>Consultant (13)</td><td>43%</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>\$ 447,200</td><td>\$ 447,200</td><td>\$ 447,200</td><td>\$ 447,200</td><td>\$ 1,788,800</td></t<>		Consultant (13)	43%					\$ 447,200	\$ 447,200	\$ 447,200	\$ 447,200	\$ 1,788,800
3 311,24 3 311,24 3 311,24 3 311,24 3 311,24 3 211,24 3 211,24 3 211,24 3 21,247,760 3. Travel Trip Purpose and Description Cost Per Trip OTY, PY1 OTY, PY2 OTY, PY4 PY1 PY2 PY3 4 Cost Director-statewide trips to LEAs (300 miles per trip) \$150 60 60 60 60 5 9,000 \$		Program Assistant (2) Total Eringo Bonofito	43%					\$ 25,082	\$ 25,082	\$ 25,082	\$ 25,082	\$ 100,328
3. Travel Trip Purpose and Description Cost Per Trip QTY, PY1 QTY, PY2 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY4 Total Costs Total Costs Total Costs PY 3 4 Cost Director- statewide trips to LEAs (300 miles per trip) 5150 660 600 600 60 <td></td> <td>Total Fringe Benefits</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>\$ 511,945</td> <td>\$ 511,945</td> <td>\$ 511,945</td> <td>\$ 511,945</td> <td>\$ 2,047,780</td>		Total Fringe Benefits						\$ 511,945	\$ 511,945	\$ 511,945	\$ 511,945	\$ 2,047,780
3. Travel Trip Purpose and Description Cost Per Trip QTY, PY1 QTY, PY2 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY4 PY1 PY2 PY3 4 Cost Director-statewide trips to LEAs (300 miles per trip) \$150 60 <td< th=""><th></th><th></th><th></th><th>1</th><th>1</th><th>1</th><th>1</th><th>Total Costs</th><th>Total Costs</th><th>Total Costs</th><th>Total Costs PV</th><th>Total Project</th></td<>				1	1	1	1	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PV	Total Project
A rate Imp runyou Cost Per runy Cirrent	3 Travel	Trin Purnose and Description	Cost Por Trip	OTV PV1	OTV PV2	OTV PV3	OTV PV4	PV 1	PV 2	PV 3		Cost
Director-statewide trips to LEAs (300 miles per trip) \$150 60	5. 11avei	Trip I ur pose and Description		Q11,111	Q11,112	Q11,115	Q11,114	111	112	115		Cost
Interview of the first of the firs		Director- statewide trips to LEAs (300 miles per trip)	\$150	60	60	60	60	\$ 9,000	\$ 9,000	\$ 9,000	\$ 9,000	\$ 36,000
Access introductor-statewide trips to LEAs (300 miles per trip) Solution		Director- sational trips	\$2,000	2	2	2	2	\$ 4,000	\$ 4,000	\$ 4,000	\$ 4,000	\$ 16,000
4. Equipment List Coto List Coto List Coto List Coto List Coto Sol Got Got Got Got Sol Sol Sol Sol Sol Got Got Got Sol Sol <ths< td=""><td></td><td>Assistant Director- statewide trips to LEAs (300 miles</td><td>\$2,000</td><td>2</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>φ 4,000</td><td>φ 4,000</td><td>φ 4,000</td><td>\$ 4,000</td><td>φ 10,000</td></ths<>		Assistant Director- statewide trips to LEAs (300 miles	\$2,000	2				φ 4,000	φ 4,000	φ 4,000	\$ 4,000	φ 10,000
Image: state birector- national trip \$2,000 1 <th1< th=""> 1 1 1</th1<>		per trip)	\$150	60	60	60	60	\$ 9.000	\$ 9.000	\$ 9.000	\$ 9.000	\$ 36.000
Lequipment Consultants (13) - statewide trips to LEAs (100 miles per trip) S50 780 780 780 780 780 8 39,000 \$ 30,000 \$ 1,500 \$ 1,500 \$ <td></td> <td>Assistant Director- national trip</td> <td>\$2,000</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>\$ 2.000</td> <td>\$ 2.000</td> <td>\$ 2.000</td> <td>\$ 2.000</td> <td>\$ 8,000</td>		Assistant Director- national trip	\$2,000	1	1	1	1	\$ 2.000	\$ 2.000	\$ 2.000	\$ 2.000	\$ 8,000
A Equipment Unit Cost QTY, PY1 QTY, PY2 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY4 Total Costs Total Costs Total Costs PY Total Project 4. Equipment Unit Cost QTY, PY1 QTY, PY2 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY4 PY1 PY2 PY3 4 Cost Laptop computers \$1,500		Consultants (13)- statewide trips to LEAs (100 miles	+_,		-				-,	-,	-,	,
Item Description Unit Cost QTY, PY1 QTY, PY2 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY4 Total Costs Total Costs Total Costs PY Total Costs PY Total Project 4. Equipment Item Description Unit Cost QTY, PY1 QTY, PY2 QTY, PY4 PY1 PY2 PY3 4 Cost Laptop computers \$1,000 \$1,000 4 \$2,000 \$-5 \$-5 \$-5 \$-5 \$22,000 Desktip computers \$2,500 \$3 \$-5 \$-5 \$-5 \$-5 \$-5 \$24,000 \$-5		per trip)	\$50	780	780	780	780	\$ 39,000	\$ 39,000	\$ 39,000	\$ 39,000	\$ 156,000
Item bescription Unit Cost QTY, PY1 QTY, PY2 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY4 Total Costs Total Costs Total Costs Total Costs PY Total Project 4. Equipment Unit Cost QTY, PY1 QTY, PY2 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY4 PY1 PY2 PY3 4 Cost Laptop computers \$1,500 \$1,500 16 \$24,000 \$5 - \$5 - \$24,000 \$5 - \$5 - \$24,000 \$5 - \$5 - \$24,000 \$5 - \$5 \$5		Program Assistants (2)- statewide trips (300 miles per										
Total Travel Costs Total Costs S 64,500 \$ <td></td> <td>trip)</td> <td>\$150</td> <td>10</td> <td>10</td> <td>10</td> <td>10</td> <td>\$ 1,500</td> <td>\$ 1.500</td> <td>\$ 1.500</td> <td>\$ 1.500</td> <td>\$ 6,000</td>		trip)	\$150	10	10	10	10	\$ 1,500	\$ 1.500	\$ 1.500	\$ 1.500	\$ 6,000
Item Description Unit Cost QTY, PY1 QTY, PY2 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY3 Total Costs Total Costs Total Costs PY 2 PY 3 4 Cost Laptop computers \$1.500 16 \$24,000 \$<-\$\$<-\$\$<-\$\$<-\$\$<5<-\$\$24,000		Total Travel Costs		-				\$ 64,500	\$ 64,500	\$ 64,500	\$ 64,500	\$ 258,000
Item Description Unit Cost QTY, PY1 QTY, PY2 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY3 Total Costs PY 1 PY 2 PY 3 A Cost Laptop computers \$1,500 16 \$\$												
Item Description Unit Cost QTY, PY1 QTY, PY2 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY4 PY1 PY2 PY3 4 Cost Laptop computers \$1,500 16 \$\$24,000 \$\$-\$\$\$-\$\$\$<-\$\$\$<-\$\$\$24,000								Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
Laptop computers \$ 1,500 16 \$ 24,000 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 24,000 Laser Printers \$1,000 4 \$ \$ 4,000 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 24,000 Desktop computers \$1,000 4 \$ \$ 4,000 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ 4,000 Desktop computers \$2,500 3 \$ \$ 7,500 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ \$ - \$ \$ \$ - \$ \$ \$ \$ - \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ - \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ - \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	4. Equipment	Item Description	Unit Cost	OTY, PY1	OTY, PY2	OTY, PY3	OTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
Laser Printers \$1,000 4 \$\$4,000 \$\$- \$\$- \$\$- \$\$- \$\$4,000 Desktop computers \$2,500 3 \$\$7,500 \$\$- \$\$- \$\$- \$\$- \$\$- \$\$4,000 Desktop computers \$2,500 3 \$\$7,500 \$\$- \$\$- \$\$- \$\$- \$\$- \$\$7,500 ICD projectors \$750 4 \$\$ \$\$30,000 \$\$- \$\$- \$\$- \$\$- \$\$7,500 Total Equipment Costs \$\$750 4 \$\$ \$\$38,500 \$\$0 \$\$0 \$\$38,500 Total Costs \$\$0 \$\$0 \$\$0 \$\$38,500 Total Costs Total Costs Total Costs Total Costs \$\$0 \$\$38,500 Total Costs Total Costs Total Costs Total Costs \$\$0 \$\$38,500 Instructional materials \$\$0 \$\$0 \$\$0 \$\$000 \$\$ \$\$0,000 \$\$ \$\$0,000 \$\$ \$\$0,000 Office supplies \$\$ \$\$1,2,00 \$\$12,500 \$\$12,500 \$\$12,500 \$\$12,500 \$\$12,500 \$\$12,500 \$\$12,500 \$\$12,500 \$\$0,000	1.1	Laptop computers	\$1.500	16	•		•	\$ 24,000	s -	\$ -	s -	\$24,000
Desktop computers \$2,500 3 \$		Laser Printers	\$1,000	4				\$ 4,000	ş -	\$ -	\$ -	\$4,000
LCD projectors \$750 4 5 3,000 \$ - \$		Deskton computers	\$2,500	3				\$ 7,500	ş -	\$ -	s -	\$7.500
Item description Unit Cost QTY, PY1 QTY, PY2 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY3 Total Costs To		LCD projectors	\$750	4				\$ 3,000	s -	\$ -	s -	\$3,000
Supplies Item description Unit Cost QTY, PY1 QTY, PY2 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY4 Total Costs Total		Total Equipment Costs	,		1	1	1	\$38,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$38,500
5. Supplies Item description Unit Cost QTY, PY1 QTY, PY2 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY3 Total Costs Total								,				· · · ·
Item description Unit Cost QTY, PY1 QTY, PY2 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY4 PY1 PY2 PY3 4 Cost Instructional materials Image: Cost of the supplies Image: Cost of the supplies </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Total Costs</td> <td>Total Costs</td> <td>Total Costs</td> <td>Total Costs PY</td> <td>Total Project</td>								Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
Instructional materials S 5,00 S 5,000 S 5,000 S 5,000 S 5,000 S 5,000 S 20,000 Office supplies S 7,500 S 30,000 Total Supply Costs S 12,500 S 12,500 S 12,500 S 12,500 S 50,000	5. Supplies	Item description	Unit Cost	OTY, PY1	OTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	OTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
Office supplies \$ 7,500	rr	Instructional materials		,	,		,	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 20,000
Total Supply Costs \$ 12,500 \$ 12,500 \$ 12,500 \$ 12,500 \$ 50,000		Office supplies			1			\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500	\$ 30,000
		Total Supply Costs		1	4	1	1	\$ 12,500	\$ 12,500	\$ 12,500	\$ 12,500	\$ 50,000

							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
6. Contractual	Item Description & Purpose or Relation to the Proj	ect					PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
	Series of videos on RtI developed by the WWWWDPI and t	he Educational Com	munications Boa	rd (5) 20 minute vie	deos. \$1,000 per 1	ninute for					
	production and editing of video over 4 years						\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 100,000
	Web site and internet support, \$6,750 per FTE over 4 years						\$ 27,000	\$ 27,000	\$ 27,000	\$ 27,000	\$ 108,000
	Editor for publications: 500 hours of editing @ \$50 per hour	over 4 years					\$ 6,250	\$ 6,250	\$ 6,250	\$ 6,250	\$ 25,000
	Writers for publications (\$30 per hour for 8 hours for 5 days	for 50 people) over	4 years				\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 60,000
	Contract to host the state Race to the Top Summit; \$10,000	per year per Summit					\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 40,000
	Total Contractual Expenses						\$ 83,250	\$ 83,250	\$ 83,250	\$ 83,250	\$ 333,000
							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
7. Training Stipends	Description and Purpose	Unit Cost	OTY, PY1	OTY, PY2	OTY, PY3	OTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			Q ,	X ,	X ,	x ,	\$ -	s -	\$ -	s -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	s -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Training						\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Training						Ψ	Ψ	Ψ	Ψ	Ψ
		1	1		1	1	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs DV	Total Project
8 Other	Tune on Cotogony & Dunnoso	Unit Cost	OTV DV1	OTV DV2	OTV DV2	OTV DV4	DV 1	DV 2	DV 2		Cost
a. Ouler	Printing 5 publications	Unit Cost	Q11,111	Q11,F12	Q11,115	Q11,114	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 120,000
	Printing 5 publications						\$ 50,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 120,000
	Postage Total Other Expenses			-		_	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 10,000
	Total Other Expenses						\$ 32,500	\$ 32,300	\$ 32,300	\$ 32,300	\$ 130,000
		T	1			1	m () a (T () G (
		Dete					Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
10. Indirect Costs	Organization	Kate				-	PYI	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
Note: No indirect charged	WI Department of Public Instruction	6%) 				\$ 111,031	\$ 108,721	\$ 108,721	\$ 108,721	\$ 437,194
for contractual costs							\$	5 -	\$ 100.731	\$ 100 701	\$ 127.104
	Total Indirect Costs						\$ 111,031	\$ 108,721	\$ 108,721	\$ 108,721	\$ 437,194
		1	1	- I	- I	1		T		r	
11. Funding for Involved							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
LEAs	Activity Description & Purpose	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Other Expenses						\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
12. Supplemental											
Funding for Participating							Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
LEAs	Item	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	PY 1	PY 2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Subgrant						\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$-	\$-

1 10 Jeee 13. White Wisconsin miniariye for reighbor hour behous that Work for Children (Project 15: WINS	(Wisconsin Initiative for Nei	ghborhood Schools that Work for Children)
---	------------------	-------------------------------	---

WINS (Wiscon	Budg nsin I (Ev	get Part II: Pro nitiative for Neig Associated v idence for selec	ojec ghbo vith tion	t-Level Budget orhood Schools th Criteria: (E)(2) criterion (A)(2)	t Ta nat V (i)(d	ble Vork for Children	<u>.)</u>		
Budget Categories	(Project Year 1 (a)		Project Year 2 (b)	(-)(Project Year 3 (c)		Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -
3. Travel	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -
4. Equipment	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$	2,500,000	\$	2,500,000	\$	2,500,000	\$	2,500,000	\$ 10,000,000
7. Training Stipends	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -
8. Other	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$	2,500,000	\$	2,500,000	\$	2,500,000	\$	2,500,000	\$ 10,000,000
10. Indirect Costs*	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -
11.Funding for Involved LEAs	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$	2,500,000	\$	2,500,000	\$	2,500,000	\$	2,500,000	\$ 10,000,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15. Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category. Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

Budget Part II: Detailed Level Project Budget Table – WINS

Establishing the WINS for Children is one of the center pieces of our plans to address the achievement gap within Milwaukee Public Schools. The central aspects of our plans in this area are covered in significant detail in section E2 of the application.

Wisconsin have reviewed detailed cost, budget and results projections on the WINS for Children project provided by the Zilber Foundation and believe them to be accurate. Wisconsin have also compared these costs to our understanding and research of the cost structures and budgets of Harlem Children zone, on which WINS for Children is modeled, and believe that the proposed funding levels are realistic to begin to achieve the significant results we believe are possible from this initiative.

While much of operational details of the WINS project still need to be fleshed out, we believe that these costs are realistic and offer a significant 'return on investment' in terms of the complimentary effects it will have on our focused efforts to reduce the achievement gap in Milwaukee.

Therefore, we believe that providing \$10 million in funding (approximately 60 - 75% of the initial projected project cost over the four year period) would be a good use of Race to the Top funds and that there will be more than sufficient measurement and shared governance structures to ensure this.

Furthermore, while Race to the Top funds would contribute significantly to the initial design and administration of WINS for Children project, we believe that the strong plans to garner additional public and private funds funded by ongoing philanthropy and local and national business support will make this initiative sustainable long after the grant period. Therefore, we would like to be at the forefront of implementing this initiative in Milwaukee as soon as Race to the top funds become available.

All costs within this budget are contractual. Administration of this investment is covered within the existing cost structure of the WDPI, OEII and the Governor's office.

For further information, please also reference Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table on the following two pages.

		n a i					Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
1. Personnel	Title and Position Description	Base Salary	% FTE PY 1	% FTE PY 2	% FTE PY 3	% FTE PY 4	1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	<u>\$</u> -	\$ -	<u>\$</u> -
							s -	5 - ¢	\$ -	\$ -	3 -
							s -	5 - ¢	¢ -	s -	\$ -
							9 - 6	ۍ - د	- с		ց - «
	Total Personnel						s -	s - \$ -	s - \$ -	s - \$ -	s - \$ -
							φ -	Ψ -	Ψ -	Ψ -	Ψ -
			1			1	Total Costs DV	Total Casta DV	Total Costa	Total Costs DV	Total Dusient
2 Fringe Benefits	Position Title	Fringe Rate					1 otar Costs F 1		PV 3		Total Project
2. Fringe Denema		Tringe Rute					\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$	\$ -
							\$	\$	\$	\$ _	÷ - 2
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
			1				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Fringe Benefits	I		1			\$ -	\$-	\$ -	\$ -	\$-
	0										
			1				Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
3. Travel	Trip Purpose and Description	Cost Per Trip	OTY, PY1	OTY, PY2	OTY, PY3	OTY, PY4	1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
		F	Q ,	x ,	x ,	x ,	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Travel Costs		•		•	•	\$-	\$ -	\$-	\$-	\$-
							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
4. Equipment	Item Description	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Equipment Costs						\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$ -
							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
5. Supplies	Item description	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Supply Costs						\$ -	\$-	\$-	\$ -	\$-
							m	m . 1 a - '		m	
							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
6. Contractual	Item Description & Purpose or Relation to the Project	:t					1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
	Contract with organizations in Milwaukee to implement the W	isconsin Initiative fo	or Neighborhoods	and Schools that W	Vork for Children (V	WINS for Children)	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 10,000,000
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							s -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ - ^	\$ -
	Total Contractual Functions						\$ 2,500,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,500,000	\$ - \$ 10.000.000
	Total Contractual Expenses						φ 2,500,000	φ 2,500,000	φ 2,500,000	φ 2,500,000	φ 10,000,000
			1	1		1	m () () ()	T . 1.0	T () C (T () C (T)	
7 Tusining Stinand-	Description and Durmass	Unit Cost	OTV DV1	OTV DV2	OTV DV2	OTV DV4	1 otal Costs PY	1 otal Costs PY	1 otal Costs	1 otal Costs PY	Total Project
7. 1 raining Supends	Description and Purpose	Unit Cost	Q11,P11	Q11,P12	Q11,P15	Q11,P14	¢ I	<u>4</u>	rr3	4	COSE
			<u> </u>				မ –	ቃ - ፍ	φ - ¢	ۍ - د	ቃ - ፍ
			<u> </u>	1			э - «	а – С	ф - С	ۍ - د	 с
	Total Training	1	1	1	1	1	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							-	т -	т	т –	т ⁻

							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
8. Other	Type or Category & Purpose	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
Γ							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Other Expenses						\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
Γ							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
10. Indirect Costs	Organization	Rate					1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
j	Total Indirect Costs						\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
-											
11. Funding for Involved							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
LEAs	Activity Description & Purpose	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Γ							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
j	Total Other Expenses						\$ -	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
-											
Г											
12. Supplemental Funding							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
for Participating LEAs	Item	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Γ							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Γ							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
7	Total Subgrant		•	•	•	•	\$ -	\$-	\$-	\$ -	\$-

Project 16: STEM

	Budget Part II: Pr	oject-Level Budget	t Table		/
		<u>STEM</u>			/
	Associated wit	th Criteria: Priority 2	2		
	(Evidence for selec	tion criterion (A)(2)	(i)(d))		
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equipment	\$	\$ -	\$	\$	\$
5. Supplies	\$ 200,000	\$-	\$-	\$	\$ 200,000
6. Contractual	\$ 40,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 400,000
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ 450,000	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 800,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 2,900,000
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 690,000	\$ 1,110,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 700,000	\$ 3,500,000
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 39,000	\$ 63,000	\$ 48,000	\$ 36,000	\$ 186,000
11.Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500,000
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$ 979,000	\$ 1,423,000	\$ 1,048,000	\$ 736,000	\$ 4,186,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category. Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

Budget Part II: STEM

Science, Technology, Engineering and Math are important aspects of our reform plan in Wisconsin, running through the majority of our reform plan initiatives. To support this emphasis, Wisconsin propose to utilize Race to the Top funds to establish STEM academies and further support the development of STEM best practices across the state. These aspects of the Wisconsin are covered in detail in Priority 2 of this application.

Our cost projections are based on both costings and non-binding proposals provided by both national and local organizations and not-forprofits who have proven track records in these activities as well as our existing experience.

All costs within this budget are contractual. Administration of this investment is covered within the existing cost structure of the WDPI.

For further information, please also reference Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table on the following two pages.

1. Personnel	Title and Position Description	Base Salary	% FTE PY 1	% FTE PY 2	% FTE PY 3	% FTE PY 4	Total Costs PY 1	Total Costs PY 2	Total Costs PY 3	Total Costs PY 4	Total Project Cost
	*	, i					\$ -	\$ -	s -	s -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Personnel						\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
2. Fringe Benefits	Position Title	Fringe Rate					Total Costs PY 1	Total Costs PY 2	Total Costs PY 3	Total Costs PY 4	Total Project Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Fringe Benefits						\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
3. Travel	Trip Purpose and Description	Cost Per Trip	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
		-					\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Travel Costs						\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
4. Equipment	Item Description	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	Total Costs PY 1	Total Costs PY 2	Total Costs PY 3	Total Costs PY 4	Total Project Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Equipment Costs						\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$ -
5. Supplies	Item description	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	Total Costs PY 1	Total Costs PY 2	Total Costs PY 3	Total Costs PY 4	Total Project Cost
	STEM Academies:										
	Adaptation of instructional site to offer distance										
	instruction and STEM lab needs	\$ 50,000	4				\$ 200,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 200,000
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Supply Costs						\$ 200,000	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$ 200,000
6. Contractual	Item Description & Purpose or Relation to the Proje	et					Total Costs PY 1	Total Costs PY 2	Total Costs PY 3	Total Costs PY 4	Total Project Cost
	Stem Academies:										
	Development of STEM curriculum models and units of instru-	iction					\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,000
	Summer training institute for teaching staff and statewide col	laborators					\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,000
	Leadership training and networking activities: \$15,000 per si	te in year 2, \$20,000	per site in Year 3,	and \$25,000 per s	ite in Year 4		\$ -	\$ 60,000	\$ 80,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 240,000
	Non-course based STEM experiences: \$30,000 per site						\$ -	\$ -	\$ 120,000	\$ -	\$ 120,000
	Total Contractual Expenses						\$ 40,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 400,000
							Total Costs PY	Total Costs PY	Total Costs	Total Costs PY	Total Project
7. Training Stipends	Description and Purpose	Unit Cost	QTY, PY1	QTY, PY2	QTY, PY3	QTY, PY4	1	2	PY 3	4	Cost
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
							\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total Training						\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

16 STEM

S. Other Type or Category & Purpose Unit Cost QTY, PY1 QTY, PY2 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY4 1 2 PY 3 4 Cost STEM Academies: Image: Cost of the 4 STEM Academists for personel and operating expenses (matched with local funding): \$250,000 in Year 2, \$200,000 in Year 3, and \$150,000 in Year 2, \$200,000 in Year 3, and \$150,000 in Year 4 Image: Cost of the 4 STEM Best Practices: Image: Cost of the 4 STEM Best Practi
STEM Academies: Image: Constraint of the state of
For each of the 4 STEM Academy sites for personnel and operating expenses (matched with local funding): \$250,000 in Year 2, \$200,000 in Year 3, and \$150,000 in Year 4 Image: Constraint of the form
and operating expenses (matched with local funding): \$250,000 in Year 2, \$200,000 in Year 3, and \$150,000 in Year 4 STEM Best Practices: Increase the availability of and enrollment in advanced placement courses by training high school staff; provide online networking and summer institutes for teacher training Target undergraduate science and math majors to enter teacher training
\$250,000 in Year 2, \$200,000 in Year 3, and \$150,000 \$\$<
in Year 4 \$
STEM Best Practices: Image: Constraint of the state of the stat
Increase the availability of and enrollment in advanced placement courses by training high school staff; provide online networking and summer institutes for teacher training Target undergraduate science and math majors to enter to kine nervoid for line to 2 institutions of bicker
placement courses by training high school staff; provide online networking and summer institutes for teacher training Target undergraduate science and math majors to enter the kine are straided for dise to 2 institutions of kinks
provide online networking and summer institutes for teacher training Target undergraduate science and math majors to enter the kine to 2 institutions of kinks and the science and mathematication of kinks and the science an
teacher training \$
Target undergraduate science and math majors to enter
too bing amount do fina ting to 2 institutions of binder
teaching, provide funding to 5 institutions of nigher
education, \$150,000 each \$ 150,000 3 \$ 450,000 \$ - \$ - \$ 450,000
Total Other Expenses \$ 450,000 \$ 1,050,000 \$ 800,000 \$ 2,900,000
Total Costs PY Total Costs
10. Indirect Costs Organization Rate 1 2 PY 3 4 Cost
Note: No indirect charged WI Department of Public Instruction 6% \$ 39,000 \$ 63,000 \$ 48,000 \$ 36,000 \$ 186,000
for contractual costs
Total Indirect Costs \$ 39,000 \$ 63,000 \$ 48,000 \$ 36,000 \$ 186,000
11. Funding for Involved Total Costs PY Total Costs
LEAs Activity Description & Purpose Unit Cost QTY, PY1 QTY, PY2 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY4 1 2 PY3 4 Cost
Total Other Expenses \$ - \$ - \$ -
12. Supplemental Funding Total Costs PY Total Costs
for Participating LEAs Item Unit Cost QTY, PY1 QTY, PY2 QTY, PY3 QTY, PY4 1 2 PY3 4 Cost
STEM Best Practices:
STEM Pilot Project Awards: competitive grant awards
to LEAs, ranging from \$10,000 to \$40,000 \$ 0,000 \$ 20,000
Grants to match local funds to provide start-up costs
for new Project Lead the Way school sites \$ 150,000 \$ 150,000 \$ - \$ - \$ 300,000
Total Subgrant \$ 250,000 \$ 250,000 \$ - \$ 500,000

APPENDICES - TABLE OF CONTENTS

Attachment Title		Page(s)	Relevant Section(s)	Page Reference(s)
1	Letter from Governor Jim Doyle and State	340	(A)(1)(ii)(b)	30
	Superintendent Tony Evers; December 15,			
	2009			
2	Participating LEA Memorandum of	344	(A)(1)(ii)(b)	29, 30, 157-161,
	Understanding and Exhibit I; December 15,			186
	2009	254		20
3	Letter from Governor Jim Doyle and State	356	(A)(1)(11)(b)	30
4	Superintendent Tony Evers; January 6, 2010	250	$(\mathbf{A})(1)(\mathbf{i})(\mathbf{h})$	20
4	State Reform Plan and Budget Overview	358	(A)(1)(11)(0)	30
5	Exhibit II: Additional Funds and Strategies	366	(A)(1)(11)(b)	30
	to Close the Achievement Gap, Milwaukee			
6	Specific Exhibit II: Additional Funds and Strategies	372	$(\mathbf{A})(1)(\mathbf{i}\mathbf{i})(\mathbf{b})$	30
0	to Close the Achievement Gan Select	572		50
	Districts			
7	Exhibit II: Wisconsin Achieves Competitive	378	(A)(1)(ii)(b)	30
	Grant Program			
8	NAEP Achievement Data and Goals	383	(A)(1)(iii)(b)	36
9	Every Child A Graduate	386	(A)(1)(iii)	47,90
10	Detailed Table for (A)(1)	387	(A)(1)	55
11	Wisconsin Stakeholder Letters of Support	400	(A)(2)(ii)	73
12	Signed Common Core Standards MOA	456	(B)(1)	93
13	Internationally Benchmarked Common Core	459	(B)(1)	94
	Standards - Public Drafts			
14	Next Generation Assessment Task Force -	533	(B)(2)	99
	Assessments			
15	MOSAIC Consortium MOU and State	545	(B)(2)	100, 131
	Participants			
16	SMARTER Consortium MOU and Participant	550	(B)(2)	100
	Summary			
17	Balanced Assessment Consortium MOU and	554	(B)(2)	100
	Participant Summary			
18	PALS Balanced Assessment list of	562	(B)(2)	100
	participating states			
19	ACHIEVE MOU Common Assessment	563	(B)(2)	100
	Principles			
20	VARC Data Use Agreement	565	(C)(3)(iii)	140
21	WDPI-WDHS Lead Study MOA	570	(C)(3)(iii)	140
22	Wisconsin Alternative Certification Statutory	579	(D)(1)(i)	147
	References			
23	Wisconsin Alternative Route Program	580	(D)(1)(i)	147, 149
	Application Review			

24	List of the alternative certification programs	590	(D)(1)(ii)	148, 186
	operating in the State			
25	Wisconsin Race to the Top Performance	595	(D)(2)(ii)	154, 169
	Measures Survey			
26	Wisconsin Teacher Quality Data 2007-08	597	(D)(3)(i)	182
27	WI SLDS III Project Narrative	598	(D)(4)(i)	197
28	Sanctions for Title I Districts Not Making	628	(E)(1)	212
	АҮР			
29	2009-10 Corrective Action Plan for MPS	632	(E)(2)(ii)	217
30	MPS District School Improvement	649	(E)(2)(ii)	218
	Accountability Model Under NCLB			
31	Turnaround and Transformation Model	650	(E)(3)	220
	Criteria			
32	State Budget Support for Education	662	(F)(1)(i)	237
33	Wisconsin Charter School Map	663	(F)(1)(i)	
34	Wisconsin Charter Schools by Type	664	(F)(2)(i)	



STATE OF WISCONSIN

JIM DOYLE GOVERNOR

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

TONY EVERS STATE SUPERINTENDENT



December 15, 2009

Dear Colleague:

We are excited to invite you to participate in Wisconsin's Race to the Top application to the federal government. Through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, President Obama and Congress provided \$4 billion in competitive grant funding to states that move forward with innovations and reform in education.

Earlier this fall, at our request, the Wisconsin Legislature passed bills to make Wisconsin both eligible and more competitive for the Race to the Top grants. Now our local school district leaders – school board members, superintendents, principals, teachers, and other staff – need to prepare their district for participation in Wisconsin's grant application. Enclosed is the Race to the Top district memorandum of understanding (MOU) that the federal government requires participating districts to sign as part of the state's Race to the Top grant application. The MOU provides a framework of collaboration between districts and the state articulating the specific roles and responsibilities necessary to implement an approved Race to the Top district grant.

The MOU is divided into two parts – Exhibit I and Exhibit II. To receive any Race to the Top funding, a district must agree to the activities in Exhibit I. Districts that agree to Exhibit I are eligible, if they so choose, to participate in Exhibit II. In Exhibit II districts will receive additional funding for participating in the additional activities. Exhibit I is included in this information and Exhibit II will be forthcoming in the very near future.

The MOU provides your district with critical information regarding a district's participation in Race to the Top. The following sections are included:

- Scope of Work,
- Project Administration, (i.e., Participating LEA responsibilities, State Responsibilities, Joint Responsibilities, and State Recourse for Non-Performance),
- Assurances,
- Modifications,
- Duration/Termination, and
- Signatures.

We are working under incredible time constraints to finalize the Wisconsin Race to the Top application and anticipate a draft of the Wisconsin Race to the Top application will be made public on or near December 28, 2009. This draft application will be made public on the Department of Public Instruction's website.

APPENDIX 1 - (A)(1)(ii)(b) Dec 15 Letter

December 15, 2009 Page 2

To demonstrate broad commitment to the MOU, districts should seek to obtain signatures from the LEA superintendent, the president of the local school board, and the local teachers' union leader or their authorized representatives. However, to be considered an eligible participating local education agency (LEA), the MOU must be signed by at least one authorized representative of the school district before submission.

The signed MOU must be returned to the Department of Public Instruction by 4:00 p.m. on Wednesday, January 13, 2010.

Please note that under the federal guidelines, a district that does not sign and submit the MOU by the deadline <u>cannot</u> be included as a participating LEA in Wisconsin's Race to the Top application and <u>cannot</u> be given an opportunity to participate once the award is received.

If Wisconsin is awarded Race to the Top grant funds, a participating LEA will have 90 days to finalize their work plan for their Race to the Top funds and submit that to the state. During this 90-day period, districts will have the right to review and reassess their scope of work in light of their Race to the Top local award. At this time, districts may also withdraw from the MOU and forgo their local award and participation in the Race to the Top program without penalty.

Currently, Wisconsin does not know exactly the level of funding that would be provided to the state through Race to the Top. However, federal guidelines require that at least 50 percent of the state's total award be distributed to participating LEAs through the Title I formula. To ensure districts have sufficient support to participate in the program, the state has decided that each LEA participating in Exhibit I will receive at least \$60,000. This adjustment will be made using the funds that may be distributed by the state through other means.

For your information, attached to this letter is a projected level of funding based on the Title I formula with adjustments made for the base level of funding of \$60,000. These estimates assume the state receives \$250 million in Race to the Top funding.

We hope all of you will complete the MOU and consider being a part of this important initiative. Please contact Dr. Scott Jones, Special Assistant to the State Superintendent, by email <u>scott.jones@dpi.wi.gov</u> or by phone 608/267-9269 if you have any questions or concerns regarding this letter.

Sincerely,

Jon Dah

Jim Doyle Governor

Enclosure

Tony Gr

Tony Evers, PhD State Superintendent

Participating LEA Memorandum of Understanding

This Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") is entered into by and between the State of Wisconsin ("State") and _________ ("Participating LEA"). The purpose of this agreement is to establish a framework of collaboration, as well as articulate specific roles and responsibilities in support of the State in its implementation of an approved Race to the Top grant project.

I. SCOPE OF WORK

Exhibit I outlines the State's proposed reform plans ("State Plan") that the Participating LEA is agreeing to implement.

Participating LEAs are authorized and encouraged to work collaboratively in consortia or with Cooperative Educational Service Agencies (CESAs) to develop and/or implement any or all requirements under Exhibit I.

If the State is awarded a Race to the Top grant in the first round, participating LEAs will be informed of their local award and asked to complete the final work plan required by the U.S. Department of Education within 90 days. The final work plan must be approved by an authorized LEA representative and the State Superintendent. Acceptance of a local award binds the LEA to the conditions agreed to in the MOU and the final work plan.

Nothing in this Memorandum of Understanding shall be construed to alter or otherwise affect the rights, remedies, and procedures afforded school districts and school district employees under federal, state, or local laws (including applicable regulations or court orders) or under the terms of collective bargaining agreements, memoranda of understanding, or other agreements between such employees and their employees.

Exhibit II, proposed Expanded Scope of Work, describes the additional requirements that all LEAs that agree to participate in Exhibit I may agree to in exchange for additional funds. There shall be no penalty for any LEA choosing not to participate in Exhibit II other than ineligibility for additional funds under Race to the Top. Signature pages follow for Exhibits I and II separately; Exhibit I must be signed to be eligible to sign onto Exhibit II but the choice to sign onto Exhibit II in no way impacts an LEAs allocation under Exhibit I.

II. LEA GRANT PERIOD

The project period shall be up to 48 months.

III. PROJECT ADMINISTRATION

A. PARTICIPATING LEA RESPONSIBILITIES

In assisting the State in implementing the tasks and activities described in the State's Race to the Top application, the Participating LEA subgrantee will:

- 1. Implement the LEA plan as identified in Exhibit I, and II (if applicable), of this agreement;
- 2. Actively participate in all relevant convenings, communities of practice, or other practice-sharing events that are organized or sponsored by the State or by the U.S. Department of Education ("ED");
- 3. Post to any website specified by the State or ED, in a timely manner, all non-proprietary products and lessons learned developed using funds associated with the Race to the Top grant;
- 4. Participate, as requested, in any evaluations of this grant conducted by the State or ED;
- 5. Be responsive to State or ED requests for information including the status of the project, project implementation, outcomes, and any problems anticipated or encountered;
- 6. Participate in meetings and telephone conferences with the State to discuss (a) progress of the project, (b) potential dissemination of resulting nonproprietary products and lessons learned, (c) plans for subsequent years of the Race to the Top grant period, and (d) other matters related to the Race to the Top grant and associated plans.
- 7. In addition to the funds to which Participating LEAs signing on to Exhibit I are entitled, all Participating LEAs that agree to the terms of Exhibit II will be eligible to receive additional Race to the Top funds awarded to the State for disbursement as outlined in the State's Race to the Top application. To receive those funds Participating LEAs will be required to develop a work plan in accordance with Exhibit II.

B. STATE RESPONSIBILITIES

In assisting Participating LEAs in implementing their tasks and activities described in the State's Race to the Top application, the State grantee will:

- 1. Work collaboratively with, and support the Participating LEA in carrying out the LEA Plan as identified in Exhibits I and II (if applicable) of this agreement;
- 2. Distribute in a timely fashion the LEA's portion of Race to the Top grant funds during the course of the project period and in accordance with the LEA Plan identified in Attachment A & B (if applicable);
- 3. Provide feedback on the LEA's status updates, annual reports, any interim reports, and project plans and products; and
- 4. Identify sources of technical assistance for the project.

C. JOINT RESPONSIBILITIES

- 1. The State and the Participating LEA will each appoint a key contact person for the Race to the Top grant.
- 2. These key contacts from the State and the Participating LEA will maintain frequent communication to facilitate cooperation under this MOU.
- 3. State and Participating LEA grant personnel will work together to determine appropriate timelines for project updates and status reports throughout the whole grant period.
- 4. State and Participating LEA grant personnel will negotiate in good faith to continue to achieve the overall goals of the State's Race to the Top grant, even when the State Plan requires modifications that affect the Participating LEA, or when the LEA Plan requires modifications.

D. STATE RECOURSE FOR LEA NON-PERFORMANCE

If the State determines the LEA is not meeting its goals, timelines, budget, or annual targets or is not fulfilling other applicable requirements, the State grantee will take appropriate enforcement action, which could include a collaborative process between the State and the LEA, or any of the enforcement measures that are detailed in 34 CFR section 80.43 including putting the LEA on reimbursement payment status, temporarily withholding funds, or disallowing costs.

IV. ASSURANCES

The Participating LEA hereby certifies and represents that it:

- 1. Has all requisite power and authority to execute this MOU;
- 2. Is familiar with the State's Race to the Top grant application and is supportive of and committed to working on all or significant portions of the State Plan;
- 3. Agrees to be a Participating LEA and will implement those portions of the State Plan indicated in Exhibit I and II (if applicable), if the State application is funded;
- 4. Will provide a Final Work Plan to be attached to this MOU as Exhibit III only if the State's application is funded; will do so in a timely fashion but no later than 90 days after a grant is awarded; and will describe in Exhibit III the LEA's specific goals, activities, timelines, budgets, key personnel, and annual targets for key performance measures ("LEA Plan") in a manner that is consistent with the Preliminary Scope of Work (Exhibits I and II (if applicable)) and with the State Plan; and
- 5. Will comply with all of the terms of the Grant, the State's subgrant, and all applicable federal and state laws and regulations, including laws and regulations applicable to the Program, and the applicable provisions of EDGAR (34 CFR Parts 75, 77, 79, 80, 82, 84, 85, 86, 97, 98, and 99).

V. MODIFICATIONS

This Memorandum of Understanding may be amended only by written agreement signed by each of the parties involved and in consultation with ED.

VI. DURATION/TERMINATION

This Memorandum of Understanding shall be effective, beginning with the date of the last signature hereon and, if a grant is received, ending upon the expiration of the grant project period, or upon mutual agreement of the parties, whichever occurs first.

VII. SIGNATURES

LEA Superintendent (or equivalent authorized signatory):

Signature/Date

Print Name/Title

President of Local School Board:

Signature/Date

Print Name/Title

Local Teachers' Union Leader:

Signature/Date

Print Name/Title

Authorized State Official - required:

By its signature below, the State hereby accepts the LEA as a Participating LEA.

Signature/Date

Print Name/Title

Participating LEA Memorandum of Understanding

This Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") is entered into by and between the State of Wisconsin ("State") and _________ ("Participating LEA"). The purpose of this agreement is to establish a framework of collaboration, as well as articulate specific roles and responsibilities in support of the State in its implementation of an approved Race to the Top grant project.

I. SCOPE OF WORK

Exhibit I outlines the State's proposed reform plans ("State Plan") that the Participating LEA is agreeing to implement.

Participating LEAs are authorized and encouraged to work collaboratively in consortia or with Cooperative Educational Service Agencies (CESAs) to develop and/or implement any or all requirements under Exhibit I.

If the State is awarded a Race to the Top grant in the first round, participating LEAs will be informed of their local award and asked to complete the final work plan required by the U.S. Department of Education within 90 days. The final work plan must be approved by an authorized LEA representative and the State Superintendent. Acceptance of a local award binds the LEA to the conditions agreed to in the MOU and the final work plan.

Nothing in this Memorandum of Understanding shall be construed to alter or otherwise affect the rights, remedies, and procedures afforded school districts and school district employees under federal, state, or local laws (including applicable regulations or court orders) or under the terms of collective bargaining agreements, memoranda of understanding, or other agreements between such employees and their employees.

Exhibit II, proposed Expanded Scope of Work, describes the additional requirements that all LEAs that agree to participate in Exhibit I may agree to in exchange for additional funds. There shall be no penalty for any LEA choosing not to participate in Exhibit II other than ineligibility for additional funds under Race to the Top. Signature pages follow for Exhibits I and II separately; Exhibit I must be signed to be eligible to sign onto Exhibit II but the choice to sign onto Exhibit II in no way impacts an LEAs allocation under Exhibit I.

II. LEA GRANT PERIOD

The project period shall be up to 48 months.

III. PROJECT ADMINISTRATION

A. PARTICIPATING LEA RESPONSIBILITIES

In assisting the State in implementing the tasks and activities described in the State's Race to the Top application, the Participating LEA subgrantee will:

- 1. Implement the LEA plan as identified in Exhibit I, and II (if applicable), of this agreement;
- 2. Actively participate in all relevant convenings, communities of practice, or other practice-sharing events that are organized or sponsored by the State or by the U.S. Department of Education ("ED");
- 3. Post to any website specified by the State or ED, in a timely manner, all non-proprietary products and lessons learned developed using funds associated with the Race to the Top grant;
- 4. Participate, as requested, in any evaluations of this grant conducted by the State or ED;
- 5. Be responsive to State or ED requests for information including the status of the project, project implementation, outcomes, and any problems anticipated or encountered;
- 6. Participate in meetings and telephone conferences with the State to discuss (a) progress of the project, (b) potential dissemination of resulting nonproprietary products and lessons learned, (c) plans for subsequent years of the Race to the Top grant period, and (d) other matters related to the Race to the Top grant and associated plans.
- 7. In addition to the funds to which Participating LEAs signing on to Exhibit I are entitled, all Participating LEAs that agree to the terms of Exhibit II will be eligible to receive additional Race to the Top funds awarded to the State for disbursement as outlined in the State's Race to the Top application. To receive those funds Participating LEAs will be required to develop a work plan in accordance with Exhibit II.

B. STATE RESPONSIBILITIES

In assisting Participating LEAs in implementing their tasks and activities described in the State's Race to the Top application, the State grantee will:

- 1. Work collaboratively with, and support the Participating LEA in carrying out the LEA Plan as identified in Exhibits I and II (if applicable) of this agreement;
- 2. Distribute in a timely fashion the LEA's portion of Race to the Top grant funds during the course of the project period and in accordance with the LEA Plan identified in Attachment A & B (if applicable);
- 3. Provide feedback on the LEA's status updates, annual reports, any interim reports, and project plans and products; and
- 4. Identify sources of technical assistance for the project.

C. JOINT RESPONSIBILITIES

- 1. The State and the Participating LEA will each appoint a key contact person for the Race to the Top grant.
- 2. These key contacts from the State and the Participating LEA will maintain frequent communication to facilitate cooperation under this MOU.
- 3. State and Participating LEA grant personnel will work together to determine appropriate timelines for project updates and status reports throughout the whole grant period.
- 4. State and Participating LEA grant personnel will negotiate in good faith to continue to achieve the overall goals of the State's Race to the Top grant, even when the State Plan requires modifications that affect the Participating LEA, or when the LEA Plan requires modifications.

D. STATE RECOURSE FOR LEA NON-PERFORMANCE

If the State determines the LEA is not meeting its goals, timelines, budget, or annual targets or is not fulfilling other applicable requirements, the State grantee will take appropriate enforcement action, which could include a collaborative process between the State and the LEA, or any of the enforcement measures that are detailed in 34 CFR section 80.43 including putting the LEA on reimbursement payment status, temporarily withholding funds, or disallowing costs.

IV. ASSURANCES

The Participating LEA hereby certifies and represents that it:

- 1. Has all requisite power and authority to execute this MOU;
- 2. Is familiar with the State's Race to the Top grant application and is supportive of and committed to working on all or significant portions of the State Plan;
- 3. Agrees to be a Participating LEA and will implement those portions of the State Plan indicated in Exhibit I and II (if applicable), if the State application is funded;
- 4. Will provide a Final Work Plan to be attached to this MOU as Exhibit III only if the State's application is funded; will do so in a timely fashion but no later than 90 days after a grant is awarded; and will describe in Exhibit III the LEA's specific goals, activities, timelines, budgets, key personnel, and annual targets for key performance measures ("LEA Plan") in a manner that is consistent with the Preliminary Scope of Work (Exhibits I and II (if applicable)) and with the State Plan; and
- 5. Will comply with all of the terms of the Grant, the State's subgrant, and all applicable federal and state laws and regulations, including laws and regulations applicable to the Program, and the applicable provisions of EDGAR (34 CFR Parts 75, 77, 79, 80, 82, 84, 85, 86, 97, 98, and 99).

V. MODIFICATIONS

This Memorandum of Understanding may be amended only by written agreement signed by each of the parties involved and in consultation with ED.

VI. DURATION/TERMINATION

This Memorandum of Understanding shall be effective, beginning with the date of the last signature hereon and, if a grant is received, ending upon the expiration of the grant project period, or upon mutual agreement of the parties, whichever occurs first.

VII. SIGNATURES

LEA Superintendent (or equivalent authorized signatory):

Signature/Date

Print Name/Title

President of Local School Board:

Signature/Date

Print Name/Title

Local Teachers' Union Leader:

Signature/Date

Print Name/Title

Authorized State Official - required:

By its signature below, the State hereby accepts the LEA as a Participating LEA.

Signature/Date

Print Name/Title

EXHIBIT I – PRELIMINARY SCOPE OF WORK

LEA hereby agrees to participate in implementing the State Plan in each and all of the areas identified below.

I. Standards & Assessments

- 1. Implement a curriculum aligned to the Common Core Standards in reading, English language arts, and mathematics.
- 2. Implement a statewide benchmark assessment system in reading and mathematics that allows measurement of growth throughout the school year.
 - As the State transitions to the next generation assessment system, districts may continue to use existing benchmark assessments or adopt a suitable interim system, which may be provided by the State.
 - Districts must make commitment to use growth and/or value-added data analysis tools as one component of measuring school success.

II. Data Systems

- 1. Develop or enhance local data systems or tools that track student growth and link students, their course records, and their test scores to teachers to enhance instructional improvement efforts.
- 2. Support education research efforts by continuing to provide data currently required by state and federal law and new data required for Race to the Top.

III. Effective Teachers and Principals

- 1. Provide school-based coaches for reading and mathematics at a level sufficient to having coaches in each school in the district at least the equivalent of one full day each week. These coaches must be highly trained and work with teachers in classrooms to implement new curriculum and/or instructional strategies as well as assist teachers in using data effectively to improve instruction.
- 2. Implement a teacher mentoring program that utilizes an ongoing feedback process that supports teacher growth and development.
 - Teacher mentors must be highly trained, at least partially released from classroom responsibility (or compensated for additional hours of service if specified in the Final Work Plan), and must work with new teachers for at least two years.
 - Districts may develop their own teacher mentoring program or contract with training organizations such as CESAs, The New Teacher Center, or institutions of higher education to implement this reform.

- 3. Implement a principal mentoring program that includes ongoing feedback and supports principal development.
 - Principal mentors must be highly trained and principal leadership programs must be high quality. Mentoring programs should address effective use of data and teacher evaluations to inform instructional improvement and staff professional development.
 - Districts may develop their own principal mentoring program or contract with training organizations such as New Leaders for New Schools to implement this reform.
- 4. Provide professional development and support to staff to implement new curriculum and/or instructional strategies as well as to use data effectively to improve instruction.
 - Districts must use student achievement data, as well as teacher and principal evaluations, to inform professional development.
 - Districts must participate in evaluations or conduct their own evaluations of the effectiveness of the professional development offered by the district.
- 5. Develop or implement a rigorous, transparent, and fair annual evaluation system for teachers and principals that differentiates effectiveness using multiple rating categories, takes into account data on student growth as a significant factor, and includes multiple observations or examples of actual classroom instruction.
 - *Teacher Evaluations*: Districts may adopt an established national model, which may include, but not be limited to, piloting the Gates tools for teacher evaluations, contracting with the New Teacher Center formative assessment system, or adopting the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) model, or districts may design a comparably rigorous, locally developed evaluation system.
 - Principal Evaluations: Districts may use or adopt an established national model, which may include, but not be limited to, using the evaluation protocol developed by New Leaders for New Schools or using the principal score card developed in the Milwaukee Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) project, or districts may co-design a comparably rigorous, locally developed evaluation system.
- 6. Develop a plan to ensure the equitable distribution of effective teachers in high-poverty and high-minority schools.
- 7. Adopt criteria for principal placement that includes prior evaluations and student achievement indicators, if principals have prior experience.

IV. Turning Around Struggling Schools

1. Implement a response to intervention model that provides diagnostic assessments, core instruction to all students, differentiation strategies, and interventions in reading and mathematics.

- 2. Where applicable, in the five lowest-achieving schools identified for improvement statewide, implement one of the four federally required school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model. Based on federal criteria, currently this only applies to schools in the city of Milwaukee.
- 3. Implement or expand interventions for students who need more academic support and instructional time in at least one of the following areas: extended learning time, enhanced transitions, or intensive interventions.
 - Extended learning time, which may include:
 - a. Additional instructional time in reading, English language arts, or mathematics for struggling students;
 - b. Summer school;
 - c. Saturday school with certified teachers;
 - d. Before- and after-school programs with certified teachers;
 - e. Intercession courses;
 - f. Credit recovery programs;
 - g. Extended school day; or
 - h. Extended school year.
 - Enhanced student transitions, which may include:
 - a. Early college or middle college programs in high school; or
 - b. Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, Youth Options or similar programs.
 - Intensive interventions, which may include:
 - a. One-to-one tutoring, or tutoring in small groups of less than 5, with certified teachers; or
 - b. Wraparound services.

V. Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM)

- 1. Expanded opportunities for courses in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, which may include but is not limited to:
 - a. Implementation or expansion of Project Lead the Way, or
 - b. STEM charter schools.

Agreement to Exhibit I:	
For the Participating LEA	For the State
Authorized LEA Signature/Date	Authorized State Signature/Date
Print Name/Title	Print Name/Title



STATE OF WISCONSIN

JIM DOYLE GOVERNOR

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

TONY EVERS STATE SUPERINTENDENT



January 6, 2010

Dear Colleague:

As a follow-up to the Race to the Top Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) sent to you on December 15, 2009, we are providing you with additional information regarding Wisconsin's Race to the Top application.

The attached information includes

- The revised funding projection available to a Local Education Agency (LEA) by formula,
- Exhibit II, a summary of the Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant program in which a LEA will be eligible to compete for additional money through a separate grant application, and
- A summary of Wisconsin's Race to the Top State Plan.

Please look carefully at the revised funding projection which represents the 50 percent of the state funds that will go out to LEAs through the Title I formula. LEAs choosing to participate in Exhibit I of the Race to the Top grant will be eligible for the following level of funding: at least \$60,000, or \$60 per child, or your allocation under the Title I formula whichever is the greatest amount. The projected amount is the minimum one-time funding that a district can expect if the state receives the requested \$254 million.

LEAs that sign the MOU are eligible for additional funds through Exhibit II, the Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant Program. The Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant Program will provide an additional \$19 million to Wisconsin LEAs if Wisconsin receives the maximum amount that the state is requesting from the United States Department of Education.

To compete for these additional funds, you will have to address some or all of the priorities listed in Exhibit II, propose specific activities that are 'above and beyond' those listed in Exhibit I, or have a strong case for why additional funds are needed to complete the Exhibit I commitments. Specifics on the grant application process and how this will be incorporated into your Final Work Plan will be provided to you if Wisconsin is awarded the Race to the Top state grant.

The summary of Wisconsin's Race to the Top State Plan delineates the state's goals and priority efforts. Our State Plan is based on the four reform areas that LEAs will address in their Final Work Plan and Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) efforts.

To be a participating district in the Race to the Top grant, you must submit the following signed by at least one authorized representative of the LEA: Memorandum of Understanding including the signature blocks on pages 4 and 8.

APPENDIX 3 - (A)(1)(ii)(b) Jan 6th Letter Wisconsin Race to the Top January 6, 2010 Page 2

The state is encouraging signatures from the LEA, school board, and teachers' union; however, only one authorized representative's signature of the LEA is required to make the LEA eligible and able to participate in Wisconsin's Race to the Top grant program.

The Memorandum of Understanding, signed on pages 4 and 8, must be received by the Department of Public Instruction (DPI) no later than 4:00 p.m. on Wednesday, January 13, 2010.

Finally, the signed MOU may be submitted to the DPI in three ways. First, the MOU may be submitted electronically to the department via the following email address: <u>wirttt@dpi.wi.gov</u>. Second, the signed MOU could be sent to the following address:

Dr. Scott Jones Special Assistant to the State Superintendent Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction P.O. Box 7841 Madison, WI 53707-7841

Third, hand-delivered MOUs will be accepted to the stated deadline. Hand-delivered MOUs must be brought to the DPI Reception Desk located in the GEF 3 building at 125 S. Webster Street, Madison, on the 5th Floor. Faxed MOUs will not be accepted.

As a reminder, LEAs intending to participate in Race to the Top must complete the online survey found at <u>http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/MDPTQMF</u> by Friday, January 8, 2010. This survey can be completed by the district administrator in about ten minutes and provides the state with needed information for our state application. Only LEAs that intend to participate in Wisconsin's Race to the Top grant should complete the online survey.

Thank you for your continued interest and support in Wisconsin's Race to the Top grant application. Please contact Dr. Scott Jones, Special Assistant to the State Superintendent, at <u>scott.jones@dpi.wi.gov</u> or 608/267-9269 if you have questions or concerns regarding this letter.

Sincerely,

pm Dafe

Jim Doyle Governor

Enclosures

Tony Sm

Tony Evers, PhD State Superintendent

APPENDIX 4 - (A)(1)(ii)(b) State Reform Plan and Budget Overview

Wisconsin Race to the Top – State Plan Overview

INTRODUCTION

This overview of Wisconsin's Race to the Top State Plan delineates the State's goals and priority efforts.

The Wisconsin State Plan is based on the four reform areas that districts will have to address in their Final Work Plan and Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) efforts.

Wisconsin's focus within our Race to the Top application will be on achieving significant improvement in the following areas:

- student achievement,
- decreasing achievement gaps,
- increasing high school graduation rates, and
- increasing college enrollment rates.

The following overview is a summary of the key priority efforts and projects that the State will manage and implement to support the efforts of all districts as well as drive education reform efforts in Wisconsin.

OVERVIEW

(A) Overall Commitment-State Success Factors

GOAL – To ensure that the State has adequate capacity, resources, and control to effectively manage and implement the RTTT plans (in collaboration with the LEAs) as well as internal and external mechanisms that will drive accountability of successful management and implementation of the RTTT plans by the State and participating LEAs, through regular measurement and reporting of the State's and LEA's progress with and compliance to the conditions and goals outlined in the State's RTTT grant and LEAs Final Work Plans.

i. Create the Office of Education Innovation and Improvement (OEII)

Reporting to the State Superintendent, the <u>Office of Education Innovation and</u> <u>Improvement (OEII)</u> will be responsible for overseeing the execution of Wisconsin's Race to the Top (RTTT) plans, awarding and managing external contracts (as specified throughout the State plan) and ensuring the State's and LEA's compliance with the conditions outlined in the State's RTTT grant and Local Education Agency's (LEA) Final Work Plans.

Additionally, the OEII will be charged with providing statewide expertise and support to LEA's to advance the federal education reform agenda requirements in areas such as:

APPENDIX 4 - (A)(1)(ii)(b) State Reform Plan and Budget Overview

standards and assessments, data system, effective teachers and leaders, and turning around struggling schools.

The office will include project management and administration staff housed in Madison and project consultants working regionally with each Cooperative Educational Service Agency (CESA).

ii. Secure external mechanisms to measure and report on RTTT progress

The Wisconsin Department of Administration (DOA), in consultation with the Wisconsin Office of Recovery Reinvestment (ORR), the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI) and the OEII will contract with an outside accountability/audit/consulting firm or firms to externally measure and report on an annual basis the State's and LEA's progress with and compliance to the conditions and goals outlined in the State's RTTT grant and LEA's Final Work Plans.

Outside entities may also be used in the 90 day period to ensure that the correct resources, capacity, and capabilities are leveraged by the OEII in this critical period in order to guarantee that the Final Work Plans are specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and time bound and in line with the RTTT ethos of ambitious yet achievable plans for implementing coherent, compelling, and comprehensive education reform.

(B) Standards & Assessments

GOAL – Ensure that the State has rigorous, internationally benchmarked standards on which to build a robust system for measuring student growth and LEAs have assessment systems that accurately measure student performance and feed information back to principals, teachers, students, and parents in a timely fashion.

i. Adopt the Common Core Standards and develop related curriculum and units of instruction

The State will adopt the English Language Arts Common Core Standards and the Mathematics Common Core Standards. The State, as a leading member of the Multiple Opportunities for Student Assessment and Instruction Consortium (MOSAIC), will involve Wisconsin educators in developing model curriculum and units of instruction for each grade level, reflecting a learning progression for the Common Core Standards.

ii. Develop and implement a common benchmark assessment

The State, as part of MOSAIC, will develop a common statewide benchmark assessment accessible through a shared computer-based format to gauge student progress on the Common Core Standards throughout the school year.

iii. Provide professional development and online resources

The State, in collaboration with MOSAIC, will develop online resources to include model curriculum, model units of instruction, classroom assessment strategies, and video classroom vignettes. Professional development will occur through a combination of local and regional professional learning communities, summer institutes, and online training modules and networking.

(C) Data

GOAL - Ensure that LEAs know how to use data to meaningfully inform instructional improvement and assist districts in the use of classroom assessment and benchmark assessment data.

i. Provide professional development modules and trainers on data use to improve instruction

The OEII will work in collaboration and / or contract with educational institutions, professional organizations, or non-profit organizations to develop and provide professional development modules, tools, and administrator training in data literacy in order to create and drive regional expertise in data usage as well as promote best practices.

The OEII will work with the CESAs, professional organizations, or non-profit organizations to provide educators the professional development tools and face-to-face training they need to utilize student growth and value-added data reports in the classroom to improve instruction.

ii. Through the state Longitudinal Data System (LDS), expand access to assessment reports that show student/group growth over time, which may include value-added data

The OEII will provide support to the Value-Added Research Center (VARC) at the Wisconsin Center for Education Research (WCER) to expand district participation in growth reporting or value-added analysis around the current summative assessment and/or pilot new benchmark assessment value-added and growth reporting work.

Additionally, VARC will be invited to provide technical advice during the development of the next generation assessment system to increase the precision and accuracy of growth reporting and value-added results.

This support will ensure that Wisconsin has the ability in the future to integrate growth reporting and/or value-added data from the State's summative and benchmark assessments into the statewide LDS as appropriate.
(D) Effective Teachers and Principals

GOAL – To provide structures and resources that will increase teacher and principal effectiveness and encourage high-quality teacher and principal evaluations.

i. Develop mentor and coaching guidelines and best practices to improve effectiveness

The OEII will work in collaboration and / or contract with groups such as educational institutions, CESAs, professional organizations, and / or non-profit organizations to build on existing efforts to develop and provide high quality mentoring and coaching guidelines as well as best practices for teachers and principals. These guidelines and best practices will include: mentoring and coaching strategies, guidelines for length and quality of mentoring and coaching training materials.

ii. Provide high quality coaching and mentoring resources and tools for principal and teacher effectiveness

The OEII will work in collaboration and / or contract with groups such as educational institutions, CESAs, professional organizations, and non-profit organizations to create and provide professional development modules, tools, and training around principal and teacher effectiveness. These tools will be based on the best practices and methods of evaluating and supporting teachers and principals previously identified under (D)i.

iii. Provide mentor academies, training, and support

The OEII will work in collaboration and / or contract with groups such as educational institutions, CESAs, professional organizations, and non-profit organizations to provide mentor academies and training throughout the state, using the guidelines, best practices, resources, and tools (including professional development modules) already developed under (D)i and (D)ii.

iv. Provide coach institutes, training, and support

The OEII will work in collaboration and / or contract with groups such as educational institutions, CESAs, professional organizations, and non-profit organizations to provide coaching institutes and training throughout the state, using the guidelines, best practices, resources and tools (including professional development modules) already developed under (D)i and (D)ii.

v. Develop and pilot a model evaluation system

The OEII will develop and pilot a model evaluation system for teachers and principals based on Wisconsin Educator Standards, aligned with the National Board Certification and the Wisconsin Master Educator Assessment Process, and with student growth as a significant factor.

This model evaluation system may include: growth models, classroom observations, supervisor evaluations, analysis of classroom or school artifacts, portfolios, self-reports of practice, and multiple student achievement measures. This evaluation system will be developed in conjunction with educational institutions, professional organizations, and other related education stakeholders.

vi. Develop a preservice teacher performance assessment tool

The OEII will participate in a national partnership to develop and pilot a teacher performance assessment to be used by educator preparation programs to endorse candidates for state licensure.

Currently, Wisconsin is participating in a ten state partnership created by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) to develop, pilot, and validate a preservice teacher performance assessment (TPA) tool with a rating scale to be used during the student teaching clinical experience. This will require university supervisors and cooperating teachers to be trained so that the tools remain valid and reliable across candidates.

The OEII will provide funding for student teachers from Alverno College, University of Wisconsin-Madison, and University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, which are all current program participants, to field test the tool. Additional educator preparation programs may be added based on available funding.

vii. Expand urban teacher training and recruitment programs

The OEII will provide funding for the University of Wisconsin System's Urban Educator Institute (and / or similar programs) to expand the placement of preservice teachers from across the state in urban centers for their student teaching clinical experience.

Additionally, the OEII will provide funding to support programs that recruit prospective secondary and postsecondary students interested in urban teaching and / or retains those students or current teachers in an urban school setting.

(E) Turning Around Struggling Schools

GOAL - Effectively turnaround AT LEAST the five lowest performing schools in the State of Wisconsin, delivering dramatically improved student achievement in a condensed time frame in these struggling schools.

i. Funding for resources to implement turnaround strategies in struggling schools (currently all located within MPS)

The OEII will provide funding for additional resources (including internal and/or external consultants) to support local administrators in implementing turnaround strategies in struggling schools, initially focused on the five lowest performing schools (currently all located within MPS), with the responsibility of dramatically improving student achievement in a condensed time frame. Resources (including internal and/or external consultants) would be dual-selected/mutually agreed upon by the State and the participating LEA(s).

ii. Expand the statewide RtI Center

The OEII will support local implementation of response to intervention (RtI) district efforts through the expansion of a statewide RtI Center. The RtI Center will provide technical assistance and professional development throughout the state, directly engaging districts and schools around their RtI efforts. The RtI Center also will produce publications and resources, for districts and schools to use as they develop and refine their RtI programs. Finally, the RtI Center will be involved in and support the RtI statewide summit and academies.

iii. Support projects related to K-12 elements of WINS (Milwaukee Children's Zone)

The State will provide funding for the Wisconsin Initiative for Neighborhoods and Schools that Work for Children (WINS), as known as the Milwaukee Children's Zone, initiative that focus on K-12 education and are consistent with and support the broader elements of the Final Work Plan agreed to with MPS in the areas of education reform as pertains to RTTT.

The goal of the State is to provide support for the full scale creation and implementation of the full WINS plan, accelerating and driving urban renewal in Milwaukee that will further maximize and multiply the impact of the RTTT funds leveraged in Milwaukee by MPS.

(F) STEM

GOAL - Build on existing Wisconsin strengths in STEM, strengthen STEM education across Wisconsin, particularly in terms of participation of women and minorities.

i. Coordinate STEM efforts statewide

The OEII will create a working group to coordinate STEM efforts around the state, strengthen ties with regional economic development partners and higher education stakeholders to align STEM efforts around higher education and workforce need as well as to promote best practices within Wisconsin schools.

ii. Establish STEM academies

The OEII will contract with educational institutions, professional organizations and / or non-profit organizations to provide STEM teacher and learning academies on site and via virtual learning opportunities throughout the State.

iii. Support initiatives to drive STEM best practices

The OEII will work with educational institutions, professional organizations and / or nonprofit organizations to develop and provide resources and partnerships that drive STEM best practices through support of pilot projects, teacher development, and STEM instructional materials. These efforts will be coordinated with the STEM academies and ensure the long term sustainability of these enhanced STEM initiatives.

APPENDIX 4 - (A)(1)(ii)(b) State Reform Plan and Budget Overview

<u>Wisconsin Race to the Top – State Plan Budget</u>

BUDGET

(A) Overall Commitment-State Success Factors	\$ (millions
i.	Create the Office of School Improvement (OSI)	5.2
ii.	External mechanisms to measure and report on RTTT progress	4.0
(B) Standards & Assessments	
i.	Adopt the common core standards and develop related	3
	curriculum	
ii.	Develop and implement a common benchmark assessment	12
(C	') Data	
i.	Provide professional development modules and trainers around	3.5
	data use to improve instruction	-
ii.	Expand access to growth assessments, which may include	0.5
	value-added, through the state LDS	
(D) Effective Teachers and Principals	
i.	Develop mentor guidelines and best practices to improve	2.8
	effectiveness	
ii.	Provide high quality mentoring resources and tools for	2
	principal and teacher effectiveness	
iii.	Institute mentor academies	1.65
iv.	Provide coach training	4
v.	Develop and pilot a model evaluation system	3
vi.	Develop a teacher performance assessment	0.2
vii.	Expand UW system urban teacher program (or similar	1.44
	program)	
- Andrew		
(E) Turning Around Struggling Schools	
i.	Funding for resources to implement turnaround strategies in	2.6
	struggling schools (currently all located within MPS)	
ii.	Establish a statewide RtI Center	8
iii.	Support initial demonstration projects related to K-12 elements	10
	of WINS (MKE Children's Zone)	
(F) STEM	
i.	Establish STEM academies	3
ii.	Support for initiatives driving STEM best practices	1
STAT	'E PLAN TOTAL	68



STATE OF WISCONSIN

JIM DOYLE GOVERNOR

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

TONY EVERS STATE SUPERINTENDENT



January 6, 2010

Dear Colleague:

As a follow-up to the Race to the Top Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) sent to you on December 15, 2009, we are providing you with additional information regarding Wisconsin's Race to the Top application.

The attached information includes

- The revised funding projection available to a Local Education Agency (LEA) by formula,
- Exhibit II of the MOU, and
- A summary of Wisconsin's Race to the Top State Plan.

Please look carefully at the revised funding projection which represents the 50 percent of the state funds that will go out to LEAs through the Title I formula. LEAs choosing to participate in Exhibit I of the Race to the Top grant will be eligible for the following level of funding: at least \$60,000, or \$60 per child, or your allocation under the Title I formula whichever is the greatest amount. The projected amount is the minimum one-time funding that a district can expect if the state receives the requested \$254 million.

Exhibit II outlines additional funds available to Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS).

If you also choose to participate in Exhibit II of the MOU and Wisconsin receives the maximum amount that the state is requesting from the United States Department of Education, MPS will be eligible for funding based on a per pupil formula of \$166 per pupil. The district's Final Work Plan will have to address all of the required activities listed in Exhibit II.

The summary of Wisconsin's Race to the Top State Plan delineates the state's goals and priority efforts. Our State Plan is based on the four reform areas that districts will address in their Final Work Plan and Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) efforts.

To be a participating district in the Race to the Top grant, you must ensure the following is signed by at least one authorized representative of the school district:

- Memorandum of Understanding,
- Exhibit I, and
- Exhibit II (if you wish to participate in Exhibit II funding and the required activities listed),

and that all the above are received by the Department of Public Instruction (DPI) no later than 4:00 p.m. on Wednesday, January 13, 2010.

January 6, 2010 Page 2

The state is encouraging signatures from the LEA, school board, and teachers' union; however, only one authorized representative's signature is required to make the LEA eligible and able to participate in Wisconsin's Race to the Top grant program.

Finally, the signed MOU may be submitted to the DPI in three ways. First, the MOU may be submitted electronically to the department via the following email address: <u>wirttt@dpi.wi.gov</u>. Second, the signed MOU could be sent to the following address:

Dr. Scott Jones Special Assistant to the State Superintendent Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction P.O. Box 7841 Madison, WI 53707-7841

Third, hand-delivered MOUs will be accepted to the stated deadline. Hand-delivered MOUs must be brought to the DPI Reception Desk located in the GEF 3 building at 125 S. Webster Street, Madison, on the 5th Floor. Faxed MOUs will not be accepted.

As a reminder, LEAs intending to participate in Race to the Top must complete the online survey found at <u>http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/MDPTQMF</u> by Friday, January 8, 2010. This survey can be completed by the district administrator in about ten minutes and provides the state with needed information for our state application. Only LEAs that intend to participate in Wisconsin's Race to the Top grant should complete the online survey.

Thank you for your continued interest and support in Wisconsin's Race to the Top grant application. Please contact Dr. Scott Jones, Special Assistant to the State Superintendent, at <u>scott.jones@dpi.wi.gov</u> or 608/267-9269 if you have questions or concerns regarding this letter.

Sincerely,

Jon Dah

Jim Doyle Governor

Tony Sm

Tony Evers, PhD State Superintendent

Enclosures

EXHIBIT II: ADDITIONAL FUNDS & STRATEGIES TO CLOSE THE ACHIEVEMENT GAP

Note: Only Milwaukee Public Schools may sign and accept this version of Exhibit II.

Exhibit II will make additional funds available to Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS). These additional funds will demonstrate the district's commitment to increasing their efforts to close the achievement gap and improve student achievement in line with the broader State Plan and goals of increasing student achievement, closing the achievement gap, increasing high school graduation rates¹ and increasing college enrollment rates².

If Wisconsin receives the maximum amount of \$254 million that the State is requesting from the United States Department of Education in its Race to the Top Application, and MPS chooses to participate in Exhibit II, it will receive, at a minimum, <u>an additional \$166 per pupil</u>. These funds are above and beyond the LEA funding for Exhibit I.

Required Goals for Participation

For MPS to accept funds under Exhibit II it will agree to accomplish <u>all of the required high</u> <u>leverage strategies outlined in Exhibit II</u>.

In addition, in order to receive funds under Exhibit II, MPS must identify clear, measurable, data-driven, achievable goals in their Race to the Top Final Work Plan. These goals must be benchmarked for the district and individual school(s), tailored to address specific achievement challenges in the district and may build upon existing LEA goals and strategies. Metrics for evaluating progress must include, but are not limited to, value-added achievement data and measures of student growth, which may be provided through the State Longitudinal Data System.

With any remaining resources, MPS may use funds to complete or expand their Exhibit I scope of work, or to meet or initiate additional innovative, data proven projects 'above and beyond' Exhibits I and II that are focused on increasing student achievement, closing the achievement gap, increasing high school graduation rates and/or increasing college enrollment rates. If proposed by MPS and agreed to by the State, such additional initiatives will be encapsulated in MPS's Final Work Plan in addition to the MPS's existing commitments as outlined in Exhibit I of the MOU.

¹ Federal Race to the Top guidelines defines high school graduation rate at the four-year or extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate. Wisconsin is currently transitioning to this new definition, which will likely be completed by July 2011. For at least three years beginning in 2010-11, the State and LEAs may track graduation rates and set goals using both the existing and revised methods in order to analyze trend data.

 $^{^2}$ Federal Race to the Top guidelines defines college enrollment as students who enroll in an institution of higher education within 16 months of graduation.

MPS's Final Work Plan will identify how the elements and strategies from Exhibit I, Exhibit II and any additional new work (where applicable) will be used to meet these benchmarked goals. Accepting these funds does not alter any of the terms or conditions of the Race to the Top District Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

Specifics on the process for development and approval of the Final Work Plan will be provided to you once Wisconsin has been notified of any award under its Race to the Top application.

Exhibit II B – Required High Leverage Strategies

\$166 per student available to Milwaukee Public Schools.
1. Early Childhood Initiatives
Provide quality learning experiences for four year olds, which must include at least two of the following:
Reduce class size in existing 4K program.
 Implement appropriate early childhood curriculum aligned with Wisconsin Early Learning Standards that includes training on curriculum.
• Implement family literacy programs for families with children from birth to 4 that includes English language and/or native language support, parenting and literacy strategies, and materials for parents.
2. Supporting Successful Transitions Initiatives
Provide academic and social support for struggling students to include at a minimum:
• Academic supports provided by licensed teachers (at least one per every 100 students below proficiency in a state or local assessment) to tutor students either one-on-one or in groups of no more than five.
 Social supports through access either to community or school-based mentoring and/or programs that follow students through middle school and into high school.
Provide additional support to 9th grade students, which must include at least two of the following:
• Create manageable class sizes not greater than 30.
• Create a team of teachers for 9 th grade with at least one hour per week of collaborative time to plan instructional improvements.
• Reduce teacher load for 9th grade team so that these teachers teach fewer students (<100 students).
• Provide summer programs to help students transition from 8th grade to 9th grade.
• Provide annual parent engagement activities to all parents to assist their children in making the transition from 8 th grade to high school.
3. Closing Achievement Gap Initiatives
Provide teachers at least one hour per week for collaborative planning for the purpose of instructional improvement.
Develop and implement a plan to provide coaching to principals in district-identified schools.
Develop and implement a district plan to address the equitable distribution of highly effective teachers.
Develop and implement a plan to provide extended high quality learning time, for district-identified schools with high- need students, which may include year-round school programs or extended days.
Implement and/or expand after school services in reading and mathematics for high-needs students.
Integrate Response to Intervention (RtI) to address individual student academic needs with an intervention and support program to address individual student behavioral needs.
Develop and implement a plan to strengthen human capital by working with organizations such as the UW System Urban Teacher Program, The New Teacher Project, and others.
Participate and collaborate fully in the creation of the Milwaukee Children's Zone (WINS).
Develop a plan providing monetary or non-monetary incentives to attract and retain effective teachers in high need schools.
Develop and implement a plan to expand access to obtain college credit with in high school by increasing the number of Advanced Placement preparatory courses, Advanced Placement courses, and Youth Options.

4. Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM)

Require three years of mathematics and science for high school graduation.

Provide opportunities for teachers to participate in STEM training and incorporate STEM instruction in the classroom.

Agreement to Exhibit II:	
For the Participating LEA	For the State
Authorized LEA Signature/Date	Authorized State Signature/Date
Print Name/Title	Print Name/Title



STATE OF WISCONSIN

JIM DOYLE GOVERNOR

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

TONY EVERS STATE SUPERINTENDENT



January 6, 2010

Dear Colleague:

As a follow-up to the Race to the Top Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) sent to you on December 15, 2009, we are providing you with additional information regarding Wisconsin's Race to the Top application.

The attached information includes

- The revised funding projection available to a Local Education Agency (LEA) by formula,
- Exhibit II of the MOU, and
- A summary of Wisconsin's Race to the Top State Plan.

Please look carefully at the revised funding projection which represents the 50 percent of the state funds that will go out to LEAs through the Title I formula. LEAs choosing to participate in Exhibit I of the Race to the Top grant will be eligible for the following level of funding: at least \$60,000, or \$60 per child, or your allocation under the Title I formula whichever is the greatest amount. The projected amount is the minimum one-time funding that a district can expect if the state receives the requested \$254 million.

Exhibit II outlines additional funds available to the following school districts: Beloit, Green Bay, Kenosha, Madison, and Racine.

If you also choose to participate in Exhibit II of the MOU and Wisconsin receives the maximum amount that the state is requesting from the United States Department of Education, your district will be eligible for funding based on a per pupil formula of \$166 per pupil. The district's Final Work Plan will have to address all of the required activities listed in Exhibit II.

The summary of Wisconsin's Race to the Top State Plan delineates the state's goals and priority efforts. Our State Plan is based on the four reform areas that districts will address in their Final Work Plan and Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) efforts.

To be a participating district in the Race to the Top grant, you must ensure the following is signed by at least one authorized representative of the LEA:

- Memorandum of Understanding,
- Exhibit I, and
- Exhibit II (if you wish to participate in Exhibit II funding and the required activities listed),

and that all the above are received by the Department of Public Instruction (DPI) no later than 4:00 p.m. on Wednesday, January 13, 2010.

January 6, 2010 Page 2

The state is encouraging signatures from the LEA, school board, and teachers' union; however, only one authorized representative's signature of the LEA is required to make the LEA eligible and able to participate in Wisconsin's Race to the Top grant program.

Finally, the signed MOU may be submitted to the DPI in three ways. First, the MOU may be submitted electronically to the department via the following email address: <u>wirttt@dpi.wi.gov</u>. Second, the signed MOU could be sent to the following address:

Dr. Scott Jones Special Assistant to the State Superintendent Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction P.O. Box 7841 Madison, WI 53707-7841

Third, hand-delivered MOUs will be accepted to the stated deadline. Hand-delivered MOUs must be brought to the DPI Reception Desk located in the GEF 3 building at 125 S. Webster Street, Madison, on the 5th Floor. Faxed MOUs will not be accepted.

As a reminder, LEAs intending to participate in Race to the Top must complete the online survey found at <u>http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/MDPTQMF</u> by Friday, January 8, 2010. This survey can be completed by the district administrator in about ten minutes and provides the state with needed information for our state application. Only LEAs that intend to participate in Wisconsin's Race to the Top grant should complete the online survey.

Thank you for your continued interest and support in Wisconsin's Race to the Top grant application. Please contact Dr. Scott Jones, Special Assistant to the State Superintendent, at <u>scott.jones@dpi.wi.gov</u> or 608/267-9269 if you have questions or concerns regarding this letter.

Sincerely,

Jon Dah

Jim Doyle Governor

Tony Sm

Tony Evers, PhD State Superintendent

Enclosures

EXHIBIT II: ADDITIONAL FUNDS & STRATEGIES TO CLOSE THE ACHIEVEMENT GAP

Note: Only the Beloit, Kenosha, Green Bay, Madison and Racine school districts may sign and accept this version of Exhibit II.

Exhibit II will make additional funds available for Beloit, Green Bay, Kenosha, Madison, and Racine school districts. These additional funds will demonstrate that the districts are committed to increasing their efforts to close the achievement gap and improve student achievement in line with the broader State Plan and goals of increasing student achievement, closing the achievement gap, increasing high school graduation rates¹ and increasing college enrollment rates².

If Wisconsin receives the maximum amount of \$254 million that the State is requesting from the United States Department of Education in its Race to the Top Application, LEAs participating in Exhibit II will receive, at a minimum, <u>an additional \$166 per pupil</u>. These funds are above and beyond the LEA funding for Exhibit I.

Required Goals for Participation

All participating LEAs that accept funds under Exhibit II will agree to accomplish <u>all of the</u> required high leverage strategies outlined in Exhibit II.

In addition, all participating LEAs that accept funds under Exhibit II must identify clear, measurable, data-driven, achievable goals in their Race to the Top Final Work Plan. These goals must be benchmarked for the district and individual school(s), tailored to address specific achievement challenges in the district and may build upon existing LEA goals and strategies. Metrics for evaluating progress must include, but are not limited to, value-added achievement data and measures of student growth, which may be provided through the State Longitudinal Data System.

With any remaining resources, districts may use funds to complete or expand their Exhibit I scope of work, or to meet or initiate additional innovative, data proven projects 'above and beyond' Exhibits I and II that are focused on increasing student achievement, closing the achievement gap, increasing high school graduation rates and/or increasing college enrollment rates. If proposed by the LEA and agreed by the State, such additional initiatives will be encapsulated in the LEAs Final Work Plan in addition to the LEAs existing commitments as outlined in Exhibit I of the MOU.

¹ Federal Race to the Top guidelines defines high school graduation rate at the four-year or extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate. Wisconsin is currently transitioning to this new definition, which will likely be completed by July 2011. For at least three years beginning in 2010-11, the State and LEAs may track graduation rates and set goals using both the existing and revised methods in order to analyze trend data.

² Federal Race to the Top guidelines defines college enrollment as students who enroll in an institution of higher education within 16 months of graduation.

The LEA Final Work Plan will identify how the elements and strategies from Exhibit I, Exhibit II and any additional new work (where applicable) will be used to meet these benchmarked goals. Accepting these funds does not alter any of the terms or conditions of the Race to the Top District Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

Specifics on the process for development and approval of the Final Work Plan will be provided to you once Wisconsin has been notified of any award under its Race to the Top application.

•

Exhibit II – Required High Leverage Strategies

\$166 per student available to the School District of Beloit, Green Bay Area Public Schools, Kenosha Unified School District, Madison Metropolitan School District, and Racine Unified School District.

1. Early Childhood Initiatives

Provide quality learning experiences for four year olds, which must include at least two of the following:

- Implement 4K for all eligible children in the district.
- Reduce class size in existing 4K program.
- Implement appropriate early childhood curriculum aligned with Wisconsin Early Learning Standards that includes training on curriculum.
- Implement family literacy programs for families with children from birth to 4 that includes English language and/or native language support, parenting and literacy strategies, and materials for parents.

2. Supporting Successful Transitions Initiatives

Provide academic and social support for struggling students to include at a minimum:

- Academic supports provided by licensed teachers (at least one per every 100 students below proficiency in a state or local assessment) to tutor students either one-on-one or in groups of no more than five.
- Social supports through access to either community or school-based mentoring and/or programs that follow students through middle school and into high school.

Provide additional support to 9th grade students, which must include at least two of the following:

- Create manageable class sizes not greater than 30.
- Create a team of teachers for 9th grade with at least one hour per week of collaborative time to plan instructional improvements.
- Reduce teacher load for 9th grade team so that these teachers teach fewer students (<100 students).
- Provide summer programs to help students transition from 8th grade to 9th grade.
- Provide annual parent engagement activities to all parents to assist their children in making the transition from eighth grade to high school.

3. Closing Achievement Gap Initiatives

Provide teachers at least one hour per week for collaborative planning for the purpose of instructional improvement.

Develop and implement a plan to provide coaching to principals in district-identified schools.

Develop and implement a district plan to address the equitable distribution of highly effective teachers.

Develop and implement a plan to provide extended high quality learning time, for district-identified schools with highneed students, which may include year-round school programs or extended days.

Implement and/or expand after school services in reading and mathematics for high-needs students.

Integrate Response to Intervention (RtI) to address individual student academic needs with an intervention and support program to address individual student behavioral needs.

4. Science Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM)

Require three years of mathematics and science for high school graduation.

Provide opportunities for teachers to participate in STEM training and incorporate STEM instruction in the classroom.

Agreement to Exhibit II:	
For the Participating LEA	For the State
Authorized LEA Signature/Date	Authorized State Signature/Date
Print Name/Title	Print Name/Title

APPENDIX 7 - (A)(1)(ii)(b) General LEA Exhibit II Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant



STATE OF WISCONSIN

JIM DOYLE GOVERNOR

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

TONY EVERS STATE SUPERINTENDENT



January 6, 2010

Dear Colleague:

As a follow-up to the Race to the Top Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) sent to you on December 15, 2009, we are providing you with additional information regarding Wisconsin's Race to the Top application.

The attached information includes

- The revised funding projection available to a Local Education Agency (LEA) by formula,
- Exhibit II, a summary of the Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant program in which a LEA will be eligible to compete for additional money through a separate grant application, and
- A summary of Wisconsin's Race to the Top State Plan.

Please look carefully at the revised funding projection which represents the 50 percent of the state funds that will go out to LEAs through the Title I formula. LEAs choosing to participate in Exhibit I of the Race to the Top grant will be eligible for the following level of funding: at least \$60,000, or \$60 per child, or your allocation under the Title I formula whichever is the greatest amount. The projected amount is the minimum one-time funding that a district can expect if the state receives the requested \$254 million.

LEAs that sign the MOU are eligible for additional funds through Exhibit II, the Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant Program. The Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant Program will provide an additional \$19 million to Wisconsin LEAs if Wisconsin receives the maximum amount that the state is requesting from the United States Department of Education.

To compete for these additional funds, you will have to address some or all of the priorities listed in Exhibit II, propose specific activities that are 'above and beyond' those listed in Exhibit I, or have a strong case for why additional funds are needed to complete the Exhibit I commitments. Specifics on the grant application process and how this will be incorporated into your Final Work Plan will be provided to you if Wisconsin is awarded the Race to the Top state grant.

The summary of Wisconsin's Race to the Top State Plan delineates the state's goals and priority efforts. Our State Plan is based on the four reform areas that LEAs will address in their Final Work Plan and Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) efforts.

To be a participating district in the Race to the Top grant, you must submit the following signed by at least one authorized representative of the LEA: Memorandum of Understanding including the signature blocks on pages 4 and 8.

APPENDIX 7 - (A)(1)(ii)(b) General LEA Exhibit II Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant January 6, 2010 Page 2

The state is encouraging signatures from the LEA, school board, and teachers' union; however, only one authorized representative's signature of the LEA is required to make the LEA eligible and able to participate in Wisconsin's Race to the Top grant program.

The Memorandum of Understanding, signed on pages 4 and 8, must be received by the Department of Public Instruction (DPI) no later than 4:00 p.m. on Wednesday, January 13, 2010.

Finally, the signed MOU may be submitted to the DPI in three ways. First, the MOU may be submitted electronically to the department via the following email address: <u>wirttt@dpi.wi.gov</u>. Second, the signed MOU could be sent to the following address:

Dr. Scott Jones Special Assistant to the State Superintendent Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction P.O. Box 7841 Madison, WI 53707-7841

Third, hand-delivered MOUs will be accepted to the stated deadline. Hand-delivered MOUs must be brought to the DPI Reception Desk located in the GEF 3 building at 125 S. Webster Street, Madison, on the 5th Floor. Faxed MOUs will not be accepted.

As a reminder, LEAs intending to participate in Race to the Top must complete the online survey found at <u>http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/MDPTQMF</u> by Friday, January 8, 2010. This survey can be completed by the district administrator in about ten minutes and provides the state with needed information for our state application. Only LEAs that intend to participate in Wisconsin's Race to the Top grant should complete the online survey.

Thank you for your continued interest and support in Wisconsin's Race to the Top grant application. Please contact Dr. Scott Jones, Special Assistant to the State Superintendent, at <u>scott.jones@dpi.wi.gov</u> or 608/267-9269 if you have questions or concerns regarding this letter.

Sincerely,

pm Dafe

Jim Doyle Governor

Enclosures

Tony Sm

Tony Evers, PhD State Superintendent

EXHIBIT II: WISCONSIN ACHIEVES COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM

If Wisconsin receives the maximum amount of \$254 million that the State is requesting from the United States Department of Education in its Race to the Top Application, \$19 million in State discretionary funding will be used to establish the Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant Program.

Eligibility Criteria

Local Education Agencies (LEAs) (*except Beloit, Green Bay, Kenosha, Madison, Milwaukee and Racine*) choosing to participate in Exhibit II of the MOU will be eligible to apply for additional funds through this competitive grant program that supports the broader State Plan and goals of increasing student achievement, closing the achievement gap, increasing high school graduation rates¹ and increasing college enrollment rates².

LEAs may apply for funds from the Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant Program to:

(1) Participate in Exhibit II Competitive Priorities

Specific proposals for additional funds that will be used to implement additional initiatives from the list of priorities in Exhibit II of the MOU.

The LEA will be free to choose which elements of Exhibit II it wishes to pursue as part of its application for additional funds. All additional proposals, if funded, will be included in the LEAs Final Work Plan.

AND / OR

(2) Supplement Exhibit I

Specific proposals for additional funds that will be used to ensure that the LEAs is able to implement or enhance its commitments as outlined in Exhibit I of the MOU and included in a Final Work Plan.

All participating LEAs that accept funds under Exhibit II and the Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant Program must identify clear, measurable, data-driven, achievable goals in their Race to the Top Final Work Plan. These goals must be benchmarked for the district

¹ Federal Race to the Top guidelines defines high school graduation rate at the four-year or extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate. Wisconsin is currently transitioning to this new definition, which will likely be completed by July 2011. For at least three years beginning in 2010-11, the State and LEAs may track graduation rates and set goals using both the existing and revised methods in order to analyze trend data.

 $^{^2}$ Federal Race to the Top guidelines defines college enrollment as students who enroll in an institution of higher education within 16 months of graduation.

and individual school(s), tailored to address specific achievement challenges in the district and may build upon existing LEA goals and strategies. Metrics for evaluating progress must include, but are not limited to, value-added achievement data and measures of student growth, which may be provided through the State Longitudinal Data System.

The LEA Final Work Plan will identify how the elements and strategies from Exhibit I and Exhibit II (where applicable) will be used to meet these benchmarked goals. Accepting these funds does not alter any of the terms or conditions of the Race to the Top District Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

Specifics on the grant application process, evaluation criteria and how this will be incorporated into your Final Work Plan will be provided to you once Wisconsin has been notified of any award under its Race to the Top application.

Exhibit II – Priorities for the Wisconsin Achieves Competitive Grant Program

\$19	million dollars available on a competitive basis for school districts
1.	Early Childhood Initiatives
	Implement a 4K program for all eligible children in the district <i>or</i> expand current models to community settings with child care or Head Start <i>or</i> reduce class size in existing 4K program.
	Implement appropriate early childhood curriculum aligned with Wisconsin Early Learning Standards that includes training on curriculum.
	Implement family literacy programs for families with children from birth to 4 that includes English language and/or native language support, parenting and literacy strategies, and materials for parents.
2.	Supporting Successful Transitions Initiatives
	Design and deliver academic and/or social support programs for struggling students:
	Academic supports provided by licensed teachers (at least one per every 100 students below proficiency in a state or local assessment) to tutor students either one-on-one or in groups of no more than five.
	Social support through access to community or school-based mentoring and/or programs that follow students through middle school and into high school.
	Design and deliver additional support to 9th grade students:
	Create manageable class sizes not greater than 30.
	Create a team of teachers for 9 th grade with at least one hour per week of collaborative time to plan instructional improvements.
	Reduce teacher load for 9th grade team so that these teachers teach fewer students (<100 students).
	Provide summer programs to help students transition from 8 th grade to 9 th grade.
	Provide annual parent engagement activities to all parents to assist their children in making the transitions from eighth grade to high school.
3.	Closing Achievement Gap Initiatives
	Provide teachers with at least one hour per week for collaborative planning for the purpose of instructional improvement.
	Develop and implement a plan to provide coaching to principals in district-identified schools.
	Develop and implement a district plan to address the equitable distribution of highly effective teachers.
	Implement alternative pay structures and/or incentives which may be targeted for hard-to-staff subjects and/or teachers teaching in hard-to-staff schools.
	Develop and implement a plan to provide extended high quality learning time, for district-identified schools with high-need students, which may include year-round school programs or extended days.
	Implement and/or expand after school services in reading and mathematics for high-need students.
	Integrate Response to Intervention (RtI) to address individual student academic needs with an intervention and support program to address individual student behavioral needs.
4.	Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Initiatives
	Develop and implement a plan requiring three years of science and mathematics as requirements for high school graduation.
	Provide opportunities for teachers to participate in STEM training and incorporate STEM instruction in the classroom.

Percent of W	/I stude	nts scori	ng profic	ient and	above on t	the Grad	de 4 Rea	ding NA	EP. * In	dicates da	ta is not a	vailable																		
	-		All Stude	nts		_	Student	ts with D	isabilitie	s		English l	Languag	e Learne	rs		Economie	cally Disa	advantage	ed			Black					Hispanic		
School Year	Avg. score	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% Prof + Adv	Avg. score	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% Prof + Adv	Avg. score	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% Prof + Adv	Avg. score	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% Prof + Adv	Avg. score	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% Prof + Adv	Avg. score	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% Prof + Adv
2002-03	221	32.2%	26.0%	6.6%	32.6%	181	77.1%	5.4%	1.1%	6.5%	199	61.9%	9.3%	1.0%	10.3%	205	49.8%	15.0%	2.6%	17.6%	200	58.0%	10.7%	1.9%	12.5%	209	46.5%	15.6%	4.3%	19.9%
2004-05	221	32.8%	26.0%	7.1%	33.1%	189	70.6%	7.0%	1.6%	8.6%	202	58.0%	11.5%	2.1%	13.6%	204	52.4%	13.8%	2.1%	15.9%	194	66.2%	9.0%	0.6%	9.6%	208	50.7%	16.7%	3.8%	20.5%
2006-07	223	29.6%	27.4%	8.2%	35.6%	191	62.6%	11.0%	3.0%	14.0%	201	57.7%	9.3%	1.0%	10.4%	205	49.3%	15.2%	2.7%	17.9%	191	64.7%	8.8%	2.1%	10.9%	208	50.4%	14.4%	2.2%	16.7%
2010-11	227	25.6%	29.3%	9.4%	38.4%	200	53.3%	14.7%	4.6%	18.9%	211	47.9%	12.3%	2.2%	14.0%	209	44.2%	17.1%	3.2%	20.2%	197	57.8%	11.5%	2.9%	14.0%	213	43.7%	16.8%	3.3%	19.7%
2012-13	230	21.5%	31.1%	10.6%	41.1%	210	44.1%	18.3%	6.2%	23.8%	221	38.1%	15.4%	3.4%	17.6%	214	39.1%	19.1%	3.8%	22.5%	203	50.9%	14.1%	3.7%	17.2%	219	37.1%	19.2%	4.4%	22.8%

Percent of V	VI stude	ents scori	ng profic	cient and	above on	the Grad	de 8 Rea	ding NA	EP. * In	dicates da	ita is not a	vailable	•																	
			All Stude	nts		_	Student	ts with D	isabilitie	S		English	Language	e Learne	rs		Economi	cally Dis	advantage	ed			Black			-		Hispanic		
School Year	Avg. score	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% Prof + Adv	Avg. score	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% Prof + Adv	Avg. score	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% Prof + Adv	Avg. score	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% Prof + Adv	Avg. score	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% Prof + Adv	Avg. score	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% Prof + Adv
2002-03	266	22.8%	33.5%	3.0%	36.5%	226	69.5%	3.7%	0.3%	4.0%	*	*	*	*	*	244	47.1%	15.4%	1.1%	16.5%	234	60.2%	7.4%	0.1%	8.0%	244	48.7%	15.3%	1.4%	16.8%
2004-05	266	23.4%	31.5%	3.4%	34.9%	230	64.4%	5.9%	0.1%	6.0%	*	*	*	*	*	249	41.0%	18.3%	0.9%	19.2%	236	55.8%	8.5%	0.3%	9.0%	247	42.6%	16.5%	1.5%	18.0%
2006-07	264	24.1%	30.6%	2.6%	33.2%	221	72.6%	2.9%	0.3%	3.3%	243	46.1%	11.0%	0.0%	11.0%	246	43.4%	15.0%	0.7%	15.6%	231	60.4%	7.3%	0.7%	8.0%	247	41.7%	16.2%	0.6%	16.8%
2010-11	265	22.1%	31.9%	2.8%	34.4%	226	66.4%	5.2%	0.6%	5.7%	247	40.9%	12.3%	0.2%	12.4%	249	39.7%	16.8%	0.9%	17.5%	234	56.8%	9.2%	1.0%	10.2%	253	35.1%	19.8%	1.1%	20.6%
2012-13	267	20.2%	33.2%	3.0%	35.7%	232	60.3%	7.5%	1.0%	8.2%	251	35.8%	13.7%	0.4%	13.8%	252	36.0%	18.7%	1.1%	19.5%	237	53.3%	11.2%	1.3%	12.3%	258	28.6%	23.4%	1.6%	24.4%

Percent of W	I stude	nts scori	ng profic	ient and	above on t	he Grae	de 4 Mat	thematic	s NAEP.	* Indicate	es data is	not avai	lable.																	
			All Stude	nts			Studen	ts with D	isabilitie	8		English 1	Language	e Learne	rs		Economic	cally Disa	advantage	ed			Black					Hispanic		
School Year	Avg. score	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% Prof + Adv	Avg. score	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% Prof + Adv	Avg. score	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% Prof + Adv	Avg. score	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% Prof + Adv	Avg. score	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% Prof + Adv	Avg. score	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% Prof + Adv
2002-03	237	20.6%	31.0%	4.3%	35.2%	211	54.9%	8.4%	0.4%	8.7%	215	47.7%	9.1%	0.4%	9.5%	221	38.9%	15.4%	1.1%	16.6%	209	58.8%	7.0%	0.5%	7.5%	221	36.9%	11.6%	0.9%	12.6%
2004-05	241	16.2%	35.3%	5.0%	40.3%	221	38.6%	16.2%	0.4%	16.6%	225	32.7%	18.2%	0.5%	18.7%	225	32.2%	18.2%	1.0%	19.3%	210	53.6%	6.5%	0.3%	6.8%	224	34.1%	15.5%	0.6%	16.1%
2006-07	244	14.7%	40.0%	6.9%	46.9%	223	36.9%	19.1%	1.5%	20.6%	227	33.4%	20.5%	1.9%	22.3%	228	31.5%	22.7%	1.9%	24.6%	212	52.7%	9.5%	0.8%	10.4%	229	31.0%	26.2%	1.0%	27.2%
2008-09	244	15.0%	37.4%	7.6%	45.1%	222	39.6%	15.5%	2.0%	17.6%	223	33.9%	14.1%	1.1%	15.2%	229	27.5%	22.0%	1.8%	23.9%	217	45.3%	11.0%	0.4%	11.5%	228	28.7%	20.1%	1.4%	21.5%
2010-11	247	11.5%	40.6%	9.1%	49.5%	227	32.3%	19.3%	2.9%	22.1%	229	25.6%	17.9%	1.8%	19.4%	233	22.3%	25.4%	2.3%	27.7%	221	39.1%	14.6%	0.9%	15.4%	233	22.1%	24.6%	2.1%	26.5%
2012-13	251	7.9%	43.8%	10.5%	54.0%	232	25.0%	23.1%	3.8%	26.5%	234	17.2%	21.7%	2.5%	23.6%	236	17.2%	28.8%	2.9%	31.4%	225	32.9%	18.2%	1.4%	19.4%	237	15.4%	29.1%	2.8%	31.4%

Percent of W	/I stude	nts scori	ng profic	cient and	above on t	the Grae	de 8 Mat	hematic	s NAEP.	* Indicat	es data is	not ava	ilable.																	
			All Stude	nts		_	Student	ts with D	isabilitie	S		English	Language	e Learne	rs		Economi	cally Disa	advantag	ed	_		Black					Hispanic		
School Year	Avg. score	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% Prof + Adv	Avg. score	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% Prof + Adv	Avg. score	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% Prof + Adv	Avg. score	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% Prof + Adv	Avg. score	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% Prof + Adv	Avg. score	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% Prof + Adv
2002-03	284	24.8%	28.7%	6.4%	35.2%	247	68.7%	5.9%	0.6%	6.5%	*	*	*	*	*	259	51.8%	10.4%	1.4%	11.8%	241	76.0%	4.1%	0.5%	4.6%	262	50.4%	14.7%	1.0%	15.7%
2004-05	285	23.9%	29.2%	6.7%	35.8%	250	62.7%	9.0%	0.3%	9.3%	269	44.1%	15.1%	3.9%	19.0%	263	46.3%	13.5%	1.5%	15.0%	246	69.6%	4.1%	1.2%	5.3%	265	43.8%	15.8%	0.6%	16.3%
2006-07	286	24.1%	29.0%	8.0%	37.0%	249	63.4%	7.3%	0.5%	7.7%	260	52.5%	9.4%	2.7%	12.2%	266	44.4%	16.1%	1.5%	17.6%	247	69.7%	5.9%	0.1%	5.9%	268	40.8%	16.6%	1.5%	18.1%
2008-09	288	21.0%	31.0%	8.4%	39.3%	255	55.2%	8.7%	0.9%	9.6%	259	54.8%	8.9%	0.4%	9.3%	269	39.7%	18.2%	1.8%	20.0%	254	61.5%	9.4%	1.6%	11.0%	268	44.0%	17.4%	2.8%	20.2%
2010-11	291	17.4%	34.2%	9.8%	43.8%	260	47.9%	12.5%	1.8%	14.1%	265	46.5%	12.7%	1.1%	13.5%	273	34.6%	21.6%	2.3%	23.8%	258	55.3%	12.9%	2.1%	14.9%	273	37.3%	21.9%	3.5%	25.1%
2012-13	295	13.9%	37.4%	11.2%	48.2%	265	40.6%	16.2%	2.7%	18.6%	270	38.2%	16.5%	1.8%	17.7%	276	29.5%	24.9%	2.8%	27.6%	262	49.1%	16.5%	2.6%	18.9%	277	30.7%	26.4%	4.2%	30.1%









APPENDIX 8 - (A)(1) NAEP Achievement Data and Goals



Tony Evers, PhD, State Superintendent

Every Child a Graduate

Every child must graduate ready for further education and the workforce. We must align our efforts so our students benefit from both college and career preparation, learning the skills and knowledge necessary to be contributing members of our communities.

To build on our long-standing commitment to public education, Wisconsin must recruit and retain quality educators, invest in innovation, ensure safe and respectful schools, advance accountability, and work toward fair and sustainable school funding.

- **Recruit and Retain Quality Teachers.** Strong teachers and school leaders are vital to the success of our students, schools, and communities. We need to recruit and retain talented educators for our children. Trained mentors are essential for our newest teachers and school leaders. We must expand incentives for our best educators to work in high-needs schools and engage in research and innovation. We should pilot new and innovative systems for educator compensation.
- **Innovation that Works.** Our students require strong libraries and access to up-to-date technology that reflects the information economy that is changing our lives and schools. For this we need multiple pathways to connect rigorous academic standards to real-world learning experiences, including on-line learning opportunities for all students. We must create the next generation of charter schools, schools that are of the highest quality and reach strong standards of accountability.
- Safe and Respectful Schools. Wisconsin parents want and expect their children to attend safe schools. Children learn best in positive, healthy, and successful learning environments. Investments in a safe and respectful school community include small class sizes, access to highly qualified counselors, anti-bullying programs, and systems that promote positive behaviors.
- Accountability for Results. We must create schools that are truly accountable to the parents, students, and citizens of every district in this state. We must develop multiple assessments that provide students and teachers with meaningful and timely information about student learning as measured against rigorous standards. A new generation accountability system recognizes progress in raising student achievement.
- Fair and Sustainable Funding. Our children, no matter where they live in Wisconsin, must have the same educational opportunities. Deferred maintenance, program and staffing cuts, delayed technology purchases, and higher student fees are becoming the norm instead of the exception. Child poverty continues to grow at a rapid rate. Moving beyond current challenges, we must agree on the building blocks of a sustainable funding future for our public schools and libraries. And, we must leverage available state funds and federal dollars to target schools that have the neediest children.

Detailed Table for (A)(1)

This table provides detailed information on the participation of each participating LEA (as defined in this notice). States should use this table to complete the Summary Tables above. (Note: If the State has a large number of participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), it may move this table to an appendix. States should provide in their narrative a clear reference to the appendix that contains the table.)

	De	LEA mograp	ohics	Sig	natures MOU's	s on	MOU Terms]	Prelim	inary S	Scope	of Wo	rk – Pa	articipa	ation i	n each	applic	able P	'lan Cr	iterior	1	
Participating LEAs	# of Schools	# of K-12 Students	# of K-12 Students in Poverty	LEA Supt. (or equivalent)	President of local school board (if applicable)	Teachers Union (if applicable)	Uses Standard Terms & Conditions?	(B)(3)	(C)(3)(i)	(C)(3)(ii)	(C)(3) (iii)	(D)(2) (i)	(D)(2) (ii)	(D)(2) (iii)	(D)(2)(iv)(a)	(D)(2)(iv)(b)	(D)(2)(iv)(c)	(D)(2) (iv)(d)	(D)(3)(i)	(D)(3)(ii)	(D)(5)(i)	(D)(5)(ii)	(E)(2)
				Υ/	Y/	Υ/	Yes/	Υ/	Y/	Y/	Υ/	Υ/	Υ/	Υ/	Υ/	Υ/	Y/	Υ/	Y/	Υ/	Y/	Υ/	Y/
Name of LEA				N/	N/	N/	No	N/	N/	N/	N/	N/	N/	N/	N/	N/	N/	N/	N/	N/	N/	N/	N/
	_			NA	NA	NA		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Abbotsford	3	676	359	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Adams-Friendship Area	6	1833	965	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Albany	3	411	23	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Algoma	3	608	198	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Alma	2	289	79	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Alma Center	3	618	328	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Almond-Bancroft	3	480	236	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Altoona	3	1502	561	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Amery	4	1736	372	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Tomorrow River	3	942	190	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Antigo	9	2543	1147	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Appleton Area	37	15233	5302	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Arcadia	2	1034	358	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Argyle	3	337	79	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Ashland	5	2233	1198	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Ashwaubenon	6	3134	635	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

| Athens | 3 | 516 | 132 | YES | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES |
|------------------------|----|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Auburndale | 2 | 909 | 227 | YES | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Augusta | 4 | 646 | 318 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Baldwin-Woodville Area | 3 | 1554 | 361 | YES | NO | YES |
| Unity | 3 | 1090 | 441 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Bangor | 2 | 641 | 149 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Baraboo | 7 | 2981 | 982 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Barneveld | 2 | 461 | 68 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Barron Area | 7 | 1334 | 603 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Bayfield | 4 | 393 | 281 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Beaver Dam | 10 | 3574 | 1303 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Belleville | 4 | 953 | 136 | YES | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Belmont Community | 2 | 335 | 76 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Beloit | 19 | 7130 | 4472 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Beloit Turner | 4 | 1357 | 309 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Benton | 2 | 252 | 83 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Berlin Area | 4 | 1629 | 507 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Birchwood | 4 | 326 | 170 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Wisconsin Heights | 4 | 862 | 151 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Black River Falls | 5 | 1898 | 785 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Blair-Taylor | 3 | 656 | 258 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Pecatonica Area | 2 | 437 | 124 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Bloomer | 3 | 1117 | 305 | YES | NO | YES |
| Bonduel | 4 | 862 | 273 | YES | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Boscobel Area | 3 | 900 | 443 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| North Lakeland | 1 | 24 | 11 | YES | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Bowler | 2 | 417 | 215 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Boyceville Community | 2 | 789 | 354 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Brighton #1 | 1 | 186 | 23 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Brillion | 3 | 960 | 169 | YES | NO | YES |
| Bristol #1 | 1 | 648 | 117 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Brodhead | 3 | 1138 | 248 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Elmbrook | 11 | 7363 | 589 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Brown Deer | 4 | 1808 | 488 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Bruce | 3 | 513 | 302 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Burlington Area | 8 | 3614 | 865 | YES | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Butternut | 3 | 174 | 91 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |

Cadott Community	3	901	387	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Cambria-Friesland	2	460	92	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Cambridge	4	900	115	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Cameron	4	944	354	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Campbellsport	4	1470	239	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Cashton	2	565	236	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Cassville	2	241	55	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Cedarburg	6	3080	186	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Cedar Grove-Belgium	4	1100	111	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Area	-	1100		1115	TLS	110	125	125	110	1 25	1125	125	110	125	125	110	125	125	125	125	110	125	125
Chequamegon Sch Dist	7	897	269	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Chetek	3	922	411	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Chilton	3	1216	293	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Chippewa Falls Area	9	5013	1555	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Clayton	3	421	181	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Clear Lake	3	632	193	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Clinton Community	3	1259	303	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Clintonville	4	1572	638	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Cochrane-Fountain City	2	663	168	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Colby	5	985	406	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Coleman	3	751	252	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Colfax	2	843	262	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Columbus	4	1185	265	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Cornell	2	459	212	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Crandon	4	953	295	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Crivitz	3	748	323	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Cuba City	2	662	201	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Cudahy	9	2663	1126	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Cumberland	5	1110	461	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Darlington Community	2	764	166	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Deerfield Community	5	791	125	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
De Forest Area	7	3267	584	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Kettle Moraine	6	4287	239	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Delavan-Darien	6	2634	1419	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
Denmark	6	1547	176	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
De Pere	7	3792	437	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						
De Soto Area	5	565	221	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES						

Dodgeville	4	1368	377	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Dover #1	1	88	16	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Drummond Area	3	449	212	YES	NO	YES																	
Durand	2	1030	342	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Northland Pines	5	1410	492	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
East Troy Community	5	1764	248	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Edgar	3	667	171	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Edgerton	4	1890	399	YES	NO	YES																	
Elcho	2	376	168	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Eleva-Strum	3	638	191	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Elkhart Lake-Glenbeulah	3	527	102	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Elkhorn Area	6	3091	753	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Elk Mound Area	3	1094	230	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Ellsworth Community	5	1705	412	YES	NO	YES																	
Elmwood	3	350	89	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Royall	3	570	198	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Erin	1	345	8	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Evansville Community	4	1831	386	YES	NO	YES																	
Fall Creek	3	863	158	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Fall River	2	498	92	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES															
Fennimore Community	2	766	287	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Lac du Flambeau #1	1	447	388	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Florence	3	516	195	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Fond du Lac	13	7449	2637	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Fontana J8	1	291	49	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Fort Atkinson	8	2880	762	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Fox Point J2	2	927	67	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Franklin Public	9	4150	369	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Frederic	2	486	245	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Northern Ozaukee	5	1853	109	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Galesville-Ettrick-	6	1456	350	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Trempealeau	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,																						
North Crawford	2	494	212	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Geneva J4	1	177	0	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Genoa City J2	2	624	149	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Germantown	6	3985	373	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Gibraltar Area	3	625	94	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														

| Gillett | 3 | 703 | 300 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
|------------------------|----|-------|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Gilman | 2 | 489 | 279 | YES | NO | YES |
| Gilmanton | 2 | 204 | 81 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Nicolet UHS | 1 | 1196 | 140 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Glendale-River Hills | 2 | 989 | 195 | YES | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Glenwood City | 4 | 712 | 206 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Goodman-Armstrong | 2 | 172 | 92 | YES | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Grafton | 5 | 2205 | 261 | YES | NO | YES |
| Granton Area | 2 | 263 | 147 | YES | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Grantsburg | 5 | 1368 | 498 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Black Hawk | 3 | 428 | 136 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Green Bay Area | 39 | 20573 | 10739 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Greendale | 6 | 2636 | 365 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Greenfield | 6 | 3311 | 872 | YES | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Green Lake | 3 | 311 | 51 | YES | NO | YES |
| Greenwood | 2 | 413 | 171 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Gresham | 2 | 309 | 106 | YES | NO | YES |
| Hamilton | 7 | 4439 | 393 | YES | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Saint Croix Central | 3 | 1303 | 231 | YES | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Hartford UHS | 1 | 1615 | 237 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Hartford J1 | 3 | 1634 | 459 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Arrowhead UHS | 1 | 2234 | 31 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Hartland-Lakeside J3 | 3 | 1437 | 190 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Hayward Community | 9 | 1958 | 951 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Southwestern Wisconsin | 2 | 570 | 169 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Herman #22 | 1 | 99 | 27 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Highland | 2 | 283 | 47 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Hilbert | 4 | 495 | 83 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Hillsboro | 2 | 576 | 221 | YES | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Holmen | 7 | 3637 | 787 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Horicon | 3 | 848 | 225 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Hortonville | 5 | 3327 | 408 | YES | NO | YES |
| Howard-Suamico | 9 | 5306 | 722 | YES | NO | YES |
| Howards Grove | 4 | 989 | 48 | YES | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Hudson | 8 | 5357 | 504 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Hurley | 3 | 656 | 124 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Hustisford | 2 | 421 | 82 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |

Independence	2	362	118	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Iola-Scandinavia	3	774	196	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Iowa-Grant	2	771	227	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Ithaca	3	352	87	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Janesville	23	10567	3797	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Jefferson	6	1883	542	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES						
Johnson Creek	2	659	162	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES						
Juda	2	290	73	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Dodgeland	2	817	244	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Kaukauna Area	7	3989	721	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Kenosha	44	22772	9225	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Kewaskum	5	2050	268	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES						
Kewaunee	5	1030	155	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Kimberly Area	8	4458	372	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Kohler	3	624	0	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
La Crosse	20	7104	3049	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES						
Ladysmith-Hawkins	4	986	506	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
La Farge	4	247	125	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES						
Lake Geneva-Genoa City	2	1390	416	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
UHS	-	1370	410	125	125	110	125	125	110	1 25	125	125	125	125	125	110	125	125	125	125	110	1 LS	125
Lake Geneva J1	4	2115	1011	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Lake Holcombe	2	387	179	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Lake Mills Area	4	1327	246	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Lancaster Community	3	948	269	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Lena	4	419	143	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Linn J4	1	119	49	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Linn J6	1	125	34	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Richmond	1	497	9	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Little Chute Area	3	1520	347	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Lodi	5	1639	151	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Lomira	4	1097	166	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Loyal	3	564	258	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Luck	2	554	199	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Luxemburg-Casco	5	1919	234	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Madison Metropolitan	54	24496	10801	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Manawa	4	831	261	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Manitowoc	13	5572	1675	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES						

Maple	4	1457	411	YES	NO	YES			
Marathon City	2	679	85	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Marinette	5	2245	950	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Marion	2	544	193	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Markesan	4	747	220	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Marshall	6	1259	308	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES
Marshfield	8	4094	1015	YES	NO	YES			
Mauston	6	1551	686	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Mayville	3	1161	216	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
McFarland	5	2147	273	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES
Medford Area	5	2123	659	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Mellen	3	281	105	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Melrose-Mindoro	3	715	223	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Menasha	8	3687	1684	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Menominee Indian	3	809	670	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Menomonee Falls	8	4575	683	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Menomonie Area	8	3257	1184	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Mequon-Thiensville	6	3754	218	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Mercer	2	158	78	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Swallow	1	553	0	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
North Lake	1	373	0	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Merton Community	2	1053	16	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Stone Bank	1	343	13	YES	NO	YES			
Middleton-Cross Plains	10	5899	781	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Milton	7	3295	543	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Milwaukee	215	85376	65517	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Mineral Point	3	787	154	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Minocqua J1	1	538	141	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Lakeland UHS	1	883	274	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Northwood	1	423	195	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES
Mishicot	5	994	187	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Mondovi	3	1077	375	YES	NO	YES			
Monona Grove	8	3068	443	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Monroe	9	2934	774	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Monticello	3	381	80	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES
Mosinee	3	2174	511	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES
Mount Horeb Area	5	2328	262	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES

| Mukwonago | 8 | 5044 | 376 | YES | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES |
|------------------------|----|-------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Riverdale | 3 | 708 | 337 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Muskego-Norway | 8 | 4887 | 233 | YES | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Lake Country | 1 | 540 | 24 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Necedah Area | 3 | 803 | 444 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Neenah | 14 | 6289 | 1377 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Neillsville | 3 | 1069 | 371 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Nekoosa | 6 | 1338 | 553 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Neosho J3 | 1 | 191 | 36 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| New Auburn | 2 | 360 | 177 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| New Berlin | 7 | 4794 | 367 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| New Glarus | 2 | 882 | 110 | YES | NO | YES |
| New Holstein | 4 | 1133 | 239 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| New Lisbon | 3 | 643 | 265 | YES | NO | YES |
| New London | 8 | 2396 | 577 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| New Richmond | 6 | 2970 | 677 | YES | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Niagara | 2 | 465 | 156 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Norris | 1 | 58 | 56 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| North Fond du Lac | 4 | 1265 | 407 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Norwalk-Ontario-Wilton | 2 | 726 | 322 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Norway J7 | 1 | 91 | 7 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Oak Creek-Franklin | 11 | 5995 | 819 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Oakfield | 3 | 572 | 76 | YES | NO | YES |
| Oconomowoc Area | 8 | 4727 | 386 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Oconto | 4 | 1181 | 398 | YES | NO | YES |
| Oconto Falls | 7 | 1933 | 616 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Omro | 4 | 1311 | 283 | YES | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Onalaska | 6 | 2947 | 697 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Oregon | 6 | 3623 | 410 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Parkview | 6 | 1032 | 143 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Osceola | 5 | 1885 | 461 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Oshkosh Area | 27 | 10329 | 3407 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Osseo-Fairchild | 4 | 1000 | 290 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Owen-Withee | 3 | 598 | 250 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Palmyra-Eagle Area | 5 | 1175 | 222 | YES | NO | YES |
| Pardeeville Area | 4 | 905 | 247 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Paris J1 | 1 | 202 | 22 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |

Beecher-Dunbar-Pembine	2	259	151	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Pepin Area	2	239	64	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Peshtigo	2	1219	385	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Pewaukee	4	2406	239	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES															
Phelps	2	138	57	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Phillips	3	900	351	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Pittsville	2	639	187	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Tri-County Area	3	693	368	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Platteville	4	1418	473	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Plum City	2	335	110	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Plymouth	7	2422	455	YES	NO	YES																	
Portage Community	11	2637	794	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Port Edwards	4	464	153	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Port Washington-	5	2686	391	YES	NO	YES																	
Saukville	-																						
South Shore	2	153	85	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Potosi	3	359	117	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Poynette	5	1090	136	YES	NO	YES																	
Prairie du Chien Area	3	1191	552	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Prairie Farm	3	341	95	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Prentice	5	493	169	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Prescott	4	1295	217	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Princeton	1	351	124	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Pulaski Community	8	3693	651	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Racine	35	21172	10100	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Randall J1	1	739	111	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Randolph	2	541	168	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Random Lake	4	929	205	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Raymond #14	1	428	53	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
North Cape	1	200	22	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Reedsburg	8	2559	884	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Reedsville	5	669	136	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Rhinelander	8	2721	1045	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Rib Lake	4	489	177	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Rice Lake Area	12	2395	833	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Richfield J1	2	383	24	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Friess Lake	1	302	13	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES														

| Richland | 6 | 1408 | 609 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
|----------------------|----|-------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Rio Community | 2 | 509 | 129 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Ripon Area | 6 | 1829 | 501 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| River Falls | 7 | 3018 | 549 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| River Ridge | 3 | 578 | 241 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Rosendale-Brandon | 5 | 1035 | 182 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Rosholt | 3 | 652 | 145 | YES | NO | YES |
| D C Everest Area | 11 | 5676 | 1494 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Rubicon J6 | 1 | 161 | 22 | YES | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Saint Croix Falls | 4 | 1116 | 318 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Saint Francis | 3 | 1331 | 385 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Central/Westosha UHS | 1 | 1235 | 177 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Salem | 1 | 1029 | 236 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Sauk Prairie | 7 | 2693 | 660 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Seneca | 3 | 273 | 138 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Sevastopol | 5 | 562 | 168 | YES | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Seymour Community | 5 | 2473 | 572 | YES | NO | YES |
| Sharon J11 | 1 | 330 | 157 | YES | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Shawano | 4 | 2517 | 1033 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Sheboygan Area | 27 | 10336 | 3712 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Sheboygan Falls | 3 | 1788 | 342 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Shell Lake | 3 | 638 | 291 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Shiocton | 2 | 769 | 181 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Shorewood | 5 | 1948 | 220 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Shullsburg | 3 | 386 | 115 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Silver Lake J1 | 1 | 578 | 190 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Siren | 2 | 519 | 317 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Slinger | 5 | 2916 | 241 | YES | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Solon Springs | 1 | 322 | 138 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Somerset | 3 | 1602 | 218 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| South Milwaukee | 8 | 3334 | 1096 | YES | NO | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Southern Door County | 4 | 1213 | 311 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Sparta Area | 11 | 2608 | 1226 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Spencer | 2 | 747 | 206 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Spooner Area | 3 | 1251 | 526 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| River Valley | 6 | 1375 | 420 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
| Spring Valley | 3 | 749 | 199 | YES | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES |
APPENDIX 10 - (A)(1) Detailed Table

Stanley-Boyd Area	4	960	422	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Stevens Point Area	18	7511	2226	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Stockbridge	4	215	24	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Stoughton Area	6	3411	551	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Stratford	2	838	168	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Sturgeon Bay	6	1243	404	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Sun Prairie Area	11	6172	1356	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Superior	8	4931	2141	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Suring	2	520	206	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Thorp	2	608	278	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Three Lakes	3	607	167	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Tigerton	2	302	167	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Tomah Area	10	2995	1083	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Tomahawk	3	1464	497	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Flambeau	5	660	371	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Trevor-Wilmot	3	575	170	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Consolidated																							
Turtle Lake	2	503	220	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Twin Lakes #4	1	430	142	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Two Rivers	6	1873	658	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Union Grove UHS	1	833	51	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Union Grove J1	1	749	179	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Valders Area	4	1088	198	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Verona Area	10	4671	1072	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Kickapoo Area	3	468	233	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Viroqua Area	5	1175	453	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Wabeno Area	2	534	285	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Big Foot UHS	2	572	125	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Walworth J1	1	542	241	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Washburn	3	557	212	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Washington	2	78	18	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Waterford UHS	1	1092	69	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Waterford Graded J1	4	1610	161	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Watertown	8	3894	1190	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Waukesha	28	12990	3156	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Waunakee Community	6	3529	203	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Waupaca	5	2408	719	YES	NO	YES																	

APPENDIX 10 - (A)(1) Detailed Table

Waupun	6	2023	630	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Wausau	21	8681	3264	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Wausaukee	3	563	288	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Wautoma Area	4	1501	858	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Wauwatosa	15	6811	813	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Wauzeka-Steuben	3	342	192	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Webster	3	725	494	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
West Allis	18	8678	3714	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES														
West Bend	12	6916	1738	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Westby Area	5	1138	318	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
West De Pere	6	2704	489	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Westfield	6	1208	566	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Weston	3	334	118	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
West Salem	3	1648	339	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Weyauwega-Fremont	5	963	271	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Weyerhaeuser Area	2	156	90	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Wheatland J1	1	403	113	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Whitefish Bay	4	2939	9	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Whitehall	4	775	302	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
White Lake	2	217	104	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Whitewater	6	2060	546	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Whitnall	5	2410	279	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Wild Rose	3	720	276	YES	NO	YES																	
Williams Bay	4	560	98	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Wilmot UHS	1	1166	252	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Winneconne Community	4	1558	193	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Wisconsin Dells	5	1643	627	YES	NO	YES																	
Wisconsin Rapids	15	5654	1787	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Wittenberg-Birnamwood	4	1305	441	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Wonewoc-Union Center	4	360	166	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Woodruff J1	1	576	162	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Wrightstown Community	3	1318	200	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Yorkville J2	1	409	43	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Non-district Charter																							
Schools: Downtown	1	106	25	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Montes																							
Non-district Charter	1	477	0	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														

APPENDIX 10 - (A)(1) Detailed Table

Schools: Milwaukee Colle																							(
Non-district Charter Schools: Central City Cy	1	327	300	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Non-district Charter Schools: Milwaukee Acad	1	951	932	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Non-district Charter Schools: Sch for Early D	1	66	65	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Non-district Charter Schools: BEAM	1	566	553	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Non-district Charter Schools: DLH Academy	1	281	211	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Non-district Charter Schools: 21st Century Pr	1	493	248	YES	NO	YES																	
Non-district Charter Schools: YMCA Young Lead	1	597	103	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Non-district Charter Schools: Acad of Learnin	1	420	408	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Non-district Charter Schools: Woodlands Sch	1	301	73	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Non-district Charter Schools: Capitol West Ac	1	116	90	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Non-district Charter Schools: Tenor High Scho	1	206	161	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Non-district Charter Schools: Inland Seas Sch	1	113	89	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Non-district Charter Schools: Seeds of Health	1	332	326	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Non-district Charter Schools: Milwaukee Renai	1	88	77	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														
Non-district Charter Schools: Bruce Guadalupe	1	780	619	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES														



PPENDIX 11 - (A)(2)(ii) RTTT LETTERS OF SUPPORT FINAL Association of Wisconsin School Administrators

4797 Hayes Road, Suite 103, Madison, WI 53704-3292 Phone: (608) 241-0300 • FAX: (608) 249-4973 Web site: www.awsa.org

January 11, 2010

Mr. Tony Evers, State Superintendent Department of Public Instruction PO Box 7841 Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7841

Dear State Superintendent Evers:

The Association of Wisconsin School Administrators supports the initiatives that comprise our state's Race to the Top Application. We are excited about the plan's promise for improving learning for every student in Wisconsin.

AWSA is the professional association of Wisconsin school principals. The plan's focus on attracting, supporting, and developing school leaders holds great potential to improve the leadership capacity of our schools and therefore, the achievement of our students.

Our organization is committed to the Race to the Top Application and stands ready to help implement this comprehensive package.

Jim Lynch

Executive Director

Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa P.O. Box 39 Odanah, WI. 54861

Dear Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers:

The Bad River Tribe fully supports the reform initiatives that comprise Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers' Race to the Top Application for Wisconsin. We are excited about this new era for education in Wisconsin, where students will be held to the same high standards as students in other states and around the world, and these additional federal resources will be directed to initiatives that research has shown will improve the overall quality of education in our state.

The Ashland School District is the primary provider of education to Bad River Tribal youth. There are 492 Native American students within the District who makeup over 25% of the total student population.

The Mission of the Bad River Tribe is to work progressively and collaboratively with the Ashland School District to ensure support and monitoring of academic achievement, attendance, graduation rates, and transition to higher educational settings.

The Bad River Tribe and the School District of Ashland have resolved to work together and make it a priority to eliminate the academic achievement gap between Native and non Native students. To address the academic achievement gap both entities have established a task force aimed at improving the direct relationships between teaching staff, community members and families in Bad River. This group has collaborated to create several district-wide projects including a Youth & Family Open House, the Native Youth Newsletter and has initiated and implemented a bully-proofing project, Creating Caring Communities at the high school. Through this partnership, the Bad River community and school district staff have worked to recognize Native Student achievement, improve transition for Native students between childhood & adulthood and improve communication between families, community and school staff.

In addition, the State of Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction has identified the Ashland School District as having a disproportionate number of Native American students referred to Special Education Services. As a means for eliminating this problem, the district has identified two goals that are being worked on collaboratively. The goals include improving communication between the Bad River community and staff district-wide and improved means of collecting data and interpreting this data so it can be used in a meaningful way.

Our organization embraces the Race to the Top reforms and stands ready to help implement the reforms laid out in the state plan.

Sincerely,

Michael Wiggins Jr.

Bad River Tribal Chairman



January 13, 2010

Office of Governor Jim Doyle 115 East, State Capitol PO Box 7863 Madison, WI 53707

Dear Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers:

As the Executive Director of Engineers & Scientists of Milwaukee (ESM), I am writing in support of the STEM-related reform initiatives that comprise Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers' Race to the Top Application for Wisconsin.

We are excited about this new era for education in Wisconsin, where students will be held to the same high standards as students in other states and around the world, and these additional federal resources will be directed to implementing initiatives that research has shown will improve the overall quality of education in our state.

Who We Are. ESM was founded in 1905. Originally conceived as a "cooperative body, broad enough in scope to meet the needs of all engineers in the community", ESM has evolved into Southeastern Wisconsin's leading technical organization providing and/or promoting educational outreach programs emphasizing STEM. Our mission is to accelerate regional prosperity by:

- Creating STEM awareness in the community
- Engaging students to advance STEM competencies
- Optimizing the effectiveness of STEM programs
- Leading a collaborative approach to STEM talent development

What We Do. We accomplish this mission through the direct management of educational programs (including Future City Competition, Rube Goldberg Machine Contest, Space Camp for Educators, and Website Design Camp), annual events (including the Engineers Week banquet, ESM Scholarship golf outing, and the sySTEMnow conference), and our awards program (including Engineer of the Year and the coveted "Stemmy" award for excellence in STEM).

We also aggressively support and promote affiliated STEM programs including the Badger State Science and Engineering Fair, the *FIRST* family of robotics programs, 4-H Gateway Academies, iFAIR, STEM Fest, and of course, Project Lead The Way (PLTW).

How We Do It. ESM views the STEM education challenge (and its ultimate solution) holistically; not as an issue which belongs solely to PK-12 education, but rather as a talent development continuum in which PK-12, higher education, and the public and private sector STEM workforce are inter-dependent constituencies.

ESM connects resources and needs by creating partnerships between the private and public sector STEM workforce and the education community. We strive to fully engage the workforce in the STEM initiative, recognizing that they are the end user in the STEM talent pipeline, they have reliable and available resources, and they have been vastly underutilized and under-leveraged in the development of STEM talent.

We encourage our partners to commit to building tomorrow's STEM workforce through advocacy, funding, in-kind services, and/or volunteerism. It's a very basic approach, but one that has been very effective as evidenced by significant increases in all of our key metrics, including...

- number of programs
- number of participants
- number of members
- . number of volunteers
- event sponsorship
- scholarship funding levels .
- overall awareness .

Our organization's unique approach and proven success with respect to STEM outreach was validated on September 21, 2009 when the Milwaukee 7 Regional Economic Development Campaign formally recognized and endorsed ESM's STEM7 Initiative as the region's Partner for STEM Talent Development.

We believe there is strong potential to scale up the STEM successes our organization has facilitated in the context of the overall STEM strategy outlined in the Race to the Top application - "Investing in STEM -- Building off our currently successful STEM efforts to ensure that more students have access to high-quality STEM courses and training."

ESM stands ready to help implement the STEM-related reforms laid out in the state plan; the goals of which are very consistent with our mission. We believe that in order for Wisconsin to be globally competitive in an innovation economy, we must have a reliable talent pipeline producing well-qualified, STEM-competent workers. Accordingly, we are honored to support this application.

Van Walling, P.E

Executive Director

ESM Board of Directors

President	Jerome Chudzik GRAEF	Director	Jen Larsen Eaton Corporation
President Elect	Susan Michaelson Marquette University	Director	Susan Lunsford MPS PLTW Consultant
Vice President/ Secretary	Judy Fassbender Bloom Companies	Director	Christy Matuszewski Briggs & Stratton
Treasurer	Nicole Jutz Johnson Controls	Director	Angela Obst P&H Mining Equipment
Past President	David Peterson Rockwell Automation	Director	Ron Perez UW-Milwaukee
Director	Frances Hardrick We Energies	Director	Kevin Pulz Milwaukee Public Television
Director	Adam Holton GE Healthcare	Director	Chris Taylor MSOE
Director	Joseph Jacobsen MATC	Director	James Wilke Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren
Director	Julie Janowak Badger Meter	Director	

ESM Staff

Executive Director	Van Walling	Program Coordinator	Kiley Kurz
Program Manager	Kelly Wesolowski	Student Intern	Meredith Claeys

APPENDIX 11 - (A)(2)(ii) RTTT LETTERS OF SUPPORT FINAL Forest County Potawatomi Community P.O. BOX 340 • Crandon, WI 54520

January 12, 2010

Forest County Potawatomi Community PO Box 340 Crandon, WI 54520

Dear Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers:

The Forest County Potawatomi fully supports the reform initiatives that comprise Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers' Race to the Top Application for Wisconsin. We are excited about this new era for education in Wisconsin, where students will be held to the same high standards as students in other states and around the world, and these additional federal resources will be directed to initiatives that research has shown will improve the overall quality of education in our state.

The Forest County Potawatomi Community has long held education as a high priority, actively working with our local schools to increase student achievement. The goals and objectives outlined in Wisconsin's Race to the Top plan would augment these efforts tremendously and we are in full support.

The Forest County Potawatomi Community is committed to the Race to the Top reforms and stands ready to help implement the reforms laid out in the state plan.

Sincerely,

Darold & Frind

Harold "Gus" Frank Chairman, Forest County Potawatomi Community



GE Healthcare

4855 W. Electric Ave Mirwoukee, WI 53219 USA

January 12, 2010

Office of Governor Jim Doyle 115 East, State Capitol PO Box 7863 Madison, WI 53707

Dear Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers:

GE Healthcare fully supports the reform initiatives that comprise Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers' Race to the Top Application for Wisconsin. We understand the state's plan to achieve these goals and agree that multiple facets of the system need to be addressed and improved.

It is vital to the State of Wisconsin and the future of the US that a significant emphasis be placed on the STEM components of this plan.

GE Healthcare has been engaged for a many years in the development of multi-generational technology leaders. In Southeastern Wisconsin our volunteers spend hundreds of hours each year supporting classroom and after school programming in STEM.

Our focus has been on Project-Lead-The-Way and FIRST Robotics, these are the two finest programs we have seen and they are delivering! We strongly encourage you to incorporate and expand those programs so that ALL Wisconsin youth have an opportunity to be involved.

GE Healthcare is extremely excited about Wisconsin's efforts with respect to Race-to-the-Top and particularly the STEM-specific component of the state plan. We will continue our active engagement in creating the innovators of the future!

Sincerely,

Dr. William Berezowitz VP & GM Imaging Subsystems GE Healthcare



Michael W. Grebe Chairman

> Julia H. Taylor President

January 13, 2010

The Honorable Governor James Doyle 819 North 6th Street Milwaukee, WI 53203

Dear Governor Doyle:

The Greater Milwaukee Committee, whose membership include our region's business, labor, academic, philanthropic, nonprofit and civic leadership, believes that Race to the Top funds are an important tool for implementing the level school reform needed to dramatically improve the academic achievement of Milwaukee K-12 students. We recognize that we cannot achieve that vision unless we fundamentally change the current performance of the schools that are preparing our future workforce. Currently for every 2 students who graduate from MPS one drops out and 80% of graduates who attend the University of Wisconsin- Milwaukee need remedial coursework.

Our organization has been focused on improving the Milwaukee Public Schools for a considerable time. Most recently we supported the district in the creation of its first formal strategic plan, however we remain concerned about the future of the district and the ability of the district to achieve the goals laid out in that plan without implementing fundamental reforms of the type included in the Race to the Top application.

Ensuring that we have a sustainable core of effective teachers and leaders is essential to a successful school system. The proposals in Wisconsin's application to strengthen teacher mentoring and professional development and establish evaluation systems for teachers and principals that incorporate student outcomes are important reforms to ensure we have effective teachers and leaders in our schools.

While we believe that schools themselves can have significant influence on student outcomes, clearly there are many factors outside the classroom that effect student achievement. The Harlem Children's Zone model has been successful in providing comprehensive supports to students and families in New York City. Establishing Children Zones in Milwaukee to provide those same supports will enhance the school level reforms, and we look forward to learning what role the Greater Milwaukee Committee can play in that effort.

While the needs are great in Milwaukee, the will to change is even greater. Our organization and many prominent community leaders are committed to the Race to the Top reforms. We encourage you to support this opportunity to help more Milwaukee children realize their full potential.

MWD

Michael W. Grebe Chairman

Julia H. Taylor

Julia Taylor President



Wednesday, January 13, 2010

Dear Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers:

Great Lakes Higher Education Corporation and Affiliates (Great Lakes) fully supports the reform initiatives that comprise Governor Doyle and Superintendent Evers' Race to the Top Application for Wisconsin. We are excited about this new era for education in Wisconsin, where our students will be held to the same high standards as students in other states and around the world. These additional federal resources will be directed to initiatives that research has shown will improve the overall quality of education in our state.

For more than 40 years, Great Lakes' support of statewide college access initiatives has been an integral part of our responsibilities under the U.S. Higher Education Act. But our commitment to Wisconsin goes beyond that. To date, Great Lakes has committed more than \$43 million in funding, support, and resources towards college access and completion programs benefiting students, families, and ultimately the State of Wisconsin.

Great Lakes is dedicated to helping people build brighter futures through education. We work to identify established college access programs whose leadership shares our commitment to increasing access to higher education for economically disadvantaged students and families across Wisconsin. By providing vital funding and support, we seek to help these programs sustain, grow, and replicate their efforts and services – leveraging their energy and innovation to change more lives for the better.

The reform initiatives outlined in the Race to the Top Application for Wisconsin are directly in line with Great Lakes' college access goals. Specifically, decreasing achievement gaps and increasing college enrollment rates are shared goals among Great Lakes, the community organizations we fund, and the State of Wisconsin. Designing useful assessments and expanding the state's data system will provide the necessary evaluation tools we need to work together to identify programs and approaches that are providing real results for Wisconsin's students.

Our organization is committed to the Race to the Top reforms and stands ready to help implement the reforms laid out in the state plan.

Richard D. George President and Chief Executive Officer Great Lakes Higher Education Corporation and Affiliates



KENOSHA AREA BUSINESS ALLIANCE

600 52nd Street, Suite 120 Kenosha, WI 53140 P 262.605.1100 F 262.605.1111

January 13, 2010

The Honorable Governor Jim Doyle and State Superintendent Tony Evers State of Wisconsin State Capitol Room 115 East Madison, WI 53702

RE: Race to the Top

We are pleased to write this letter, and extend our offer, of support for Wisconsin's Race to the Top application. Our organization serves as Kenosha County's economic development organization and employers association and has a vested interest in the quality of Wisconsin's schools. The primary objectives of the Race to the Top program are critical areas for the State's largest urban school districts, including Kenosha Unified. As our organization works to sustain and expand the area's economic base, it is clear that high performing school systems are critical to the economic health and prosperity of Wisconsin.

Wisconsin's Race to the Top application promises to provide significant resources to the State's largest school systems to address major issues such as closing the achievement gap, early childhood initiatives, teacher development, and the expansion of STEM curriculum. We strongly support these initiatives and recognize how important they are to Kenosha and Wisconsin. Please contact me and let us know what else we can do to support and assist you with this grant application and its successful implementation. Thank you.

Sincerely Todd'

President

■01/11/2010 16:18 FAX

APPENDIX 11 - (A)(2)(ii) RTTT LETTERS OF SUPPORT FINAL



Pride Of The Ojibwa 13394 W Trepania Road Hayward • Wisconsin • 54843 PHONE (715) 634-8934 • FAX (715) 634-4797

IMPORTANT FAX TRANSMITTAL

TO:Brian Vigue, Dept of Administration, 608-267-6917FROM:Terri Miller, Administrative AssistantDATE:January 11, 2010RE:Letter of SupportPAGES:2 (including cover page)MESSAGE:Here's the letter. Have a great evening!

If you receive this transmission in error, please call sender immediately. Information contained in this facsimile is legally privileged, confidential, and intended only for the individual(s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient or their agent, you are hereby notified any dissemination, disclosure, or copying of this transmission is strictly prohibited.



Pride Of The Ojibwa 13394 W Trepania Road Hayward • Wisconsin • 54843 PHONE (715) 634-8934 • FAX (715) 634-4797

January 11, 2010

The Honorable Jim Doyle Governor – State of Wisconsin PO Box 7863 Madison WI 53707-7863

Mr. Tony Evers State Superintendent of Public Instruction PO Box 7841 Madison WI 53707-7841

Dear Governor Doyle and Superintendent Evers:

The Lac Courte Oreilles Tribal Governing Board/School Board fully supports the reform initiatives that comprise Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers' Race to the Top Application for Wisconsin. We are excited about this new era for education in Wisconsin, where students will be held to the same high standards as students in other states and around the world, and these additional federal resources will be directed to initiatives that research has shown will improve the overall quality of education in our state.

It is the mission of the Lac Courte Oreilles Ojibwe School to provide the proper guidance to maximize the spiritual, cultural, intellectual, physical, emotional, social and well being of each individual, to ensure that all who attend our school will become productive and contributing citizens of the LCO community, state, nation and world in their own unique way.

Though we are a private school, a tribally controlled school funded through a Grant with the U.S. Bureau of Indian Education, our school has adopted the standards of the State of Wisconsin and has reached AYP for five years. Yet, we are deeply concerned about what happens to our students after they leave our school and their continued success in further education. We need to increase our college enrollment and success rates. We need to take a closer and longer-range look at assessment reports to assist us in preparing our children to become productive and contributing citizens of the Lac Courte Oreilles Ojibwe community and the State of Wisconsin. We believe that the Rate to the Top Initiatives, with a focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) can provide great assistance for teachers and students to meet the challenges our students face at the college level.

Our organization is committed to the Race to the Top reforms and stands ready to help implement the reforms laid out in the state plan:

Sincere

Brian Bisopette, Secretary/Treasurer Lac Courte Oreilles Tribal Governing Board/School Board



WILLIAM BESON TRIBAL ADMINISTRATOR

January 13, 2010

Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians P.O. Box 67 Lac du Flambeau, WI 54538

Dear Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers:

The Lac du Flambeau Tribe fully supports the reform initiatives that comprise Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers' Race to the Top Application for Wisconsin. We are excited about this new era for education in Wisconsin, where students will be held to the same high standards as students in other states and around the world, and these additional federal resources will be directed to initiatives that research has shown will improve the overall quality of education in our state.

Our organization is committed to the Race to the Top reforms and stands ready to help implement the reforms laid out in the state plan.

Sincerely liam Beson, Administrator

Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians

P.O. Box 67 - Lac du Flambeau, Wisconsin 54538 • (715) 588-3303 • FAX# - (715) 588-7930

413

Office of the Dean, College of Engineering



January 11, 2010

Office of Governor Jim Doyle 115 East, State Capitol PO Box 7863 Madison, WI. 53707

Dear Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers;

This letter is being written by me, the OPUS DEAN of the College of Engineering here at Marquette University, in enthusiastic support of the reform initiatives that comprise Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers 'RACE TO THE TOP' APPLICATION FOR OUR STATE OF WISCONSIN.

Here in our College of Engineering at Marquette University, we are intensely engaged in enhancing the education of our students of our state, focusing on high standards and assessment as well as hands-on Discovery Learning, all targeted to build an enhanced workforce for the 21st century.

Because we are an engineering college, we have invested heavily in engaging students from all ages, classes and backgrounds and races, in STEM related activities, designed specifically to build a world-class innovative workforce for our country capable of leading the world in new innovation that results in new products, new processes and new services (see the attached summary). In so doing, we not only help provide an enhanced workforce, but we are ensuring that this country has the developed workforce to maintain and grow our standard of living and our quality of life.

Hence, we are enthusiastic supporters of the plan proposed by the State of Wisconsin in its Race To The Top proposal, for it will raise standards, conduct useful assessments to fill an available data system, it will provide enhanced teacher training thus enabling low performing schools to raise their results, and it will raise overall achievement by all members of our society.

As this proposal gets deployed, we, here in our College of Engineering, offer to serve on a state-wide STEM TEAM or STEM BOARD, as a component of the state's RACE TO THE TOP program that could provide guidance and leadership direction for how the available support funds could be optimally used. In addition, we would be pleased to collaboratively join forces with other academic institutions of higher learning, as well as industrial and business partners, to carefully lay out a roadmap for future workforce needs and development, thus ensuring that the efforts of this proposed work match the needs of our collective future.

APPENDIX 11 - (A)(2)(ii) RTTT LETTERS OF SUPPORT FINAL Office of the Dean, College of Engineering

Finally and summarily, I and we fully endorse the Race To The Top application of the State of Wisconsin, we commend our Governor and our State Superintendent for their aggressive leadership in developing this application, and we guarantee our enthusiastic, team based collaboration to make this proposal exceed all expectations.

Aten Joskolski

Stanley V. Jaskolski, Ph.D. OPUS Dean of Engineering

STEM ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY: RTTT MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN

Here at Marquette University, the College of Engineering, we have a huge, robust STEM ENGAGEMENT activity focused totally to INCREASING THE PIPELINE OF YOUNG STUDENTS STUDYING ENGINEERING AND SCIENCE.

We have invested in this for 5 years now and over that time, our incoming freshmen classes have increased by 46%. So, we feel good about our activities in that we are seeing great results.

Listed below, are the key strategic tactics we have used to accomplish these kinds of results. These tactics were all developed within our College by our faculty working with high schools, grade schools and Milwaukee industries. I describe them below, being brief and pointed.

1. First, we have engaged grade school, middle school and high school students in what we call DISCOVERY LEARNING (DL) ACADEMIES, that are two to five day HANDS ON, FUN FILLED, LEARNING ACTIVITIES for classes of 8 to 26 students at a time, in a wide array of technical areas such as robotics, water quality, bio-medical engineering, energy, environment, bridge building, etc. The key in our DL Academies is to help the students have fun in learning what an engineer does, what an engineer is, and to show the student that he or she too can do this, it doesn't take a genius.

We hold almost 50 of these academies each year and because of that we annually have 500 to 1,000 grade school, middle school and high school students in our engineering labs having great fun, learning about engineering and becoming believers that they too can do it. In turn, many of these students will enroll somewhere in engineering, and we feel that is great success.

2. Secondly, we support 13 high schools and middle schools in teaching PROJECT LEAD THE WAY COURSES in these schools. This PLTW curriculum is a dynamite way for these pre-college schools to help their students learn about and become inquisitive of engineering. In addition, youngsters who graduate from the PLTW curriculum automatically get a \$1,000.00 scholarship to our College of Engineering here at Marquette University.

3. Thirdly, we support any high school that develops a team to compete in the FIRST ROBOTICS competition with \$2,000.00 to help purchase the components, with faculty mentors to guide the students in building the robots, and we let the robotic teams use our labs to build their robots.

4. We in our College started a high/grade school SCIENCE/ENGINEERING FAIR that now draws almost 200 students to Marquette's campus where the winners get up to \$25,000.00 scholarships to our College of Engineering. This Science/Engineering Fair allows us to identify great students who we in turn recruit.

5. Fifth, we started an annual two day conference held here on our campus that attracts high school and middle school faculty and administrators from the Milwaukee Public School and Private School systems, as well as interested local industries, that focuses all of those two days on STEM, what works, what doesn't work, and draws national speakers in STEM. We have held this conference now for 6 years. The Governor this last year also joined us as does the Mayor of Milwaukee.

The Conference is called 'sySTEM NOW!, which stands for 'STRENGTHENING YOUTH IN STEM', and has been extremely successful in raising the importance of STEM EDUCATION in the greater

Milwaukee area. This conference draws in excess of 250 participants each year, and is a great way to motivate faculty and administrators to get stem related activities going in their schools.

6. Sixth, in Milwaukee, there is a local organization that is over 100 years old, called the ESM, ENGINEERS AND SCIENTISTS OF MILWAUKEE. Working with ESM, we have a focal point for all STEM RELATED ACTIVITIES by anyone in the Southeast Wisconsin area, and as such, to serve as a data based clearing house for anyone wanting to start a STEM ACTIVITY IN THEIR COMPANY, THEIR SCHOOL OR CHURCH OR ORGANIZATION. To that end, ESM hired a new Director who came from industry who is a passionate leader for STEM. This is working extremely well and is another huge resource pushing STEM in the Milwaukee area.

7. Seventh, high school and middle school teachers unfortunately are not engineers or scientists and hence don't really know STEM. So, we here in the College of Engineering at Marquette University wrote a NSF proposal to start a 5 year program whereby a graduate gets both an engineering degree plus a teaching certificate that qualifies the graduate to teach in Wisconsin schools. NSF awarded us the proposal, it is now in its second year, and in steady state it will graduate 15 engineer/teachers every year, thus making available new teachers who really know engineering and can motivate students.

8. Eighth, we have raised about \$32 million to endow a scholarship fund just for Engineering students who could not otherwise afford to come to Marquette. This great endowment allows us now to award 160, \$10,000.00 scholarships each year and that is a game changer in terms of helping new engineering students come to our College.

9. Ninth, we will work with any high school, middle school or grade school that wants to start anything in engineering to help kids learn about the beauty and utility of becoming engineers. As an example, we taught a one semester course in an all girls high school in engineering. Sixteen girls were in that class. This year, 13 of those girls are in their sophomore year in our College of Engineering. As another example, we give afternoon and summer jobs in our research labs to game-changing high school students. These unique jobs again motivate these students to become engineering students in our College.

10. Tenth, we put together an Office of Enrollment Management, headed by our Dr. Jon Jensen. It is this office and its staff that is responsible for all these great activities.

Hence, the College of Engineering at Marquette University has demonstrated visionary leadership and commitment to Race To The Top principals and activities.



Tom Barrett Mayor, City of Milwaukee

January 13, 2009

Governor Doyle and Superintendent Evers:

I am writing to express my support for the reform initiatives that comprise Wisconsin's Race to the Top Application.

As Mayor of our State's largest city, I am very concerned about the state of our current school system and the effect that has on our children, families and the future success of our city and State. Over 70% of MPS 10th graders are not proficient in Math and 60% are not proficient in Reading on the State's tests. For every 2 students who graduate from MPS, one drops out, and 80% of graduates who attend the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee need remedial coursework. We must reverse those trends and doing so requires bold reforms.

The MPS Innovation and Improvement Advisory Council that I chaired submitted a report with recommendations for Race to the Top for your consideration. Several of the recommendations from the Council were included and I believe those reforms will not only strengthen the application, but have the potential to improve outcomes for our children.

It is critical to ensure a core of effective teachers and leaders to have a successful school system. Under the Race to the Top plan, districts will be required to strengthen teacher mentoring and professional development and to establish evaluation systems for teachers and principals that incorporate student outcomes.

The plan will also require MPS to turnaround its five worst struggling schools so that students in those schools can learn in a new or transformed environment which has the characteristics that are linked to success. This will hopefully become a model for how we address additional schools that are not providing our children with the opportunity for success they deserve.

I also fully support the establishment of the Wisconsin Initiative for Neighborhoods and Schools for Children (WINS for Children), which is modeled on the successful Harlem Children's Zone. I look forward to being part of making those centers a success. Another model, that I am glad will be explored as part of the Race to the Top application

Office of the Mayor • City Hall • 200 East Wells Street • Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202 (414) 286-2200 • fax (414) 286-3191 • mayor@milwaukee.gov

is the establishment of a Research Entity focused on Milwaukee Public Schools, similar to the Consortium on School Research in Chicago. There are many stakeholders who want to support education reform and such an entity will help inform what initiatives are and are not working so we can invest our resources most effectively.

Thank you for submitting this application on behalf Wisconsin's students and we look forward to the improvements that can be realized if Wisconsin is awarded the grant.

Dan Barrett

Tom Barrett Mayor



MENOMINEE INDIAN TRIBE OF WISCONSIN CHAIRMAN'S OFFICE

P.O. Box 910 Keshena, WI 54135-0910

Monday, January 11, 2010

Governor Jim Doyle Office of the Governor 115 East State Capitol Madison, WI 53702

Tony Evers, PhD State Superintendent of Public Instruction Department of Public Instruction 125 S. Webster Street, P. O. Box 7841 Madison, WI 53707-7841

RE: RACE TO THE TOP APPLICATION FOR WISCONSIN

Dear Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers:

The Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin strongly supports the reform initiatives that comprise Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers' Race to the Top Application for Wisconsin. We are excited about this new era for education in Wisconsin where students will be held to the same high standards as students in other states and around the world. These additional federal resources will be directed to initiatives that research has shown will improve the overall quality of education in our state.

The Menominee Indian Tribe has over 8,400 enrolled members with about half living on our Reservation. The Tribe recognizes the importance that education plays in trying to raise our members out of poverty. We believe that the Race to the Top funding could help with that tremendously.

Over 1,000 Menominee children attend the Menominee Indian Public School. The school does what it can to provide a quality education for our children, but lacks the resources and tools to help our children who face many problems. We believe our public schools are the type of schools that President Obama and Congress had in mind when they passed Race to the Top.

In addition, the Menominee Indian Tribe operates our own tribal school with nearly 200 children attending kindergarten through eighth grades. We work hard to find the resources to prepare our children for a secondary education, but find there are never enough resources to do what we

think could be done to improve the children's education. Race to the Top funding could be of a valuable assistance here too.

The Menominee Indian Tribe is committed to the Race to the Top reforms and stands ready to help implement the reforms laid out in the state plan.

Should you wish to discuss this further, please contact me at the address above or you may call me at 715-799-5114 at your convenience.

Respectfully Lisa S. Waukau

Lisa S. Waukau Menominee Tribal Chairman

Cc: File

WISCONSIN EDUCATION ASSOCIATION COUNCIL

Affiliated with the National Education Association

January 15, 2010



Dear Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers:

WEAC, Wisconsin's largest union of educators, submits this letter for inclusion in our state's application for the first round of Race to the Top grants.

We represent 98,000 members who are dedicated to great schools for all of our students, not just for today but into the future. Many challenges face our schools and districts, particularly in those serving students in poverty whether urban or rural. Finding solutions to these challenges requires us to work in collaboration with communities, school governance and administrative leaders, as well as with state and regional legislative and policy leaders. It's in the best interest of our state to build a quality support network in support of student learning.

These partnerships, in addition to the involvement of the federal government in reform, take time to develop. Although this grant-writing process has not reflected what we believe is the best example of Wisconsin's collaborative history, the overview we have received of the state plan looks to include many initiatives that could potentially benefit Wisconsin's schools should a federal grant be awarded, such as revising standards and creating balanced assessments that inform teaching practice and improve instruction; respectful and responsible use of student data in evaluation of school and educator performance; and quality professional development and mentoring to maximize effective practice. These are all areas we have been and continue to work with education stakeholders in creating and implementing, despite financial challenges for our state and districts.

Early childhood and 4-year-old Kindergarten, specific transition programs to address the needs of 9th grade students, middle school mentoring and tutoring support, and deepening student understanding through engaging, challenging math and science courses – these are important research-based strategies to catch students before achievement gaps become insurmountable.

While the state's application strives to improve school quality, it fails to address the systemic problem of an inadequate and outdated school funding system within our state. Without comprehensive school funding reform, revenue caps and a declining financial commitment to education will continue to jeopardize the quality education that can be offered in Wisconsin.

Sincerely

Mary Bell) president Wisconsin Education Association Council

Mary Bell, President Dan Burkhalter, Executive Director

608.276.7711 800.362.8034

٩



January 13, 2010

Office of Governor Jim Doyle 115 East, State Capitol PO Box 7863 Madison, WI 53707

Dear Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers:

STEM education in Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS) is central to the future of our city's youth and employers alike. *MPS STEM Partners* was formed to promote educational programs and events in MPS as a positive attribute in our community.

Coming together as a direct result of the first "sySTEMnow" conference in 2004, *MPS STEM Partners* has provided opportunities for Milwaukee's business community to interact with MPS students on meaningful STEM projects and activities. The team has grown to include dozens of active businesses and post secondary partners, exposing MPS students not only to STEM-related educational pathways and career opportunities, but also providing the local face of potential employers.

The *MPS STEM Partners* Executive Committee strongly endorses the STEM-specific component of the state plan... "Investing in STEM -- Building off our currently successful STEM efforts to ensure that more students have access to high-quality STEM courses and training".

Our partners actively, enthusiastically, and successfully engage with MPS students on programs such as Project Lead The Way (PLTW), *FIRST* LEGO League, *FIRST* Robotics Competition, the Badger State Science and Engineering Fair, Future City Competition, Construction Challenge, Fluid Power Challenge, iFAIRs, iCamps, Gateway Academies, ESM's Website Design Camp, etc.

The *MPS STEM Partners* Executive Committee believes there is strong potential to scale up these successes in the context of the overall STEM strategy outlined in the Race to the Top application, and that doing so will continue to create excitement and interest amongst our MPS students for the educational pathways and career opportunities that are available to them.

an Wall

Van Walling, Chair MPS STEM Partners Executive Committee



Post Office Box 365

Phone: (920) 869-2214



Oneida, Wi 54155



UGWA DEMOLUM YATEHE Because of the help of this Oneida Chief in cementing a friendship between the six nations and the colony of Pennsylvania, a new nation, the United States was made possble.

Oneidas bringing several hundred bags of corn to Washington's starving army at Valley Forge, after the colonists had consistently refused to aid them.

1-12-2010

Governor Doyle State Capital P.O. Box 7863 Madison, WI 53707

Dear Governor Doyle:

The Oneida Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin fully supports the reform initiatives that comprise Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers' Race to the Top Application for Wisconsin. We are excited about this new era for education in Wisconsin, where students will be held to the same high standards as students in other states and around the world, and these additional federal resources will be directed to initiatives that research has shown will improve the overall quality of education in our state.

The Oneida Reservation is divided into five public school districts and a majority of our youth attends public schools. Ensuring our youth receive a quality education is vital to the continued prosperity of our great Nation. Furthermore, a portion of our mission states "The Oneida family will be strengthened through the values of our Oneida identity by providing housing, promoting education, protecting the land, and preserving the environment." The four reform areas Wisconsin has chosen will lead to student achievement, decreasing achievement gaps, increase high school graduation rates, and increase college enrollment rates and will serve as a strong foundation for our next generation of leaders.

The Oneida Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin is committed to the Race to the Top reforms and stands ready to help implement the reforms laid out in the state plan.

Sincerely & Ifil

Richard G Hill, Chairman



January 12, 2010

Office of Governor Jim Doyle 115 East, State Capitol PO Box 7863 Madison, WI 53707

Dear Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers:

Project Lead The Way (PLTW) is a nationally-acclaimed, interdisciplinary, pre-engineering program that provides middle and high school students with the 21st-century skills in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) needed to succeed in a globalized economy.

First implemented in Wisconsin in 1999, PLTW has since grown from two high schools to more than 200 middle and high schools in urban, suburban, and rural areas across the state. Wisconsin currently ranks fourth in the nation in the number of active PLTW schools with more than 20,000 Wisconsin students benefitting from PLTW's rigorous, standards-aligned curriculum and hands-on learning activities.

Consider the following facts regarding PLTW in Wisconsin:

▶PLTW is "Best Practice"- Its rigorous, project-based learning curriculum helps to build the 21st-century STEM workforce pipeline. In recent, independently-conducted studies using school-specific student course-taking and achievement data, graduating PLTW seniors --when compared to a matched sample of non-PLTW seniors – demonstrated: (a) significantly higher ACT scores in math and science (27-28, compared to 23) and (b) significantly greater engagement in career exploration activities during high school. Moreover, PLTW seniors in urban high schools had significantly higher attendance during their senior year, producing 7-8 additional days of learning opportunities annually.

>PLTW Meets State and National Objectives - Complementing existing Wisconsin initiatives such as Grow Wisconsin, the Wisconsin Covenant, and the Youth Apprenticeship Program, PLTW has been recognized as a premier education program by the Wisconsin

Technology Council. Additionally, the program aligns with national and state standards in math, science, and technology.

> PLTW is Recognized by Colleges and Universities - Joining others across the nation, Wisconsin's private universities, the Wisconsin Technical College System, the University of Wisconsin System, and the University of Wisconsin Extension and Cooperative Extension recognize PLTW's impact and reward student completion with credit, advanced standing, and/or scholarships.

>PLTW is a Public/Private Partnership - Public and private partners have joined together with innovative middle and high schools to ensure that PLTW is growing and sustainable in Wisconsin's classrooms to benefit our students, teachers, communities, and employers.

Wisconsin's PLTW State Leadership Team and Executive Council supports the STEM-related reform initiatives that comprise Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers' Race to the Top Application for our state.

We are excited about this new era for education in Wisconsin, where students will be held to the high standards as students around the world. These additional federal resources will be directed toward implementing initiatives that research has shown will improve the overall quality of education in our state... initiatives like PLTW.

With PLTW as a recognized best practice in STEM education, we could not agree more with the application's proposal for "*Investing in STEM -- Building off our currently successful STEM efforts to ensure that more students have access to high-quality STEM courses and training.*"

Race to the Top funding will allow Wisconsin to maintain and improve upon our standing as a national leader in PLTW implementation. With these resources we will create in each community the STEM-focused teaching, learning, and career development context, which will, in turn, assure that all students leave high school ready to succeed in both college and career pursuits. In doing so, we can further leverage the significant investment that has already been realized through state funding, district resources, and more than \$5 million in program support from local business and industry partners and the philanthropic community.

Wisconsin's PLTW State Leadership Team and Executive Council proudly and enthusiastically supports this application.

Sincerely,

PLTW Wisconsin - State Leadership Team

Lauren Baker Milwaukee Public Schools

Darla Burton CESA #3 Monica Butler Waunakee School District

Scott Fromader Wisconsin Dept of Workforce Development

Greg Granberg Madison Metropolitan School District

Dale Hanson Appleton Area School District

Steve Huth Janesville Schools Outdoor Laboratory

Jon Jensen Marquette University

Brent Kindred Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

James Mackey Wisconsin Technical College System

Robert Marlowe Wausau School District

Allen Phelps University of Wisconsin – Madison Greg Quam Platteville High School

Steve Salter Milwaukee School of Engineering

Mark Schroll Kern Family Foundation

Frank Steck University of Wisconsin – Platteville

Sylvia Tiala University of Wisconsin – Stout

Karen Wilken Kern Family Foundation

Greg Wright Kenosha Unified School District No. 1

PLTW Wisconsin - Executive Council

Bill Bourbonnais Wisconsin Public Service (Retired)

Sujeet Chand Rockwell Automation

Dan Clancy Wisconsin Technical College System

Steve Cramer University of Wisconsin – Madison

Brett Davis Wisconsin State Legislature

Tony Evers Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

Roberta Gassman Wisconsin Dept of Workforce Development

Jim Haney Wisconsin Manufacturers and Commerce Michael Jansen IIW Engineering and Surveyors

Stan Jaskolski Marquette University

Bob Jeffers X-nth Inc.

Brent Kindred Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

Anne Lutz Alliant Energy

Bob Meyer Wisconsin Indianhead Technical College

Jeff Nack 3M

Reggie Newson Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Ron Perez University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee

Dianne Reynolds Wisconsin Dept of Workforce Development

Lisa Riedle University of Wisconsin – Platteville

Corri Schmidt 3M

Gary Stroyny Greenheck Fan Corporation

Don Sykes Milwaukee Area Workforce Investment Board Matthew Tadisch Gilbane Building Company

Dorothy Valentine Harley-Davdison (Retired)

Hermann Viets Milwaukee School of Engineering

Van Walling Engineers & Scientists of Milwaukee

Jesse Wright Adecco Technical APPENDIX 11 - (A)(2



S OF SUPPORT FINAL

January 15, 2010

To: Governor Jim Doyle and State Superintendent Evers

The Racine Area Manufacturers and Commerce (RAMAC) is supporting the State of Wisconsin's efforts to obtain a "Race to the Top" grant for \$250 million.

RAMAC's mission is:

- To strengthen and maintain a solid, diversified, economic base, one that ensures a healthy business climate and a prosperous, progressive community.
- To promote and protect the fundamentals of the private free enterprise system as the foundation of our nation.
- To help its members manage more effectively, efficiently and productively by excelling in the delivery of Personnel, Research and Management Training Services.
- To provide the necessary business leadership and service in cooperation with other public and private sectors aimed at improving the quality of life in the Racine area.

The State goals are as follows: student achievement, decreasing achievement gaps, increasing high school graduation rates, and increasing college enrollment rates. Their main proposals to achieve these goals are:

- Raising standards -- joined consortium with 48 other states to have internationally benchmarked standards; will implement in June.
- More useful assessments -- changes to our testing process to provide more meaningful information to teachers
- Expanded data system -- includes the ability to tie students to teachers so that we can ultimately learn what works and what doesn't in education.
- More support for teachers -- both for new teachers through mentoring and for other teachers through coaching.
- Increased capacity at the state and regional level to assist with instructional improvement efforts including providing training for coaches and mentors.
- An emphasis on providing additional supports, particularly in early childhood and middle school to high school transition, in the largest and failing districts to ensure that Wisconsin narrows its achievement gap and raises overall achievement.
- Turning around our lowest performing schools -- enhancing the capacity for MPS and the state to support that effort.
- Providing wraparound services in specific neighborhoods in Milwaukee as a demonstration project to show what can be done to get kids in poverty to achieve at higher levels.
- Investing in STEM -- Building off our currently successful Science, Mathematics, Engineering and Technology efforts to ensure that more students have access to high-quality STEM courses and training.

RAMAC believes that our mission coincides with the State plan and, therefore, supports the effort.

Sincerely,

Roger Caron

Roger Caron President

RACINE AREA MANUFACTURERS AND COMMERCE 300 5th Street, Racine, WI 53403 Ph. (262) 634-1931 Fax (262) 634-7422 www.racin**gedig**mber.com



January 13, 2010

Dear Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers,

The Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa fully supports the reform initiatives that comprise Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers' Race to the Top Application for Wisconsin. We are excited about this new era for education in Wisconsin, where students will be held to the same high standards as students in other states and around the world, and these additional federal resources will be directed to initiatives that research has shown will improve the overall quality of education in our state.

The Red Cliff Tribe and its Division of Education look forward to further dialogue with you and Superintendant Evers that will ensure that this initiative addresses the unique challenges facing the Tribes of Wisconsin. We are most interested in identifying ways that will address the statistical gaps that exist between Native American students and all other races of people.

Our organization is committed to the Race to the Top reforms and stands ready to help implement the reforms laid out in the state plan.

Sincerely,

Rose Soulier, Chairperson Tribal Council Cc: Delores Gokee-Rindal, Administrator Division of Education Mark Montano, Director of Tribal Operations

Eileen M. Walter Director, Global Community Relations

> 1201 S. Second St. Milwaukee, WI 53204 Tel. 414.382.1548 emwalter@ra.rockwell.com

Rockwell Automation

January 12, 2009

Office of Governor Jim Doyle 115 East, State Capitol PO Box 7863 Madison, WI 53707

Dear Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers:

At Rockwell Automation our vision is to be THE most valued global provider of innovative industrial automation and information products, services and solutions. Our mission statement reads: "We improve the standard of living for everyone by making the world more productive and sustainable." In order to fulfill our mission and accomplish our vision, we need innovative thinkers and creative problem solvers---a STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) capable workforce.

Consequently, we have invested the majority of our philanthropic resources and efforts in the education area, and primarily STEM education programs. Our Rockwell Automation Charitable Corporation identified two pillar STEM education programs: Project Lead The Way and *FIRST*. We have reached back to create an education pipeline from middle school to post-secondary with selected MPS partner schools. This should tell you how serious we are about creating a diverse STEM educated talent pool.

In addition, we are doing everything we can to encourage seamless education and build relations with our partner schools throughout the education continuum. We sponsor events to encourage knowledge sharing among middle school, high school, and post-secondary partners. We are recruiting other corporations to join us in our STEM building efforts, and serve with several partners on a regional STEM7 effort, which is led by Van Walling, Engineers & Scientists of Milwaukee. Our STEM working group serves as the catalyst for:

- Increasing awareness of the STEM challenge
- Creating partnerships and collaborative efforts between education and the workforce
- Bringing consistency, efficiency, and synergy to existing STEM programs (rather than creating new programs)
- Continually assessing and improving the STEM environment

Our mantra, as Van Walling so aptly put it, is "collaborate now and compete later." We cannot do this alone – we need everyone to work together.

We also need the students in Wisconsin, our global headquarters state, to be held to the same high standards as students in other states and around the world. We strongly endorse the STEM-specific component of the state plan: "Investing in STEM -- Building off our currently successful STEM efforts to ensure that more students have access to high-quality STEM courses and training."

We firmly believe that students in our pipeline, as well as those in STEM programs around our State, will be the creators and innovators of tomorrow—to help solve complex societal problems and improve people's quality of life, health and environment. They are going to be the economic development engines in future years. Everyone along the education continuum—including corporations who rely heavily on the "end product"—must work together and learn from each other to create better outcomes. Our viability as a State and nation is depending on it.

Ellen Matter


Sokaogon Chippewa Community

3051 Sand Lake Road, Crandon, WI 54520 Phone: (715) 478-7500 * Fax: (715) 478-5275

www.sokaogonchippewa.com



January 12, 2010

Sokaogon Chippewa Community 3051 Sand Lake Road Crandon, WI 54520

Dear Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers:

The Sokaogon Chippewa Community fully supports the reform initiatives that comprise Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers' Race to the Top Application for Wisconsin. We are excited about this new era for education in Wisconsin, where students will be held to the same high standards as students in other states and around the world, and these additional federal resources will be directed to initiatives that research has shown will improve the overall quality of education in our state.

It is the mission of the Sokaogon Chippewa Community to provide "Quality Educational Opportunities" to its children and to assist the State of Wisconsin in all its efforts to provide those opportunities. As we are all aware, this is only possible through skilled and well trained educators. Skills which therefore, are delivered to all students through this unique, fact based state plan as outlined in Goal (D) " *To provide structures and resources that will increase teacher and principal effectiveness and encourage high-quality t*

The Sokaogon Chippewa Community is committed to the Race to the Top reforms and stands ready to help implement the reforms laid out in the state plan.

Sincerely n Arlyn Ackley Sr.

Chairman

Ga-na-waji Ga-wi-nug Way-ji-mooki-ji-wung Yi-ewe-meing-gun-a-sepii

St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin

24663 Angeline Avenue • Webster, WI 54893 • (715) 349-2195 • Fax (715) 349-5768

January 13, 2010

Re:

Mr. Anthony Evers, State Superintendent Wisconsin State Capitol, P.O. Box 7841, Madison, WI. 53707-7841



Dear Mr. Evers: The <u>St</u> b. Fully supports the Chippewa Indians of reform initiatives that you and State Superintendent Evers; in applying for \$250 million from Congres

Race to the Top Application for Wisconsin

S Through the American Recovery and Reinvestment ctePresident Obama and Congress provided \$4 billion in competitive grant funding to states that move forward with innovations and reform in education. We are excited about this new era for education in Wisconsin, where all students will be held to the same hight standards as students in other states and around the world; and these additional federal resources will be directed to initiatives that research has shown will improve the overall quality of education in Wisconsin

Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin, is committed to the Race to the Top reforms and stands ready to help implement the reforms laid out in the State of Wisconsin's Plan

Sincerely.

Lewis-Taylor, Chairman St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin

Lewis Taylor Tribal Chairman Big Sand Lake Community Danbury Community

Beverly Benjamin Tribal Vice-Chairwoman

David "Maabin" Merrill Secretary/Treasurer Round Lake-Community

Elmer J. Emery Representative Big Sand Lake Community

67⁸⁵¹⁸

Jeanne Awonohopay Representative Maple Plain Community Jan. 13. 2010 10:21AM 0 10:21AM ST CROIX TRIBAL COUNCIL APPENDIX 11 - (A)(2)(ii) RTTT LETTERS OF SUPPORT FINAL

St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin

24663 Angeline Avenue • Webster, Wi 54893 • (715) 349-2195 • Fax (715) 349-5768

January 13, 2010

COPI

Governor Jim Doyle, 115 East, State Capitol, Madison, WL 53702

Race to the Top Application for Re: Dear Governor Doyles The SECTOR Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin fully supports the reform initiatives that you and State Superintendent Evers; in applying for \$250 million from Congress. "Through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, President Obama and Congress provided \$4 billion an competitive grant funding to states that move forward with innovations and reform in education. We are excited about this new era for education in Wisconsm, where all students will be held to the same hight standards as students in other states, and around the world; and these additional federal resources will be directed to initiatives that research has shown will improve the overall quality of education in Wisconsin.

The St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin, is committed to the Race to the Top reforms and stands ready to help implement the reforms laid out in the State of Wisconsin's Plan. ^{\$}\$\$\$\$\$

Sincerely,

Lewis Taylor, Chairman St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin

Lewis Taylor Tribal Chairman

Beverly Benjamin Tribal Vice-Chairwoman Big Sand Lake Community Danbury Community

David "Maabin" Merrill Secretary/Treasulter Round Lake Community

Elmer J. Emery Representative Big Sand Lake Community

Jeanne Awonohopay Representative Maple Plain Community

APPENDIX 11 - (A)(2)(ii) RTTT LETTERS OF SUPPORT FINAL Stockbridge-Munsee Community

BAND OF THE MOHICAN INDIANS TRIBAL COUNCIL OFFICES

January 13, 2010

Dear Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers:

The Stockbridge-Munsee Community fully supports the reform initiatives that comprise the Race to the Top Application for Wisconsin.

The Tribe is very excited about this new era for education in Wisconsin, where students will be held to the same high standards as students in other states and around the world, and these additional federal resources will be directed to initiatives that research has shown will improve the overall quality of education in our state.

One of the Stockbridge-Munsee Community's top priorities is Education. The Community, along with its Education Staff, is continuously working with the local school districts to make sure students have the proper foundation to achieve their educational goals. The Community knows that all children have different learning styles and that Wisconsin's Race to the Top application will provide more training for teachers, which will increase graduation rates and prepare our children for college.

The Stockbridge-Munsee Community is committed to the Race to the Top reforms and stands ready to help implement the reforms laid out in the state plan.

Gregory L. Miller, Vice President Stockbridge-Munsee Community



Office of the President APPENDIX 11 - (A)(2)(ii) RTTT LETTERS OF SUPPORT FINAL 1220 Linden Drive Madison, Wisconsin 53706-1559 (608) 262-2321 (608) 262-3985 Fax

email: kreilly@uwsa.edu website: http://www.uwsa.edu

January 13, 2010

Governor Jim Doyle State of Wisconsin PO Box 7863 Madison, WI 53707-7863 State Superintendent Tony Evers Department of Public Instruction PO Box 7841 Madison, WI 53707-7841

Dear Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide a letter in support of the reform initiatives that comprise Wisconsin's Race to the Top application. As you know, the University of Wisconsin System is one of the largest systems of public higher education in the country, serving some 178,000 students each year. Additionally, based on yearly production data, the UW System contributes over 60% of the new educators who prepare to enter the state's PK-12 workforce. Given the impact our institutions have on the state, we are truly excited to be active partners in this effort.

In reviewing the application, it was perfectly clear to me that the fundamental goals of the Race to the Top are aligned with the mission of the University of Wisconsin System, which is focused on providing Wisconsin with world-class educational opportunities, research, and public service. UW System is committed to growing Wisconsin's knowledge economy by helping more state residents earn college degrees, and we are working hard to implement effective options that open the doors of the university to talented students from across Wisconsin, regardless of background.

The *Growth Agenda for Wisconsin* is the UW System's vision to help the state of Wisconsin and its citizens thrive in the 21st century. The plan has three goals: to produce more well-prepared college graduates, to help create new 21st century Wisconsin jobs, and to strengthen local communities.

Many of the initiatives that have emerged from the Growth Agenda complement one or more of the Race to the Top target areas. For example, as the PK-12 system is working to adopt the English Language Arts Common Core Standards and the Mathematics Common Core standards, faculty from our institutions are partnering with local school teachers to create a more coherent alignment of the middle and high school curriculums with the courses needed for college access and success.

The UW System is committed to the reforms that are detailed in Wisconsin's Race to the Top application, and we stand ready to help implement the various initiatives laid out in the state plan.

Sincerely. Kevin P. Reilly President

Universities: Madison, Milwaukee, Eau Claire, Green Bay, La Crosse, Oshkosh, Parkside, Platteville, River Falls, Stevens Point, Stout, Superior, Whitewater. Colleges: Baraboo/Sauk County, Barron County, Fond du Lac, Fox Valley, Manitowoc, Marathon County, Marinette, Marshfield/Wood County, Richland, Rock County, Sheboygan, Washington County, Waukesha. Extension: Statewide.



Dear Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers:

The University Research Park is fully supportive of Wisconsin's application for the "Race to the Top" initiative proposed by President Obama in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. It is my understanding that our state is applying for a competitive grant in the amount of \$250 million. The plan is focused on four major reform areas including: standards and assessments, data systems, great teachers and leaders, and turning around the lowest performing schools. In the final plan, Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math improvement efforts will be addressed.

The University Research Park is a world class science and technology facility that provides infrastructure for technology based companies that are spin off of the University of Wisconsin-Madison. As such, we are very interested in helping to improve our K-12 education system in Wisconsin, as it provides the future workforce for our science and technology companies in the University Research Park. The current park houses more than 100 companies, which employ close to 4,000 highly skilled employees. The secret to have successful companies is to ensure that we have the workforce capacity to work in those companies. With this grant, the State of Wisconsin would work to achieve goals of raising standards, improving our assessment methodology, turning around the lowest performing schools, and investing in STEM education.

University Research Park is committed to improving the economy by helping to grow good companies and create good jobs. We also look forward to helping our state to do what we can to improve education quality for our students. The "Race to the Top" grant program will help us make an important first step in that effort.

Best Wishes,

Mark f. Bufe

Mark D. Bugher

Director

510 Charmany Drive Suite 250 Madison, WI 53719

P. 608.441.8000 F. 608.441.8010

universityresearchpark.org



Office of Governor Jim Doyle State Capitol 115 East Madison, WI 53707

January 13, 2010

Dear Governor Doyle,

I am writing to confirm our enthusiastic support of and deep commitment to the goals of Wisconsin's Race to the Top proposal. The Value-Added Research Center is proud to be included in this important work. We also believe that energetic engagement in the work of supporting Wisconsin schools and districts is the core of the Wisconsin Idea and exactly what a major research university should be doing.

Our ongoing work with districts in Wisconsin and across the U.S. has reinforced our belief that the only path to improvement is through system-wide reform with a focus on school productivity. Wisconsin's current statewide value-added system is an example of a co-developed infrastructure focused on improving our understanding of what is working in our schools and districts. The broad range of reforms outlined in Wisconsin's Race to the Top proposal has the breadth needed to tackle complex problems. The combination of a new, strong cabinet level office in the Department of Public Instruction with generous support for districts and the regional service agencies ensure that the project will have access to senior leaders and will have the resources in hand to execute the mission.

We believe that much of the Value-Added Research Center's research and product portfolio can be leveraged to provide considerable additional benefits to the state of Wisconsin. Reporting and analytic services developed for other districts and states can be leveraged to lower development costs and deliver advances in value-added modeling.

Finally, we have very much appreciated the opportunity to work with staff from DPI and the governor's office as we assisted in crafting the language of the proposal. Those discussions about shared goals, plans for new assessments, etc. are already bearing fruit.

Sincerely,

Christopher A. Thorn Associate Scientist Associate Director, Value-Added Research Center University of Wisconsin-Madison

Wisconsin Association for Colleges of Teacher Education

Dear Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers:

The Wisconsin Association for Colleges of Teacher Education fully supports the ideal of an effective teacher in every PK-12 classroom in Wisconsin. We are equally committed to quality educator preparation programs that actualize the knowledge, performances, and dispositions embodied in the Wisconsin Standards for Teacher Licensure and Development. We are excited about the opportunities that the Race to the Top funding offers Wisconsin as students are held to high standards that are meaningful as they prepare for life in the 21st century. We also support the use of additional federal resources for initiatives that research has shown will improve the overall quality of education in our state. Currently Alverno College, the University of Wisconsin at Eau Claire and the University of Wisconsin at Madison are engaged in a pilot Teacher Performance Assessment project to develop a model of embedded signature performance assessments and a common capstone assessment that will assess teachers' ability to plan, instruct, reflect, and assess. The Teacher Performance Assessment will meet the profession's standards for validity and reliability and will provide educator preparation programs with a credible assessment for ongoing program improvement. As the pilot progresses all educator preparation programs in the state will benefit from an enhanced understanding of effective teaching practices. While some funding has been available from the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education, additional funding is needed to complete the pilot, disseminate the findings at annual Wisconsin Association for Colleges of Teacher Education meetings, and expand the number of participating programs. We believe that funding for the continued implementation of the pilot and eventual expansion of the Teacher Performance Assessment is an important component of the Wisconsin Race to the Top application.

Sincerely, jather Lake Kathy Lake

President, Wisconsin Association for Colleges of Teacher Education

Auguster - Constant Benetis Constant Continuum Brettan Universitat Content - Universitat Content - Constant Forderend - Constant Lower with Constant Lower - Constant

WAICU

WISCONSIN ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

January 13, 2010

The Honorable Jim Doyle Governor of Wisconsin P.O. Box 7863 Madison, WI 53707

The Honorable Tony Evers State Superintendent Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction P.O. Box 7841 Madison, WI 53707-7841

Dear Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers:

The Wisconsin Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (WAICU) supports Wisconsin's Race to the Top application. We are excited about this new era for education in Wisconsin, where students will be encouraged to achieve the highest possible standards. These additional federal resources will help Wisconsin strengthen its work on initiatives that research has shown will improve the quality of education in our state.

Wisconsin's Race to the Top grant is fully supportive of WAICU's mission: "Wisconsin's private colleges—working together to enhance educational opportunity." WAICU-member colleges and universities, in partnership with the state and federal governments, are already doing their part to help the state meet its Race to the Top college enrollment goals. Since 1980, enrollment in Wisconsin's non-profit, independent colleges and universities has grown by 95 percent. WAICU-member colleges and universities are committed to academic success, with a growing enrollment of low-income, minority, and non-traditional students, as well as leading the state in its four-year graduation rate.

WAICU has administered collaborative student access programming for over 30 years, and in recent years has increased targeted programming to both urban and rural high schools with high percentages of low-income students. WAICU members are full participants in the Wisconsin Covenant, working with our partners in the University of Wisconsin System and Wisconsin Technical College System to find a place in a Wisconsin college or university for Covenant Scholars—those high school graduates who, in eighth grade, pledged to demonstrate good citizenship, achieve good grades, and take classes that prepare them for college.

ROLF WEGENKE, Ph.D. President Wisconsin private colleges produce 26 percent of the state's bachelor's degrees, but graduate a disproportionate share of Wisconsin's education and STEM professionals:

29 percent of the state's engineering graduates
30 percent of the state's computer science graduates
33 percent of all teacher education graduates
31 percent of all math teachers
31 percent of all elementary teachers
76 percent of all reading teachers
70 percent of all reading teachers and specialists
77 percent all graduates in educational administration

WAICU looks forward to being an equal partner in advancing opportunity and excellence through Wisconsin's Race to the Top initiatives.

Sincerely,

Rolf Wegenke, Ph.D. President



122 W. Washington Avenue, Madison, WI 53703 Phone: 608-257-2622 • Fax: 608-257-8386 JOHN H. ASHLEY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

January 12, 2010

The Honorable Jim Doyle, Governor State of Wisconsin 115 East, State Capitol Madison, WI 53703

The Honorable Tony Evers, State Superintendent Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction 125 S. Webster Street Madison, WI 53707

Dear Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers:

The Wisconsin Association of School Boards (WASB) supports the Race to the Top application submitted by Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers on behalf of the State of Wisconsin. School board members throughout Wisconsin support many of the initiatives included in our state's plan and, in particular, the efforts to improve the state assessment system to more accurately evaluate student progress and inform instructional practices.

The WASB is dedicated to fostering effective school board practices for student success and is working to develop school board leadership based on research from the Iowa Association of School Boards Lighthouse Project and National School Board Association (NSBA) Key Work framework.

The Lighthouse Project focuses board leadership on professional development and the use of data to determine effective development practices. This focus supports the state's goal to use data to meaningfully inform instructional improvement.

The NSBA Key Work framework takes a systems approach that addresses standards, assessment and accountability along with cultural considerations and defines the board's role in leading the district's efforts to improve student achievement. The framework can help school boards provide leadership through governance that will create the conditions under which successful teaching and learning can occur. It is built on the premise that excellence in the classroom begins with excellence in the boardroom.

Doyle and Evers January 12, 2010 Page 2

The initiatives detailed in the state's Race to the Top application will further the WASB's efforts to foster effective school board practices and inform school board decision-making to improve student achievement. We look forward to working with you as the Race to the Top process continues and the initiatives are implemented.

Aliz

John H. Ashley Executive Director



January 11, 2010

Wisconsin Association of School Business Officials

The Honorable Jim Doyle Office of the Governor PO Box 7863 Madison, WI 53707

Mr. Tony Evers, State Superintendent Department of Public Instruction PO Box 7841 Madison, WI 53707-7841

Dear Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers:

The Wisconsin Association of School Business Officials (WASBO) supports the initiatives contained in the "Race to the Top Application" for Wisconsin as prepared by Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers. WASBO is excited these additional federal resources will be directed to initiatives that will improve the overall quality of education for all of our children.

WASBO is the professional education association for School Business Officials, District Administrators and Support Personnel in Wisconsin that provides leadership, mentorship, coaching, professional development opportunities and a support network for its members. WASBO members advocate for educational opportunities for the children in the State of Wisconsin and work for adequate education funding. WASBO members are the leading experts on significant Wisconsin school business management issues.

This plan's focus on attracting, supporting and developing effective school administrators and teachers holds great potential to improve the achievement of all students in the state. The Wisconsin Association of School Business Officials is committed to the "Race to the Top" reforms and stands ready to help implement the reforms laid out in the state plan.

Sincerely Yours,

Woody Wiedenhoeft Executive Director Wisconsin Association of School Business Officials

4797 Hayes Rd Suite 101 Madison, WI 53704

Phone 608.249.8588 Fax 608.249.3163 www.wasbo.com



State Superintendent Tony Evers Department of Public Instruction PO Box 7841 Madison WI 53707-7841

December 21, 2009

RE: Wisconsin ASCD Letter of Support for Race to the Top Application

Phone: (262) 242-3771 • Fax: (262) 242-1862 www.wascd.org • office@wascd.org Denise Pheifer, Executive Director

Wisconsin ASCD 210 Green Bay Road • Thiensville, WI 53092

REC'D DEC 2 2 2009

Dear Tony:

WASCD, Wisconsin's professional membership organization for excellence in teaching and learning, enthusiastically supports the State of Wisconsin's Race to the Top application. As you know, we have a long history of leadership in effective instructional strategies, assessment, and curriculum development. We bring the research, programming, and resources of ASCD to Wisconsin. ASCD is the worldwide membership organization that develops programs, products and services essential to the way educators learn, teach, and lead.

We are an active partner in Wisconsin education reform through our association with the Department of Public Instruction, colleges, universities, and school districts across the state. WASCD offers a proven record of supporting quality educational reform, and we embrace Race to the Top as the next "step up" in improving education for Wisconsin students.

We already make a significant contribution to the Race to the Top application through our state programs, products, and services. As evidence, we currently offer the following support systems for educators:

Race to the Top Reform Areas	Current Offerings
Standards and assessment adoptiou	 Common Core Standards Initiative Symposium - Feb. 19 2010 Formative Assessment Strategies - two-day program since 2007 WASCD brings national experts on assessment to the state: Ken O'Connor, Tom Guskey, Jay McTighe
Effective teachers	 Effective literacy instruction: Four-day program on Research-based reading strategies since 2003 (over 1000 teachers & administrators trained) Two-day research-based program on developing academic vocabulary since 2007
Effective administrators	 Instructional leadership mentoring and programming: one-on-one mentoring small group support for new instructional leaders (since 2002)
Closing the achievement gap	 WASCD provides national experts to the state such as Carol Tomlinson on differentiation and Richard Rothstein 2010-2011 Art & Science of Teaching Academy (6 days)
Curriculum development	• Annual Conference co-sponsored by DPI with national experts such as Ken Kay, Partnership for 21 st Centnry Skills and Ian Jukes on technology in the classroom

Wisconsin ASCD Letter of Support for Race to the Top Application

We stand willing to take these initiatives and others to scale to support the State of Wisconsin and school districts in need. We have the demonstrated capability to develop and implement high quality programs that improve teaching and learning.

We seek to partner with you and other stakeholders as an active and aggressive participant in cnrrent school reform efforts. To this end, we have invited leaders from across the state and national experts to explore the impact of the Common Core Standards on improving classroom assessment and learning (February 19, 2010). The purpose of this Symposium is to investigate how we can work together to best implement the Common Core Standards Initiative put forth by the Council of Chief State School Officers and the National Governors Association.

Please inform us as to how we can provide additional service to support the State of Wisconsin's efforts to improve teaching and learning through the Race to the Top initiative. We invite you or your representative to attend the Common Core Standards Symposium on February 19th in Madison as our guest.

Respectfully,

Christine Van Hoof President Wisconsin ASCD

flan Hoop

cc Governor Jim Doyle enc Common Core Standards Symposium

PENDIX 11 - (A)(2)(ii) RTIT LET NATORS, INC.

4797 Hayes Road, Madison, WI 53704-3288

Miles Turner, Executive Director

608/242-1090 608/242-1290 FAX http://www.wasda.org

REC'D JAN 1 1 2010

January 8, 2010

Dear Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers:

The Wisconsin Association of School District Administrators (WASDA) fully supports the reform initiatives that comprise Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers' Race to the Top Application for Wisconsin. We are excited about this new era for education in Wisconsin, where students will be held to the same high standards as students in other states and around the world, and these additional federal resources will be directed to initiatives that research has shown will improve the overall quality of education in our state.

WASDA advocates for increasing student achievement and closing the achievement gap in Wisconsin. Our members are dedicated to providing the highest level of education possible for their students. We believe that Race to the Top will provide substantial support for achieving these goals.

Our organization is committed to the Race to the Top reforms and stands ready to help implement the reforms laid out in the state plan.

Sincerely,

Willip

Miles Turner Executive Director

EXECUTIVE OFFICERS

Terms expire 6/30/10

GREGG LUNDBERG President Maple Public Schools P.O. Box 188 Maple, WI 54854

STEPHEN MURLEY President-Elect Wausau School District P.O. Box 359 Wausau, WI 54402

KIM EPARVIER Past President Peshtigo Public Schools 341 N. Emery Ave. Peshtigo, WI 54157

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Terms expire 6/30/10

Michael Beighley, CESA #4 Jeff Dickert, CESA #7 Dave Polashek, CESA #8 Chervi Gullicksrud, CESA #10 Steve Murley, Lg. Schools

Terms expire 6/30/11

Michael Weber, CESA #1 Michael Shimshak, CESA #5 Michael Kremer, CESA #6 Kristine Gilmore, CESA #9 Michael Cox, CESA #12

Terms expire 6/30/12

Gale Ryczek, CESA #2-East Wayne Anderson, CESA #2-West Jamie Benson, CESA #3 Randal Braun, CESA #11

WASDA STAFF

MILES TURNER Executive Director mturner@wasda.org

NANCY LUND Executive Assistant nlund@wasda.org

JESSICA SCHWEDRSKY Secretary/Receptionist jschwedrsky@wasda.org MET:nl



The Wisconsin Council of Administrators of Special Services

January 11, 2010

Mr. Tony Evers, State Superintendent Department of Public Instruction PO Box 7841 Madison, WI 53707-7841

Dear State Superintendent Evers:

The Wisconsin Council of Administrators of Special Services fully supports the reform initiatives that comprise Wisconsin's Race to the Top Application. We are excited about the plan's promise that students will be held to the same high standards as students in other states and around the world and will improve the overall quality of education for all children in Wisconsin.

WCASS is the professional association for Directors of Special Education/Pupil Services in Wisconsin. The plan's focus on attracting, supporting, and developing effective school administrators and teachers holds great potential to improve the achievement of all students in the state.

WCASS is committed to the Race to the Top Application and stands ready to help implement the reforms laid out in Wisconsin's plan.

Phil Knobel

Phil Knobel Executive Director



WCSA P.O. Box 1704, Madison, WI 53701 info@wicharterschools.org Tel: 608-261-1120 Fax: 608-265-0070 www.wicharterschools.org

January 10, 2010

Governor Jim Doyle Office of Governor State Capitol 115 Madison, WI 53707 State Superintendent Tony Evers Department of Public Instruction 125 South Webster Street Madison, WI 53702

Dear Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers:

The Wisconsin Charter School Association strongly supports the reform initiatives that comprise the Race to the Top Application for Wisconsin. We believe this is critically important for our State and commend you on the considerable work that has gone into the proposal.

These funds represent an opportunity to make real breakthroughs in educational excellence in Wisconsin. We are excited about this new era for education where our students will be held to the same high standards as students in other states and around the world, and these additional federal resources will be directed to initiatives that research has shown will improve the overall quality of education in our state.

Wisconsin is a state with a high number of Charter Schools. More importantly, it has some of the highest quality Charter Schools in the country. Charter Schools are an important engine of school reform in our state—and Charter Schools in the Race to the Top activities can be innovation labs to drive significant increases in student performance—particularly for areas and student populations with the greatest needs.

Particularly, in Milwaukee we are making great strides in using a chartering strategy to improve school performance. In Milwaukee and throughout the state, we will see the number of Charter Schools greatly increase over the next five years. Not only will the Race to the Top activities help ensure the quality of our Charter Schools but it will allow a robust Charter School system in the state to help improve school performance statewide.

The Wisconsin Charter School Association is committed to the Race to the Top reforms and stands ready to help implement the reforms laid out in the state plan in anyway possible.

John Gee Executive Director Wisconsin Charter Schools Association



Wisconsin Covenant

Wisconsin Covenant Foundation, Inc. 2401 International Lane Madison, WI 53704-3192

Wednesday, January 13, 2010

Dear Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers:

On behalf of the Wisconsin Covenant Foundation, I would like to express our support for the reform initiatives that comprise Governor Doyle and Superintendent Evers' Race to the Top Application for Wisconsin. Our Foundation is excited about this new era for education in Wisconsin, where our students will be held to the same high standards as students in other states and around the world. These additional federal resources will be directed to initiatives that research has shown will improve the overall quality of education in our state.

The Wisconsin Covenant Foundation, a private charitable organization, was founded in 2007 with the principal purpose of raising and distributing funds in support of post-secondary access for Wisconsin students who participate in the Wisconsin Covenant program. The Foundation is committed to providing grants to those students who complete the Wisconsin Covenant program and demonstrate financial need. We are helping to make the goal of a college education realistic, affordable, and obtainable for more students in this state.

The Wisconsin Covenant Foundation believes that, by helping more students prepare for and finance their post-secondary education, we will improve our state's economic development. Wisconsin's future success depends on building partnerships to increase college access for students and families. The more residents who hold post-secondary degrees and certificates, the greater the opportunity to improve the state's economy and the more competitive Wisconsin will be. We are investing in the human capital needed to keep Wisconsin relevant in a knowledge economy and helping Wisconsin keep pace with the rest of the nation and the world.

The reform initiatives outlined in the Race to the Top Application for Wisconsin are directly in line with the Wisconsin Covenant Foundation's goals. Specifically, building on Wisconsin's currently successful Science, Mathematics, Engineering and Technology (STEM) efforts will ensure that more of our students—future workers—will have the skills they need to compete in the new economy which has shifted from traditional manufacturing to knowledge-based jobs. Further, providing additional supports at the middle to high school transition will reinforce the Wisconsin Covenant's message of early preparedness for college.

Our organization is committed to the Race to the Top reforms and stands ready to help implement the reforms laid out in the state plan.

Mary Burke¹ Vice-Chair, Board of Directors Wisconsin Covenant Foundation, Inc.



January 12, 2010

Office of Governor Jim Doyle 115 East, State Capitol PO Box 7863 Madison, WI 53707

Dear Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers:

Accomplished inventor Dean Kamen founded *FIRST* (For Inspiration and Recognition of Science and Technology) in 1989 to inspire an appreciation of science and technology in young people.

The *FIRST* mission is to inspire young people to be science and technology leaders, by engaging them in exciting mentor-based programs that build science, engineering and technology skills, that inspire innovation, and that foster well-rounded life capabilities including self-confidence, communication and leadership.

On behalf of *FIRST* LEGO League partner Discovery World, *FIRST* Tech Challenge partner UW-Milwaukee, and the *FIRST* Robotics Competition Planning Committee, and more importantly, on behalf of the thousands of Wisconsin students enthusiastically engaging in *FIRST* programs, the **Wisconsin's FIRST Executive Advisory Board** extends its support to the reform initiatives that comprise Governor Doyle and State Superintendent Evers' Race to the Top Application for Wisconsin.

We are excited about this new era for education in Wisconsin, where students will be held to the same high standards as students in other states and around the world, and these additional federal resources will be directed to initiatives that research has shown will improve the overall quality of education in our state.

The **Wisconsin** *FIRST* **Executive Advisory Board** strongly endorses the STEM-specific component of the state plan... "Investing in STEM -- Building off our currently successful STEM efforts to ensure that more students have access to high-quality STEM courses and training". We believe the FIRST family of robotics programs¹ plays a key role in the STEM

¹ FIRST Robotics Competition for Grades 9-12 ; FIRST Tech Challenge for Grades 9-12 ; FIRST LEGO League for Grades 4-8

education continuum by complementing and reinforcing the critical thinking and problem solving skills learned in the classroom.

The **Wisconsin** *FIRST* **Executive Advisory Board** finds the STEM-related goals of the state's Race to the Top application to be consistent with *FIRST*'s global mission cited above, as well as with our state-specific mission for *FIRST*. We are convinced that our robotics programs, implemented and delivered in the context of the overall STEM strategy outlined in the application will help build a reliable talent pipeline producing Wisconsin's next generation of innovators.

Sincerely,

Wisconsin FIRST Executive Advisory Board

Craig Coursin	George Mosher
MSI General Corporation	George and Julie Mosher Family Foundation
Dan Holzmiller	Steven Roehm
FIRST	GE Healthcare
Richard Koehl	Van Walling
Kohler Company	Engineers & Scientists of Milwaukee
Susan Lawrence	Eileen Walter
FIRST	Rockwell Automation



WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE DISTRICT BOARDS ASSOCIATION

January 8, 2010

Jim Doyle Governor State of Wisconsin

Tony Evers Superintendent of Public Instruction State of Wisconsin

Dear Governor Doyle and Superintendent Evers,

On behalf of Wisconsin Technical College District Boards, I'm writing to express our support for Wisconsin's Race to the Top application. This is truly an exciting and dynamic time across the educational spectrum in Wisconsin. In a state that has always been a leader and national laboratory in education, Wisconsin's application strongly supports innovative new collaboration and initiatives.

Our members, the governing board members of our local technical colleges, work closely with local school districts statewide to promote exceptional educational opportunities. The state's Race to the Top application addresses a number of crucial investments promoting a well-educated and productive citizenry ready to lead Wisconsin and our nation to a great future. The "STEM" initiatives within Wisconsin's Race to the Top application represent just one of these important areas in which we look forward to new opportunities for collaboration.

We look forward to helping realize the objectives embodied in the Race to the Top application and appreciate your leadership in moving this process forward.

Par Jamie

Paul Gabriel Executive Director

REC'D JAN 1 3 2010

<u>APPENDIX 11 (A)(2)(ii) RTTT LETTERS OF SUPPORT FINAL</u>

Wisconsin Association of CESA Administrators



Gary Albrecht, Chair

CESA #2 448 East High St. Milton, WI 53563 (608) 758-6232 · (608) 868-4864 (fax)

Guy Leavitt, Vice-Chair Jesse Harness, Treasurer Joan Wade, Past Chair

Jim Larson, Executive Secretary 11070 Old Hwy 51 Arbor Vitae, WI 54568 (715) 356-7083 E-mail: ljl@nnex.net

January 12, 2010

The Honorable Governor James Doyle 115 East State Capitol Madison, WI 53702

State Superintendent of Public Instruction Tony Evers 125 South Webster Madison, WI 53707

Dear Governor Doyle and Superintendent Evers:

I am writing this letter on behalf of all twelve Cooperative Educational Service Agencies in the state of Wisconsin to express support for the Race to the Top reform initiatives that will be submitted by the Governor's office and the Department of Public Instruction. We are excited about this new era for education in Wisconsin, where students will be held to the same high standards as students in other states and around the world. The additional federal resources will be directed toward initiatives that research has shown are best practices and will improve the overall quality of education in our state.

As you are aware, the Cooperative Educational Service Agencies serve school districts throughout our state. CESAs provide extensive professional development in many areas such as curriculum development, assessment, special education, technology, English-language Learners, Value-Added Assessment, and many more. Additionally, CESAs work directly with students in various capacities, and partner with universities, professional organizations and the greater business community throughout Wisconsin to provide meaningful programs and services.

We embrace the opportunity to help our school districts understand this plan thoroughly, and carry it forward so that our students and teachers will benefit. On behalf of the CESAs, I appreciate the work of the Department of Public Instruction and the Governor's office in setting a new course for the future of education in our state.

Sincerely, 'NI it

Dr. Gary L. Albrecht, Chairperson Wisconsin Association of CESA Administrators

CESA #1 Tim Gavigan Brookfield

CESA #2 Gary Albrecht Milton

CESA #3 Nancy Hendrickson Fennimore

CESA #4 **Guy Leavitt** West Salem

CESA #5 Don Stevens Portage

CESA #7 **Jeffrey Dickert** Green Bay

CESA #8 Robert Kellogg Gillett

CESA #9 Jerome K. Fiene Tomahawk

CESA #10 Larry Annett Chippewa Falls

CESA #11 Jesse Harness

Turtle Lake

CESA #12 Ken Kasinski Ashland

CESA #6

Joan Wade

Oshkosh

Cooperative Solutions for Quality Education

APPENDIX 12 - (B)(1) Common Core Standards signed MOA

The Council of Chief State School Officers and The National Governors Association Center for Best Practices

Common Core Standards Memorandum of Agreement

Purpose. This document commits states to a state-led process that will draw on evidence and lead to development and adoption of a common core of state standards (common core) in English language arts and mathematics for grades K-12. These standards will be aligned with college and work expectations, include rigorous content and skills, and be internationally benchmarked. The intent is that these standards will be aligned to state assessment and classroom practice. The second phase of this initiative will be the development of common assessments aligned to the core standards developed through this process.

Background. Our state education leaders are committed to ensuring all students graduate from high school ready for college, work, and success in the global economy and society. State standards provide a key foundation to drive this reform. Today, however, state standards differ significantly in terms of the incremental content and skills expected of students.

Over the last several years, many individual states have made great strides in developing high-quality standards and assessments. These efforts provide a strong foundation for further action. For example, a majority of states (35) have joined the American Diploma Project (ADP) and have worked individually to align their state standards with college and work expectations. Of the 15 states that have completed this work, studies show significant similarities in core standards across the states. States also have made progress through initiatives to upgrade standards and assessments, for example, the New England Common Assessment Program.

Benefits to States. The time is right for a state-led, nation-wide effort to establish a common core of standards that raises the bar for all students. This initiative presents a significant opportunity to accelerate and drive education reform toward the goal of ensuring that all children graduate from high school ready for college, work, and competing in the global economy and society. With the adoption of this common core, participating states will be able to:

- Articulate to parents, teachers, and the general public expectations for students;
- Align textbooks, digital media, and curricula to the internationally benchmarked standards;
- Ensure professional development to educators is based on identified need and best practices;
- Develop and implement an assessment system to measure student performance against the common core; and
- Evaluate policy changes needed to help students and educators meet the common core standards and "end-of-high-school" expectations.

An important tenet of this work will be to increase the rigor and relevance of state standards across all participating states; therefore, no state will see a decrease in the level of student expectations that exist in their current state standards.

Process and Structure

×**

□ Common Core State-Based Leadership. The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices (NGA Center) shall assume responsibility for coordinating the process that will lead to state adoption of a common core set of standards. These organizations represent governors and state commissioners of education who are charged with defining K-12 expectations at the state level. As such, these organizations will

facilitate a state-led process to develop a set of common core standards in English language arts and math that are:

• • •

- Fewer, clearer, and higher, to best drive effective policy and practice;
- Aligned with college and work expectations, so that all students are prepared for success upon graduating from high school;
- Inclusive of rigorous content and application of knowledge through high-order skills, so that all students are prepared for the 21st century;
- Internationally benchmarked, so that all students are prepared for succeeding in our global economy and society; and
- Research and evidence-based.
- National Validation Committee. CCSSO and the NGA Center will create an expert validation group that will serve a several purposes, including validating end-of-course expectations, providing leadership for the development of K-12 standards, and certifying state adoption of the common core. The group will be comprised of national and international experts on standards. Participating states will have the opportunity to nominate individuals to the group. The national validation committee shall provide an independent review of the common core. The national validation committee will review the common core as it is developed and offer comments, suggestions, and validation of the process and products developed by the standards development group. The group will use evidence as the driving factor in validating the common core.
- Develop End-of-High-School Expectations. CCSSO and the NGA Center will convene Achieve, ACT and the College Board in an open, inclusive, and efficient process to develop a set of end-of-high-school expectations in English language arts and mathematics based on evidence. We will ask all participating states to review and provide input on these expectations. This work will be completed by July 2009.
- Develop K-12 Standards in English Language Arts and Math. CCSSO and the NGA Center will convene Achieve, ACT, and the College Board in an open, inclusive, and efficient process to develop K-12 standards that are grounded in empirical research and draw on best practices in standards development. We will ask participating states to provide input into the drafting of the common core and work as partners in the common core standards development process. This work will be completed by December 2009.
- □ Adoption. The goal of this effort is to develop a true common core of state standards that are internationally benchmarked. Each state adopting the common core either directly or by fully aligning its state standards may do so in accordance with current state timelines for standards adoption not to exceed three (3) years.

This effort is voluntary for states, and it is fully intended that states adopting the common core may choose to include additional state standards beyond the common core. States that choose to align their standards to the common core standards agree to ensure that the common core represents at least 85 percent of the state's standards in English language arts and mathematics.

Further, the goal is to establish an ongoing development process that can support continuous improvement of this first version of the common core based on research and evidence-based learning and can support the development of assessments that are aligned to the common core across the states, for accountability and other appropriate purposes.

APPENDIX 12 - (B)(1) Common Core Standards signed MOA

- □ National Policy Forum. CCSSO and the NGA Center will convene a National Policy Forum (Forum) comprised of signatory national organizations (e.g., the Alliance for Excellent Education, Business Roundtable, National School Boards Association, Council of Great City Schools, Hunt Institute, National Association of State Boards of Education, National Education Association, and others) to share ideas, gather input, and inform the common core initiative. The forum is intended as a place for refining our shared understanding of the scope and elements of a common core; sharing and coordinating the various forms of implementation of a common core; providing a means to develop common messaging between and among participating organizations; and building public will and support.
- □ Federal Role. The parties support a state-led effort and not a federal effort to develop a common core of state standards; there is, however, an appropriate federal role in supporting this state-led effort. In particular, the federal government can provide key financial support for this effort in developing a common core of state standards and in moving toward common assessments, such as through the Race to the Top Fund authorized in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. Further, the federal government can incentivize this effort through a range of tiered incentives, such as providing states with greater flexibility in the use of existing federal funds, supporting a revised state accountability structure, and offering financial support for states to effectively implement the standards. Additionally, the federal government can provide additional long-term financial support for the development of common assessments, teacher and principal professional development, other related common core over time. Finally, the federal government can revise and align existing federal education laws with the lessons learned from states' international benchmarking efforts and from federal research.

Agreement. The undersigned state leaders agree to the process and structure as described above and attest accordingly by our signature(s) below.

Signatures	s
\bigcap $i \cap I$	·
Governor: Am high	A
	·
Chief State School Officer: Chyabeth Burmaster	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

International Benchmarking and the Common Core

The Common Core State Standards (CCSS) are designed to be **college- and career-ready** and **internationally benchmarked**. To that end, the development process included the review and consideration of many sources, including research studies, existing standards from the U.S and abroad, and the professional judgment of teachers, content area experts, and college faculty. This paper will briefly describe how international benchmarking was used to develop the CCSS.

What documents were used to ensure that the CCSS were internationally benchmarked?

To ensure that the standards prepare students to be globally competitive, the development team used a number of sources, including: the frameworks for PISA and TIMSS; the International Baccalaureate syllabi; the American Institutes for Research report, *Informing Grades 1-6 Mathematics Standards Development: What Can Be Learned From High-Performing Hong Kong, Korea, and Singapore* and; the A+ Composite found in *A Coherent Curriculum: The Case for Mathematics* by Bill Schmidt, Richard Houang, and Leland Cogan.

In addition, the development team looked to the standards of a number of individual countries and provinces to inform the content, structure and language of the CCSS. In *mathematics*, twelve set of standards were selected to help guide the writing of the standards: Belgium, Canada [Alberta], China, Chinese Taipei, England, Finland, Hong Kong, India, Ireland, Japan, Korea, and Singapore.ⁱ In *English language arts*, the writing team looked closely at ten sets of standards from Australia (New South Wales and Victoria), Canada (Alberta, British Columbia, and Ontario), England, Finland, Hong Kong, Ireland, and Singapore.ⁱⁱ

How were the international benchmarks used to inform the development of the CCSS?

The goal of the international benchmarking in the common core state standards development process was to ensure that the CCSS are as rigorous as comparable standards in the high-performing and other countries. However, the use of international benchmarks as evidence is no easy feat; it is not simply a matter of identifying the "best" source and copying it, or of aggregating all viable sources to find some set of shared expectations. Rather, international benchmarks were used to guide critical decisions in the following areas:

- Whether particular content should be included: One of the principal ways international standards were used in this development process was as a guide when making tough decisions about whether content should be included or excluded.
- When content should be introduced and how that content should progress: The progression of topics in the international mathematics standards helped the development team make decisions about when to introduce topics in the CCSS as well as when to stop focusing on them.
- *Ensuring focus and coherence*: Standards from other countries tend to be very focused, including only what is absolutely necessary.

- Organizing and formatting the standards: Certain organizational aspects or characteristics of international standards that promoted clarity and ease of reading and use served as a model for the CCSS.
- Determining emphasis on particular topics in standards: Where emphasis on particular topics was found repeatedly in international standard, this was instructive in determining their importance for inclusion in the CCSS.

* * * * *

When the final version of the K-12 Common Core State Standards is released, it will be accompanied by a discussion of the evidence that was used in their development. In the meantime, the evidence from the September 2009 draft of the College and Career Ready Standards is available: The URL for the ELA document is <u>http://www.corestandards.org/Files/ELAEvidence.pdf</u>, and the URL for the mathematics document is <u>http://www.corestandards.org/Files/MathEvidence.pdf</u>.

ⁱ Eight of these were high-performers on either TIMSS, PISA or both: Belgium, Canada [Alberta], Chinese Taipei, Finland, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, and Singapore. England and Ireland, which have uneven performances on international assessments, were included because of their cultural links to the United States. China and India were included because of their growing global competitiveness.

ⁱⁱ Differences in language have a greater impact on the teaching and learning of language arts than of mathematics, so the teams looked primarily at English-speaking countries. All were high-performers on PISA except Singapore, which did not participate, and England, which as in mathematics was selected partly for its cultural links to the United States.

APPENDIX 13 - (B)(1) Internationally Benchmarked Common Core Standards - Public Drafts

College and Career Readiness Standards for Reading, Writing, and Speaking and Listening

Draft for Review and Comment

September 21, 2009

College and Career Readiness Standards for Reading, Writing, and Speaking and Listening

Table of Contents

Introduction	
Core Standards for Reading, Writing, and Speaking and Listening	i
Student Practices in Reading, Writing, and Speaking and Listening	iii
Introductory Evidence Statement for Reading, Writing, and Speaking and Listening Standards	v
How to Read the Document	vii
Core Standards for Reading Informational and Literary Texts	
Standards for the Range and Content of Student Reading	1-A
Standards for Student Performance	1 - B
Core Standards for Writing	
Standards for the Range and Content of Student Writing	2-A
Standards for Student Performance	2-B
Core Standards for Speaking and Listening	
Standards for the Range and Content of Student Speaking and Listening	3-A
Standards for Student Performance	3 - B
Applications of the Core	
Application of the Core: Research	4-A
Application of the Core: Media	4 - B
Illustrative Texts: Exemplars of Reading Text Complexity	
Introduction	5
Illustrative Texts with Annotations	6
Illustrative Student Writing Samples - Coming in next draft Introduction	
Student Writing Samples with Annotations	
Sample of Works Consulted	31

Core Standards for Reading, Writing, and Speaking and Listening

The Core Standards identify essential college- and career-ready skills and knowledge in reading, writing, and speaking and listening across the disciplines. While the English language arts classroom has often been seen as the proper site for literacy instruction, this document acknowledges that the responsibility for teaching such skills must also extend to the other content areas. Teachers in the social and natural sciences, the humanities, and mathematics need to use their content area expertise to help students acquire the discipline-specific skills necessary to comprehend challenging texts and develop deep knowledge in those fields. At the same time, English language arts teachers not only must engage their students in a rich array of literature but also must help develop their students' ability to read complex works of nonfiction independently.

What is taught is just as important as how it is taught; the Core Standards should be accompanied by a comprehensive, content-rich curriculum. While this document defines the outcomes all students need to reach to be college and career ready, many important decisions about curriculum will necessarily be left to states, districts, schools, teachers, professional organizations, and parents. For example, while the standards require that students read texts of sufficient complexity, quality, and range, this document does not contain a required reading list. If states and districts choose to develop one, they should look at the Reading exemplars provided here to get a sense of the level of complexity students must be able to handle independently when they read. Educators can also model their efforts on reading lists from around the nation and the world as long as the texts ultimately included meet the range and content standards in this document.

Standards today must ready students for competition and collaboration in a global, media-saturated environment. Colleges and universities have become international meetinghouses where people from across the globe learn with and from one another. At the same time, business today is truly a worldwide enterprise. Media-related technology helps shape what goes on in both college and the workplace; indeed, it has in some important ways reshaped the very nature of communication. Students who meet the Core Standards will have the reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills to flourish in the diverse, rapidly changing environments of college and careers.

Although reading, writing, and speaking and listening are articulated separately in the standards that follow, these divisions are made for the sake of clarity and manageability. In reality, the processes of communication are tightly interrelated and often reciprocal. The act of reading can no more be separated from the written word than the act of listening can be from the spoken word. When reading, students demonstrate their comprehension most commonly through a spoken or written interpretation of the text. As students solve problems, share insights, and build the knowledge they need for college and career success, they draw simultaneously on their capacities to read, write, speak, and listen.

Student Practices in Reading, Writing, and Speaking and Listening

The following practices in reading, writing, and speaking and listening undergird and help unify the rest of the standards document. They are the "premises"—broad statements about the nature of college and career readiness in reading, writing, and speaking and listening—that underlie the individual standards statements and cut across the various sections of the document. Every idea introduced here is subsequently represented in one or more places within the larger document.

* * *

Students who are college and career ready exhibit the following capacities in their reading, writing, and speaking and listening:

1. They demonstrate independence as readers, writers, speakers, and listeners.

Students can, without significant scaffolding or support, comprehend and evaluate complex text across a range of types and disciplines, and they can construct effective arguments and clearly convey intricate or multifaceted information. Likewise, students are independently able to discern a speaker's key points as well as ask questions and articulate their own ideas.

2. They build strong content knowledge.

Students build a base of knowledge across a wide range of subject matter by engaging with works of quality and substance. They demonstrate their ability to become proficient in new areas through research and study. They read purposefully and listen attentively to gain both general knowledge and the specific in-depth expertise needed to comprehend subject matter and solve problems in different fields. They refine their knowledge and share it through substantive writing and speaking.

3. They respond to the varying demands of audience, task, purpose, and discipline.

Students consider their reading, writing, and speaking and listening in relation to the contextual factors of audience, task, purpose, and discipline. They appreciate nuances, such as how the composition and familiarity of the audience should affect tone. They also know that different disciplines call for different types of evidence (e.g., documentary evidence in history, experimental evidence in the natural sciences).

4. They comprehend as well as critique.

Students are engaged and open-minded—but skeptical—readers and listeners. They work diligently to understand precisely what an author or speaker is saying, but they also question an author's or speaker's assumptions and assess the veracity of claims.

5. They privilege evidence.

Students cite specific textual evidence when offering an oral or written interpretation of a piece of writing. They use relevant evidence when supporting their own points in writing and speaking, making their reasoning clear to the reader or listener, and they constructively evaluate others' use of evidence.

6. They care about precision.

Students are mindful of the impact of specific words and details, and they consider what would be achieved by different choices. Students pay especially close attention when precision matters most, such as in the case of reviewing significant data, making important distinctions, or analyzing a key moment in the action of a play or novel.

7. They craft and look for structure.

Students attend to structure when organizing their own writing and speaking as well as when seeking to understand the work of others. They understand and make use of the ways of presenting information typical of different disciplines. They observe, for example, how authors of literary works craft the structure to unfold events and depict the setting.

8. They use technology strategically and capably.

Students employ technology thoughtfully to enhance their reading, writing, speaking, and listening. They tailor their searches online to acquire useful information efficiently, and they integrate what they learn using technology with what they learn offline. They are familiar with the strengths and limitations of various technological tools and mediums and can select and use those best suited to their communication goals.

Introductory Evidence Statement for Reading, Writing, and Speaking and Listening Standards

To develop college- and career-ready standards for Reading, Writing, and Speaking and Listening that are rigorous, relevant, and internationally benchmarked, the work group consulted evidence from a wide array of sources. These included standards documents from high-performing states and nations; student performance data (including assessment scores and college grades); academic research; frameworks for assessments, such as NAEP; and results of surveys of postsecondary instructors and employers regarding what is most important for college and career readiness.

The evidence strongly suggests that similar reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills are necessary for success in both college and the workplace. A review of the standards of high-performing nations also suggests that many of these skills are already required in secondary schools internationally. The work group has endeavored to articulate these skills in the Core Standards, focusing educators, students, parents, and resources on what matters most.

Given that a set of standards cannot be simplistically "derived" from any body of evidence, the work group sometimes relied on reasoned judgment to interpret where the evidence was most compelling. For example, there is not a consensus among college faculty about the need for incoming students to be able to comprehend graphs, charts, and tables and to integrate information in these data displays with the information in the accompanying text. Although some evidence suggests that this skill is critical in the workplace and in some entry-level courses, college faculties from the various disciplines disagree on its value (with science and economics faculty rating it more highly than English and humanities professors do). The work group ultimately included a standard on the integration of text and data because the preponderance of the evidence suggests the skill's importance in meeting the demands of the twenty-first-century workplace and some college classrooms.

In most cases, the evidence is clearer. In writing, for example, there is unequivocal value placed on the logical progression of ideas. The expectation that high school graduates will be able to produce writing that is logical and coherent is found throughout the standards of top-performing countries and states. This ability is also valued highly by college faculty and employers. In response to such clear evidence, the work group included Writing student performance standard #5: "Create a logical progression of ideas or events, and convey the relationships among them."

A bibliography of some of the sources the work group drew upon most is included at the end of this document. The reader should also refer to the Core Standards Web site (http://www.corestandards.org), which contains a list of standards linked to relevant sources of evidence.

Finally, while the standards reflect the best evidence available to date, the decisions the work group made are necessarily provisional. The core should be reexamined periodically as additional research on college and career readiness emerges. Indeed, this document may serve as an agenda for such research.
How to Read the Document

This document is divided into three main sections: strands, applications, and supporting materials.

Strands

There are three *strands*: Reading, Writing, and Speaking and Listening. Although each strand is presented discretely for ease of understanding, the document should be considered a coherent whole.

The three strands are each in turn divided into two sections: *Standards for Range and Content* and *Standards for Student Performance*.

Standards for Range and Content

The Standards for Range and Content in each strand describe the contexts in which college- and career-ready students must be able to read, write, speak, and listen. Rather than merely supplement or illustrate the numbered list of Standards for Student Performance, the Standards for Range and Content are themselves required and carry equal force.

Standards for Student Performance

The Standards for Student Performance in each strand enumerate the essential skills and understandings that students who are college and career ready in reading, writing, speaking, and listening must have no later than the end of high school.

Applications

The clearest examples of the integrated nature of communication are the *Applications of the Core* for Research and Media. The Core Standards for Reading, Writing, and Speaking and Listening have been designed to include the essential skills and knowledge that students need to apply to college and career tasks, such as research and media. Rather than having an additional set of standards that would largely duplicate those already in Reading, Writing, and Speaking and Listening, the document includes the Research and Media applications that draw upon standards already in those strands. This both reaffirms the centrality of the core processes of reading, writing, speaking, and listening and shows how those processes can be combined and extended to describe key communicative acts in the classroom and workplace.

In the Research and Media applications, specific Reading, Writing, and Speaking and Listening standards are identified with a letter or letters corresponding to the relevant strand (R for Reading, W for Writing, and S&L for Speaking and Listening) and a number or letter corresponding to the statement within that strand. For example, R-14 refers to the fourteenth statement in the Standards for Student Performance in Reading, and W-A refers to the first statement of the Standards for Range and Content in Writing.

Supporting Materials: Reading and Writing Exemplars

Reading and Writing exemplars, and their accompanying annotations, are used to lend further specificity to the standards.

Reading Exemplars

The Reading exemplars, representing a range of subject areas, time periods, cultures, and formats, illustrate the level of text complexity students ready for college and careers must be able to handle on their own. The exemplars are mostly excerpts or representations of larger works. To be truly college and career ready, students must be able to handle full texts—poems, short stories, novels, technical manuals, research reports, and the like. Annotations accompanying the exemplars explain how each text meets the criterion of high text complexity. The annotations also provide brief performance examples that further clarify the meaning and application of the standards.

Writing Exemplars - Coming in the next draft

The Writing exemplars are authentic samples of student writing created across the nation under a variety of conditions and for a variety of purposes and audiences. Annotations accompanying the exemplars indicate how these samples meet the Standards for Student Performance in Writing.

viii

APPENDIX 13 - (B)(1) Internationally Benchmarked Common Core Standards - Public Drafts **Core Standards for Reading Informational and Literary Texts**

Standards for the Range and Content of Student Reading

- A. **Complexity:** A crucial factor in readiness for college and careers is students' ability to comprehend complex texts independently. In college and careers, students will need to read texts characterized by demanding vocabulary, subtle relationships among ideas or characters, a nuanced rhetorical style and tone, and elaborate structures or formats. These challenging texts require the reader's close attention and often demand rereading in order to be fully understood.
- B. **Quality:** The literary and informational texts chosen for study should be rich in content and in a variety of disciplines. All students should have access to and grapple with works of exceptional craft and thought both for the insights those works offer and as models for students' own thinking and writing. These texts should include classic works that have broad resonance and are alluded to and quoted often, such as influential political documents, foundational literary works, and seminal historical and scientific texts. Texts should also be selected from among the best contemporary fiction and nonfiction and from a diverse range of authors and perspectives.
- C. **Vocabulary:** To be college and career ready, students must encounter and master a rich vocabulary. Complex texts often use challenging words, phrases, and terms that students typically do not encounter in their daily lives. Specific disciplines and careers have vocabularies of their own. Attentive reading of sophisticated works in a wide range of fields, combined with close attention to vocabulary, is essential to building comprehension and knowledge.
- D. **Range:** Students must be able to read a variety of literature, informational texts, and multimedia sources in order to gain the knowledge base they need for college and career readiness.

Literature: Literature enables students to access through imagination a wide range of experiences. By immersing themselves in literature, students enlarge their experiences and deepen their understanding of their own and other cultures. Careful reading of literature entails attentiveness to craft and details of design, which has broad value for students' work in college and career environments.

Informational Text: Because most college and workplace reading is nonfiction, students need to hone their ability to acquire knowledge from informational texts. Workplace and discipline-specific reading will often require students to demonstrate persistence as they encounter a large amount of unfamiliar and often technical vocabulary and concepts. Students must demonstrate facility with the features of texts particular to a variety of disciplines, such as history, science, and mathematics.

Multimedia Sources: Students must be able to integrate what they learn from reading text with what they learn from audio, video, and other digital media. Many of the same critical issues that students face when reading traditional printed texts will arise as they seek to comprehend multimedia, such as determining where the author has chosen to focus, evaluating evidence, and comparing different accounts of similar subjects.

E. **Quantity:** Students must have the capacity to handle independently the quantity of reading material, both in print and online, required in college and workforce training. Studies show that the amount of reading students face in high school is often far lower than that required for typical first-year college courses. Students need to be able to perform a close reading of a much higher volume of texts and to sort efficiently through large amounts of print and online information in search of specific facts or ideas.

Note: *The essential role of independence in college and career readiness:* The significant scaffolding that often accompanies reading in high school usually disappears in college and workforce training environments. Students must therefore have developed their ability to read texts of sufficient complexity, quality, and range on their own. To become independent, students must encounter unfamiliar texts presented without supporting materials.

APPENDIX 13 - (B)(1) Internationally Benchmarked Common Core Standards - Public Drafts **Core Standards for Reading Informational and Literary Texts**

Standards for Student Performance

- 1. Determine both what the text says explicitly and what can be inferred logically from the text.
- 2. Support or challenge assertions about the text by citing evidence in the text explicitly and accurately.
- 3. Discern the most important ideas, events, or information, and summarize them accurately and concisely.
- 4. Delineate the main ideas or themes in the text and the details that elaborate and support them.
- 5. <u>Determine when, where, and why events unfold</u> in the text, and explain how they relate to one another.
- 6. <u>Analyze the traits, motivations, and thoughts of individuals</u> in fiction and nonfiction based on how they are described, what they say and do, and how they interact.
- 7. Determine what is meant by words and phrases in context, including connotative meanings and figurative language.
- 8. Analyze how specific word choices shape the meaning and tone of the text.
- 9. Analyze how the text's organizational structure presents the argument, explanation, or narrative.
- 10. Analyze how specific details and larger portions of the text contribute to the meaning of the text.
- 11. Synthesize data, diagrams, maps, and other visual elements with words in the text to further comprehension.
- 12. Extract key information efficiently in print and online using text features and search techniques.
- 13. Ascertain the origin, credibility, and accuracy of print and online sources.
- 14. Evaluate the reasoning and rhetoric that support an argument or explanation, including assessing whether the evidence provided is relevant and sufficient.
- 15. Analyze how two or more texts with different styles, points of view, or arguments address similar topics or themes.
- 16. Draw upon relevant prior knowledge to enhance comprehension, and note when the text expands on or challenges that knowledge.
- 17. Apply knowledge and concepts gained through reading to build a more coherent understanding of a subject, inform reading of additional texts, and solve problems.
- 18. Demonstrate facility with the specific reading demands of texts drawn from different disciplines, including history, literature, science, and mathematics.
- Note: These Standards for Student Performance, as is the case for every strand, must be demonstrated across the range and content from the preceding page. They are meant to apply to fiction and nonfiction. For example:
 - "Determine when, where, and why events unfold" applies to plot and setting in literature as well as the sequence of a scientific procedure.
 - "<u>Analyze the traits, motivations, and thoughts of individuals</u>" applies to studying characters in fiction and figures in historical texts.

Standards for the Range and Content of Student Writing

A. Purpose:

Make an Argument: While many high school students have experience presenting their opinions, they need to be able to make arguments supported by evidence in order to be ready for careers and college. Students must be able to frame the debate over a claim, present the reasoning and evidence for the argument, and acknowledge and address its limitations. In some cases, students will make arguments to gain entry to college or to obtain a job, laying out their qualifications or experience. In college, students might defend an interpretation of a work of literature or of history; in the workplace, employees might write to recommend a course of action.

Inform or Explain: In college and in workforce training, writing is a key means for students to show what they know and to share what they have seen. Writing to inform or explain often requires students to integrate complex information from multiple sources in a lucid fashion. Explanations can take the form of laying out facts about a new technology or documenting findings from historical research; well-crafted explanations often make fresh connections and express ideas creatively.

- B. **Audience:** Students must adapt their writing so that it is appropriate to the audience by choosing words, information, structures, and formats that conform to the conventions of the discipline in which they are writing. The form and use of evidence in literary analysis, for example, are likely to be quite different from those in geology or business. Students must also be able to consider their audience's background knowledge and potential objections to an argument.
- C. Situation:

On-demand Writing: Students must have the flexibility, concentration, and fluency to produce high-quality first-draft text under a tight deadline. College and career readiness requires that students be able to write effectively to a prompt on an exam or respond quickly yet thoughtfully to a supervisor's urgent request for information.

Writing over Time: Students must be able to revisit and make improvements to a piece of their writing over multiple drafts when circumstances encourage or require it. To improve writing through revision, students must be capable of distinguishing good changes from ones that would weaken the writing.

- D. **Technology and Collaboration:** Technology offers students powerful tools for producing, editing, and distributing writing as well as for collaboration. Especially in the workplace, writers often use technology to produce documents and to provide feedback.
- E. **Quantity:** The evidence is clear that, in order to become better writers, students must devote significant time to producing writing. Students must practice writing several analytical pieces each term if they are to achieve the deep analysis and interpretation of content expected for college and careers.

Note on narrative writing:

Narrative writing is an important mode of writing; it is also a component of making an argument and writing to inform or explain. Telling an interesting story effectively or providing an accurate account of a historical incident requires the skillful use of narrative techniques. Narrative writing requires that students present vivid, relevant details to situate events in a time and place and also craft a structure that lends a larger shape and significance to those details. As an easily grasped and widely used way to share information and ideas with others, narrative writing is a principal stepping-stone to writing forms directly relevant to college and career readiness.

APPENDIX 13 - (B)(1) Internationally Benchmarked Common Core Standards - Public Drafts **Core Standards for Writing**

Standards for Student Performance

- 1. Establish and refine a topic or thesis that addresses the specific task and audience.
- 2. Gather the information needed to build an argument, provide an explanation, or address a research question.
- 3. Sustain focus on a specific topic or argument.
- 4. Support and illustrate arguments and explanations with relevant details, examples, and evidence.
- 5. Create a logical progression of ideas or events, and convey the relationships among them.
- 6. Choose words and phrases to express ideas precisely and concisely.
- 7. Use varied sentence structures to engage the reader and achieve cohesion between sentences.
- 8. Develop and maintain a style and tone appropriate to the task, purpose, and audience.
- 9. Demonstrate command of <u>the conventions of standard written English</u>, including grammar, usage, and mechanics.
- 10. Represent and cite accurately the data, conclusions, and opinions of others, effectively incorporating them into one's own work while avoiding plagiarism.
- 11. Assess the quality of one's own writing, and, when necessary, strengthen it through revision.
- 12. Use technology as a tool to produce, edit, and distribute writing.

When **writing to inform or explain**, students must also do the following:

- 13. Synthesize information from multiple relevant sources, including graphics and quantitative information when appropriate, to provide an accurate picture of that information.
- 14. Convey complex information clearly and coherently to the audience through purposeful selection and organization of content.
- 15. Demonstrate understanding of content by reporting facts accurately and anticipating reader misconceptions.

When **writing arguments**, students must also do the following:

- 16. Establish a substantive claim, distinguishing it from alternate or opposing claims.
- 17. Link claims and evidence with clear reasons, and ensure that the evidence is relevant and sufficient to support the claims.
- 18. Acknowledge competing arguments or information, defending or qualifying the initial claim as appropriate.

Note: "<u>The conventions of standard written English</u>" encompass a range of commonly accepted language practices designed to make writing clear and widely understood. When formal writing contains errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics, its meaning is obscured, its message is too easily dismissed, and its author is often judged negatively. Proper sentence structure, correct verb formation, careful use of verb tense, clear subject-verb and pronoun-antecedent agreement, conventional usage, and appropriate punctuation are of particular importance to formal writing.

Standards for the Range and Content of Student Speaking and Listening

A. **Group and One-to-One Situations:** Students are expected to be able to speak and listen effectively in both groups and one-to-one. Success in credit-bearing college coursework, whether in the humanities, mathematics, or the sciences, depends heavily on being able to take in and respond to the concepts and information conveyed in lectures and class discussions. Success in the workplace is similarly dependent on listening attentively to colleagues and customers and expressing ideas clearly and persuasively.

These speaking and listening skills may need to be applied differently in different settings. The immediate communication between two people might be replaced by formal turn taking in large-group discussions. When working in classroom or workplace teams, students should be able to ask questions that initiate thoughtful discussions, gain the floor in respectful ways, and build on the contributions of others to complete tasks or reach consensus.

- B. **Varied Disciplinary Content:** Students must adapt their speaking and listening to a range of disciplines to communicate effectively. Each academic discipline and industry has its own vocabulary and conventions; for instance, evidence is handled and discussed differently in literary analysis than in history or medicine or the sciences. College- and career-ready students must develop a foundation of disciplinary knowledge and conventions in order not only to comprehend the complexity of information and ideas but also to present and explain them.
- C. **Multimedia Comprehension:** New technologies expand the role that speaking and listening skills will play in acquiring and sharing knowledge. Students will need to view and listen to diverse media to gain knowledge and also must integrate this information with what they learn through reading text online as well as in print. When speaking, students can draw on media to illustrate their points, make data and evidence vivid, and engage their audience. Multimedia accelerates the speed at which connections between reading, writing, speaking, and listening can be made, requiring students to be ready to use these skills nearly simultaneously.

Standards for Student Performance

- 1. Select and use a format, organization, and style appropriate to the topic, purpose, and audience.
- 2. Present information, findings, and supporting evidence clearly and concisely.
- 3. Make strategic use of multimedia elements and visual displays of data to gain audience attention and enhance understanding.
- 4. Demonstrate command of formal Standard English when appropriate to task and audience.
- 5. Listen to complex information, and discern the main ideas, the significant details, and the relationships among them.
- 6. Follow the progression of the speaker's message, and <u>evaluate the speaker's point of view</u>, <u>reasoning</u>, <u>and use</u> <u>of evidence and rhetoric</u>.
- 7. Ask relevant questions to clarify points and challenge ideas.
- 8. Respond constructively to advance a discussion and build on the input of others.

Note: "<u>Style appropriate to the topic, purpose, and audience</u>" includes word choice specific to the demands of the discipline as well as delivery techniques such as gestures and eye contact that contribute to effective message delivery.

"Evaluate the speaker's point of view, reasoning, and use of evidence and rhetoric" includes distinguishing facts from opinions and determining whether the speaker is biased and evidence has been distorted.

APPENDIX 13 - (B)(1) Internationally Benchmarked Common Core Standards - Public Drafts **Application of the Core: Research**

The Core Standards for Reading, Writing, and Speaking and Listening have been designed to include the essential skills and knowledge that students need to apply to college and career tasks such as research. This section shows how standards in the core incorporate the skills of research.

To be college and career ready, students must engage in research and present their findings in writing and orally, in print and online. The ability to conduct research independently and effectively plays a fundamental role in gaining knowledge and insight in college and the workplace.

Research as described here is not limited to the formal, extended research paper nor simply to gathering information from books; rather, research encompasses a flexible yet systematic approach to resolving questions and investigating issues through the careful collection, analysis, synthesis, and presentation of information from a wide range of print and digital sources, such as historical archives and online interviews. With well-developed research skills, students have the tools to engage in sustained inquiry as well as the sort of short, focused research projects that typify many assignments in college and the workplace.

Research in the digital age offers new possibilities as well as new or heightened challenges. While the Internet provides ready access to unprecedented amounts of primary and secondary source material (such as oral histories, historical documents, maps, and scientific reports), students sorting through this wealth of data must be skilled at and vigilant in determining the origin and credibility of these sources.

The following Core Standards pertain to elements of the research process and particular research skills required for college and career readiness:

Formulate research questions:

- Establish and refine a topic or thesis that addresses the specific task and audience. (W-1)
- Establish a substantive claim, distinguishing it from alternate or opposing claims. (W-16)

Gather and evaluate relevant information from a range of sources:

- Gather the information needed to build an argument, provide an explanation or address a research question. (W-2)
- * Extract key information efficiently in print and online using text features and search techniques. (R-12)
- Ascertain the origin, credibility, and accuracy of print and online sources. (R-13)
- Evaluate the reasoning and rhetoric that support an argument or explanation, including assessing whether the evidence provided is relevant and sufficient. (R-14)
- Follow the progression of the speaker's message and evaluate the speaker's point of view, reasoning, and use of evidence and rhetoric. (S&L-6)

Analyze research sources:

- Delineate the main ideas or themes in the text and the details that elaborate and support them. (R-4)
- Listen to complex information and discern the main ideas, the significant details, and the relationships among them.
 (S&L-5)
- Discern the most important ideas, events, or information and summarize them accurately and concisely. (R-3)
- Synthesize data, diagrams, maps, and other visual elements with words in the text to further comprehension. (R-11)
- Synthesize information from multiple relevant sources, including graphics and quantitative information when appropriate, to provide an accurate picture of that information. (W-13)
- Analyze how two or more texts with different styles, points of view, or arguments address similar topics or themes. (R-15)
- Acknowledge competing arguments or information, defending or qualifying the initial claim as appropriate. (W-18)

Report findings:

- Link claims and evidence with clear reasons and ensure that the evidence is relevant and sufficient to support the claims. (W-17)
- Convey complex information clearly and coherently to the audience through purposeful selection and organization of the content. (W-14)
- Demonstrate understanding of the content by reporting the facts accurately and anticipating reader misconceptions. (W-15)
- Present information, findings, and supporting evidence, clearly and concisely. (S&L-2)
- Support and illustrate arguments and explanations with relevant details, examples, and evidence. (W-4)
- Represent and cite accurately the data, conclusions, and opinions of others, effectively incorporating them into one's own work while avoiding plagiarism. (W-10)

APPENDIX 13 - (B)(1) Internationally Benchmarked Common Core Standards - Public Drafts Application of the Core: Media

The Core Standards for Reading, Writing, and Speaking and Listening have been designed to include the essential skills and knowledge that students need to apply to college and career tasks such as media analysis and creation. This section shows how standards in the core apply to media.

Rapidly evolving technologies are powerful tools—but only for those who have the skills to put them to work. As the capability of the technology grows, students' command of these skills must only increase.

At the core of media mastery are the same fundamental capacities as are required offline in traditional print forms: an ability to access, understand, and evaluate complex materials and messages and to produce clear, effective communications. Media mastery does, however, call upon students to apply these core skills in new ways and contexts. Media enable students to communicate quickly with a large, often unknown, and broadly diverse audience. Whereas in the past, students may have had days or weeks to digest new information and formulate a response, the online environment pushes students to exercise judgment and present their responses in a matter of minutes.

Speed is not the only new factor. In the electronic world, reading, writing, speaking, and listening are uniquely intertwined. Multimedia forms force students to engage with constantly changing combinations of elements, such as graphics, images, hyperlinks, and embedded video and audio. The technology itself is changing quickly, creating new urgency for adaptation and flexibility on the part of students.

The following Core Standards describe the particular reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills that students will need in order to use media effectively in college and careers:

Standards for Range and Content drawn from each strand

Multimedia Sources: Students must be able to integrate what they learn from reading text with what they learn from audio, video, and other digital media. Many of the same critical issues that students face when reading traditional printed texts will arise as they seek to comprehend multimedia, such as determining where the author has chosen to focus, evaluating evidence, and comparing different accounts of similar subjects. [R-D]

Technology and Collaboration: Technology offers students powerful tools for producing, editing, and distributing writing as well as for collaboration. Especially in the workplace, writers often use technology to produce documents and to provide feedback. [W-D]

Multimedia Comprehension: New technologies expand the role that speaking and listening skills will play in acquiring and sharing knowledge. Students will need to view and listen to diverse media to gain knowledge and integrate this information with what they learn through reading text online as well as in print. When speaking, students can draw on media to illustrate their points, make data and evidence vivid, and engage their audiences. Multimedia accelerates the speed at which connections between reading, writing, and speaking and listening can be made, requiring students to be ready to use these skills nearly simultaneously. [S&L-C]

Standards for Student Performance drawn from each strand

Gather information from a wide array of electronic sources and multimedia:

- Extract key information efficiently in print and online using text features and search techniques. (R-12)
- Synthesize data, diagrams, maps, and other visual elements with words in the text to further comprehension. (R-11)
- Listen to complex information and discern the main ideas, the significant details, and the relationships among them. (S&L 5)

Evaluate information from digital media:

- Ascertain the origin, credibility, and accuracy of print and online sources. (R-13)
- Evaluate the reasoning and rhetoric that support an argument or explanation, including assessing whether the evidence provided is relevant and sufficient. (R-14)
- Follow the progression of the speaker's message and evaluate the speaker's point of view, reasoning, and use of evidence and rhetoric. (S&L-6)

Create and distribute media communications:

- Use technology as a tool to produce, edit, and distribute writing. (W-12)
- Synthesize information from multiple relevant sources, including graphics and quantitative information when appropriate, to provide an accurate picture of that information. (W-13)
- Make strategic use of multimedia elements and visual displays of data to gain audience attention and enhance understanding. (S&L-3)

Exemplars of Reading Text Complexity

As described in the Standards for the Range and Content of Student Reading, college- and careerready students must be able to read texts of sufficient complexity on their own. Studies show that many students who are unable to read sufficiently challenging texts independently by the end of high school struggle with the reading demands of college; many twenty-first-century careers likewise demand that people be able to obtain, search through, and comprehend large amounts of often technical information.

To develop that ability, students should engage with high-quality texts that provide strong models of thinking and writing, that challenge them intellectually, and that introduce them to rich content, sophisticated vocabulary, and examples of exceptional craft. The reading students do should be broad and deep, allowing them to extend their knowledge of particular subjects as well as learn about the features of texts written for different disciplines, audiences, and purposes. While no sampling can do justice to the numerous ways in which different authors craft complex prose, as a collection the exemplar texts below illustrate the level of complexity that college- and career-ready students should be able to handle independently by the end of high school. Texts in translation have not been included in this draft but will be part of future drafts.

How Text Complexity was Determined

In addition to surveys of required reading in twelfth grade and the first year of college as well as consultations with experts, two leading measurement systems were used to help make the selections below. The first system—a methodology described by Jeanne Chall and her coauthors in *The Qualitative Assessment of Text Difficulty*—employs trained raters to measure the sophistication of vocabulary, density of ideas, and syntactic complexity in a text as well as the general and subject-specific knowledge and the level of reasoning required for understanding it. The second system, Coh-Metrix, incorporates into its computer-based analysis more than sixty specific indices of syntax, semantics, readability, and cohesion to assess text complexity. Central to its assessment are measures of text cohesiveness, which is the degree to which the text uses explicit markers to link ideas. By analyzing the degree to which those links are missing in a text—and therefore the degree to which a reader must make inferences to connect ideas—this measure gauges a key factor in the comprehension demand of a text.

The two methods described above have limitations. The complexity of poems (such as "O Captain! My Captain!") cannot be assessed by Coh-Metrix because poetry adheres to different rules of construction than does prose. Similarly, while individual stories in the sample *New York Times* front pages can be measured for complexity by Coh-Metrix, the method does not capture how the electronic environment enhances or detracts from readability. However, for those exemplar texts whose complexity could be measured by both systems, comparable results were yielded by Coh-Metrix and the Chall method.

Note: The samples of complex text are supplemented by brief performance examples that further clarify the meaning of the standards. These illustrate specifically the application of the performance standards to texts of sufficient complexity, quality, and range. Relevant standards are noted in brackets following each sample performance.

Pride and Prejudice by Jane Austen

Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice* is a sophisticated literary text featuring multiple plotlines, a style and word choice reflective of its time period and setting, and subtle relationships among characters; the excerpt here can only illustrate some of the complexities that readers of the full work will encounter. The novel's opening sentence—"It is a truth universally acknowledged, that a single man in possession of a good fortune, must be in want of a wife"—signals that today's readers will need to employ literary imagination and historical context to re-create for themselves a world largely in the past. The novel's style is elaborate, with many lengthy and, to the modern ear, formal-sounding sentences typical of the period during which the novel was written. While the dialogue is less formal than much of the surrounding text, words and phrases such as *let* (to mean "rent" or "lease") and *chaise and four* (referring to a type of carriage) mark the novel's setting. The excerpt suggests also the kind of close reading of the subtleties of character that readers must perform. The banter between Mr. and Mrs. Bennet reveals both affection and difference of opinion, and it offers clues to the mores of well-to-do English society in the early nineteenth century.

Sample performance aligned with the Core Standards

Students analyze the first impressions given of Mr. and Mrs. Bennet in the first chapter of *Pride and Prejudice* based on how the characters are described, what they say and do, and how they interact. Students compare these first impressions with their later understanding based on how the characters develop throughout the novel. [R-6]

from Pride and Prejudice

<u>Chapter 1</u>

It is a truth universally acknowledged, that a single man in possession of a good fortune, must be in want of a wife.

However little known the feelings or views of such a man may be on his first entering a neighbourhood, this truth is so well fixed in the minds of the surrounding families that he is considered as the rightful property of some one or other of their daughters.

"My dear Mr. Bennet," said his lady to him one day, "have you heard that Netherfield Park is let at last?"

Mr. Bennet replied that he had not.

"But it is," returned she; "for Mrs. Long has just been here, and she told me all about it."

Mr. Bennet made no answer.

"Do not you want to know who has taken it?" cried his wife impatiently.

"You want to tell me, and I have no objection to hearing it."

This was invitation enough.

"Why, my dear, you must know, Mrs. Long says that Netherfield is taken by a young man of large fortune from the north of England; that he came down on Monday in a chaise and four to see the place, and was so much delighted with it, that he agreed with Mr. Morris immediately; that he is to take possession before Michaelmas, and some of his servants are to be in the house by the end of next week."

"What is his name?"

"Bingley."

"Is he married or single?"

"Oh! single, my dear, to be sure! A single man of large fortune; four or five thousand a year. What a fine thing for our girls!"

"How so? how can it affect them?"

"My dear Mr. Bennet," replied his wife, "how can you be so tiresome! You must know that I am thinking of his marrying one of them."

7

"Is that his design in settling here?"

"Design! nonsense, how can you talk so! But it is very likely that he *may* fall in love with one of them, and therefore you must visit him as soon as he comes."

"I see no occasion for that. You and the girls may go, or you may send them by themselves, which perhaps will be still better, for as you are as handsome as any of them, Mr. Bingley might like you the best of the party."

"My dear, you flatter me. I certainly *have* had my share of beauty, but I do not pretend to be any thing extraordinary now. When a woman has five grown-up daughters she ought to give over thinking of her own beauty."

"In such cases a woman has not often much beauty to think of."

"But, my dear, you must indeed go and see Mr. Bingley when he comes into the neighbourhood."

"It is more than I engage for, I assure you."

"But consider your daughters. Only think what an establishment it would be for one of them. Sir William and Lady Lucas are determined to go, merely on that account, for in general, you know, they visit no new-comers. Indeed you must go, for it will be impossible for us to visit him if you do not."

"You are over-scrupulous surely. I dare say Mr. Bingley will be very glad to see you; and I will send a few lines by you to assure him of my hearty consent to his marrying whichever he chuses of the girls: though I must throw in a good word for my little Lizzy."

"I desire you will do no such thing. Lizzy is not a bit better than the others; and I am sure she is not half so handsome as Jane, nor half so good-humoured as Lydia. But you are always giving *her* the preference."

"They have none of them much to recommend them," replied he; "they are all silly and ignorant, like other girls; but Lizzy has something more of quickness than her sisters."

"Mr. Bennet, how can you abuse your own children in such a way! You take delight in vexing me. You have no compassion on my poor nerves."

"You mistake me, my dear. I have a high respect for your nerves. They are my old friends. I have heard you mention them with consideration these twenty years at least."

"Ah! you do not know what I suffer."

"But I hope you will get over it, and live to see many young men of four thousand a year come into the neighbourhood."

"It will be no use to us if twenty such should come, since you will not visit them."

"Depend upon it, my dear, that when there are twenty, I will visit them all."

8

Mr. Bennet was so odd a mixture of quick parts, sarcastic humour, reserve, and caprice, that the experience of three-and-twenty years had been insufficient to make his wife understand his character. *Her* mind was less difficult to develope. She was a woman of mean understanding, little information, and uncertain temper. When she was discontented she fancied herself nervous. The business of her life was to get her daughters married; its solace was visiting and news.

"O Captain! My Captain!" by Walt Whitman

Though poetry's complexity cannot be assessed by the measures of readability used for the prose exemplars, "O Captain! My Captain!" by Walt Whitman clearly has many of the features of complex texts listed in the Standards for the Range and Content of Student Reading. Modern readers must work to understand what would have been obvious to readers in 1865: "O Captain! My Captain!" is an extended-metaphor poem intended to convey Whitman's and the North's grief over the assassination of Abraham Lincoln so near the conclusion of hostilities in the Civil War. Every element in the poem stands for something else, with the captain representing Lincoln, the ship representing the Union (or the "ship of state"), the voyage representing the war, and so on. Historical context, along with skill in reading literature, is thus particularly important to interpreting this text.

Sample performance aligned with the Core Standards

Students apply knowledge gained from reading the *New York Times* articles on Lincoln's assassination to their understanding of the poem "O Captain! My Captain!" Specifically, students draw on the description of the crowd's response to the attack on Lincoln to inform their understanding of Whitman's poem. [R-17]

"O Captain! My Captain!" by Walt Whitman

O Captain! my Captain! our fearful trip is done, The ship has weather'd every rack, the prize we sought is won, The port is near, the bells I hear, the people all exulting, While follow eyes the steady keel, the vessel grim and daring, But O heart! heart! heart! O the bleeding drops of red, Where on the deck my Captain lies, Fallen cold and dead. O Captain! my Captain! rise up and hear the bells; Rise up—for you the flag is flung—for you the bugle trills, For you bouquets and ribbon'd wreaths—for you the shores a-crowding, For you they call, the swaying mass, their eager faces turning, Here, Captain! dear father! This arm beneath your head; It is some dream that on the deck You've fallen cold and dead. My Captain does not answer, his lips are pale and still My father does not feel my arm, he has no pulse nor will, The ship is anchor'd safe and sound, its voyage closed and done. From fearful trip, the victor ship comes in with object won; Exult, O shores, and ring O bells! But I with mournful tread Walk the deck my Captain lies, Fallen cold and dead.

The front page of the New York Times, April 15, 1865

The challenge posed to a modern reader by the front page of the *New York Times* on April 15, 1865, is significant in terms of format, timeliness, and point of view. Unlike the graphically heavy front page of modern newspapers, this 1865 New York Times front page is mostly uninterrupted columns of text. The reader is obviously expected to proceed from top to bottom and left to right across the page, but little other guidance is provided. Because the assassination of Lincoln was still "breaking news" as this edition of the Times would have gone to press, some details of the event would have not yet been known; readers will have to sort out what they know about the assassination from what the people reading the paper on that Saturday morning would just have been learning. Three accounts of the events rather than one are provided here, and the sourcing and tone vary greatly. Certain details found in one place are contradicted in another: the "Detail of the Occurrence," for example, suggests that Lincoln may not have been mortally wounded, but the main headline in the top left-hand corner of the page states "No Hopes Entertained of His Recovery." While the first two accounts aim at a certain objectivity, the third begins with a flourish that may surprise readers more used to a restrained style of journalism: "A stroke from Heaven laying the whole of the city in instant ruin could not have startled us as did the word that broke from Ford's Theatre a half hour ago that the President had been shot."

Sample performance aligned with the Core Standards

Students analyze how the three different accounts on the front page portray Lincoln's assassination, including which details are similar or different. [R-15]

Illustrative Text #3: The front page of the New York Times, April 15, 1865

The New-York Times. PRICE FOUR CENTS VOL. XIV NO. 4230. EUROPEAN NEWS AWFUL EVENT INDIA all, he then rushed upon the arry, who was lying in hed in same room, and latinized three ad from the box, wh date in much the AYS LATER BY THE EUROP ent to the sport DETAILS OF THE DREADFUL TRAGEDY. President Lincoln BRAZII It to Our C all has re by Portugal. Shot by an Howing Game. Eco on Javerne, Beitrowy, ere Ers. 4004. - State of Good Sorie at 5556. Raigrowth - State of Good Sorie at 5556. Bane, Book, 100,000 Ban. Freights State Bane, Setarday, Narah 1 Bane, State War Department, Washington, April 15- 1:30 A.M. aister at Li a of Mrs. Lo Assassin. Maj.-Gen. Dix: Ruckunge Sfie. ds Satis This evening at about 9:30 P.M., at Ford's Theater, the the bec has extrendered to The Deed Done at F of the Commander LATEOT VIA LEVERING reserves, Suturday Evolute, Vienze to-day has an of the total the second second second the second second second second the second second second second the second second second second second the second second second second second the second second second second second second the second second second second second second second second the second seco Theatre Last Night. President, while sitting in his private box with Mrs. Belan Requested. Lincoln, Mrs. Harris, and Major Rathburn, was shot THE ACT OF A DESPERATE REBE ce in Fi by an assassin, who suddenly entered the box and approached behind the President. The President Still Alive AND C The assassin then leaped upon the stage, brandishing Last Accounts. a large dagger or knife, and made his escape in the rear No Hopes Entertained of of the theater. Recovery. LATEST VIA QUI There is no nows of importance Pass, Frider, Ma Destry, The Re pted Assassination The a Secretary Seward. CONNERCTAL. as be DETAILS OF THE BREADFUL TRAGED Loventon, April 1 an she hav ANOTHER ACCOUNT freed on the o Special Dispatch to the New-York Times. Was Davasterer. to which the Pr Washington, Friday, April 14, As Inc g at about 9 20 P. M., al Fo President, while sitting in eith Mon. Lorona, Men. Hat courses, was shot by an an 11:15 P.M. Th A stroke from Heaven laying the whole of nt as that up the city in instant ruin could not have behind the Presi Mr. Bawahns we ad is not d startled us as did the word that broke from il, but may prove so then leaped upon the Ford's Theater a half hour ago that the pe in the rear of the theaten a shill, but all he President had been shot. It flew I's head and penetrated m of his family with the too and for description. everywhere in five minutes, and set five ANOTHER ACCOUNT. a been insensible over slove it was i and is now dying. It the sense how on assault, wheth no or and, entored Mr. Reward's app and sucket the persons of having pilon, was shown to the Secretary harder. The assesses isomediate to the bed, and inflicted two or the idnight, the Catomes, Contax and Pannewonro, Judge C Con. Macon, Col. 33 ninoros, Priday, April 14, 3 11:16 P. M. thousand people in swift and excited motion on the instant. are with him, as also the V an did the the It few . the threat and two on the set five t et the wounds may not be ma on is that they will pro g. 11 surve sharmed Mr. Fas Les India and gen was in an adjuising room, and to an acquising resea, and see of his father's rescu, while, who influence upon his forgerous wounds. The re-s Sawanu is doubtful, it probable that the Tree ighton the night. saw and wills were advert any this evening, but he ad. 12.0 P on his Cite of Cite e this is not to he stage, and in gh the side so on at 6 o'clock this ere ast meeting at which Gen At a Cab TION OF THE PRESENT the subject of the state Sewam had also and the prospect of a speat the Pro on Chambers of the 253, 'H. J DETAIL OF THE OCCURRENCE Washington, Friday, April 14- 12:30 A.M. eint iner, #31,000 : the fire is anknow The President was shot in a theater tonight, and is, perhaps, mortally wounded. Secretary Seward was WIN M. START also assassinated. rihr War SECOND DISPATCH. DETAIL OF THE OCCURRENCE. kis fubde Washington, Friday, April 14. President Lincoln and what n, Frider, April 14wife, with other friends, this evening visited Ford's tary as he was a Theater for the purpose of witnessing the AFTINE BORTIS, Jr., Par is bod, inff foist Dat performance of the "American Cousin. montal w visited 2 line and wanted at 198 e of wi using the but not serie ty he the "Ame rican Cenain." 28 . The assault rid ad the fleet horse on met whee Mould need in the papers that he be present, but he Australe is the City, as A Gilesce, Canoni, S. H., is Pitherena Harti, J. R. Benners, Chaireall, Gar would also be present, be trais of cars for New Jers which he did to the the O. N. Ebannen, Chaisenall, Gen, E. F. Milger, Athland, Dr. N. Greens, Louisvite, Ja. S. Gritsmud, Terre Hauts, are stapping al surgestings Barri.

http://timesmachine.nytimes.com/browser/1865/04/15/P1

The Declaration of Independence

The Declaration of Independence represents the kind of rich primary source material students should be able to read on their own by the end of high school. Though some of the lines ("We hold these truths . . .") are familiar to most American readers, the case against Great Britain that the Declaration lays out, expressed in elevated, sometimes archaic language (*unalienable, hath, usurpations*), requires careful examination to follow in its particulars. The beginning of the document, excerpted here, poses a reading challenge partly because of its philosophical abstractness. The first three sentences, although formally divided, are one continuous list of propositions ("truths") about the nature of government and the rights of the people. Further complicating the reading is that there is little explicit cohesion between sentences—links supplied by words and phrases such as "for example," "moreover," or "in addition"—to help readers understand the relationship between the ideas being expressed.

Sample performance aligned with the Core Standards

Students compare the argument that the Declaration makes justifying revolution to Martin Luther King, Jr.'s defense of civil disobedience in *Letter from Birmingham Jail*. [R-15]

from The Declaration of Independence

When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. —That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, —That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive to these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shewn, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new guards for their future security. —Such has been the patient sufferance of these Colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former Systems of Government. The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States. To prove this, let Facts be submitted to a candid world.

Letter from Birmingham Jail by Martin Luther King, Jr.

Martin Luther King, Jr.'s, *Letter from Birmingham Jail* presents many challenges to the reader in terms of its format, purpose, tone, use of allusions, and language. Apart from letters to the editor (most of which are relatively short), public letters such as King's are uncommon today. The purpose of the text may also be confusing: King is ostensibly addressing his "Fellow Clergymen," but skilled readers will reasonably infer that King's message is intended for a broader audience. Though the tone of the text is measured, King's passion for his cause comes through. The author frequently points outside the *Letter* itself through allusions to other texts, including the Hebrew and Christian scriptures. Moreover, King uses sophisticated vocabulary (*cognizant, mutuality, provincial, gainsaying*) and figurative language (*garment of destiny*) throughout his text. However, the piece is both coherent in that its sequence is signaled ("While confined here . . . But more basically . . . Moreover, I am cognizant . . .") and cohesive in that its clauses and sentences are logically linked for the reader ("Just as the prophets . . . and just as the Apostle Paul . . . so am I compelled . . .").

Sample performance aligned with the Core Standards

Students evaluate the reasoning and rhetoric of the three very different arguments King makes to defend his being in Birmingham. Students assess the different kinds of evidence he uses to support each argument. [R-14]

from Letter from Birmingham Jail*

License granted by Intellectual Properties Management, Atlanta, Georgia, as exclusive licensor of the King Estate.

My Dear Fellow Clergymen:

While confined here in the Birmingham city jail, I came across your recent statement calling my present activities "unwise and untimely." Seldom do I pause to answer criticism of my work and ideas. If I sought to answer all the criticisms that cross my desk, my secretaries would have little time for anything other than such correspondence in the course of the day, and I would have no time for constructive work. But since I feel that you are men of genuine good will and that your criticisms are sincerely set forth, I want to try to answer your statements in what I hope will be patient and reasonable terms.

I think I should indicate why I am here In Birmingham, since you have been influenced by the view which argues against "outsiders coming in." I have the honor of serving as president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, an organization operating in every southern state, with headquarters in Atlanta, Georgia. We have some eighty-five affiliated organizations across the South, and one of them is the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights. Frequently we share staff, educational and financial resources with our affiliates. Several months ago the affiliate here in Birmingham asked us to be on call to engage in a nonviolent direct-action program if such were deemed necessary. We readily consented, and when the hour came we lived up to our promise. So I, along with several members of my staff, am here because I was invited here I am here because I have organizational ties here.

But more basically, I am in Birmingham because injustice is here. Just as the prophets of the eighth century B.C. left their villages and carried their "thus saith the Lord" far beyond the boundaries of their home towns, and just as the Apostle Paul left his village of Tarsus and carried the gospel of Jesus Christ to the far corners of the Greco-Roman world, so am I. compelled to carry the gospel of freedom beyond my own home town. Like Paul, I must constantly respond to the Macedonian call for aid.

Moreover, I am cognizant of the interrelatedness of all communities and states. I cannot sit idly by in Atlanta and not be concerned about what happens in Birmingham. Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly, affects all indirectly. Never again can we afford to live with the narrow, provincial "outside agitator" idea. Anyone who lives inside the United States can never be considered an outsider anywhere within its bounds.

*As reprinted in *Why We Can't Wait* by King, Jr., M. L. (2000). New York City: Signet Classics.

Toni Morrison's Nobel lecture, 1993

Toni Morrison's Nobel lecture, though originally delivered orally, can be read on the page as a complex work of analysis and criticism. Its structure, syntax, imagery, language, and density of ideas contribute to the challenge of studying it in this manner. As this excerpt shows, Morrison begins with a folktale. While the "once upon a time" opening may lead readers into thinking that the lecture will primarily be in narrative form, Morrison uses the tale mainly as a springboard for an abstract, allegorical discussion of language, writing, and those who have no voice in society. Morrison often employs sophisticated sentences that require patience and concentration to follow. Readers may recognize places where Morrison varies sentence patterns to change pace and rhythm—particularly important to the oral delivery of the text. The images Morrison creates are powerful and poetic, the diction is elevated and academic, and the word choice is metaphorical and unconventional: "Official language smitheryed to sanction ignorance and preserve privilege is a suit of armor polished to shocking glitter, a husk from which the knight departed long ago." The richness and abstractness of the ideas in the lecture mean that rereadings may be necessary to comprehend and evaluate the ideas fully.

Sample performance aligned with the Core Standards

Students determine what Morrison means when she compares language to "a bird in the hand," including the different connotations of this phrase that she develops throughout the lecture. Students also explore what Morrison means by saying that both the bird and language can be "dead or alive." [R-7]

from Toni Morrison's Nobel lecture, 1993

Copyright © The Nobel Foundation 1993. Reprinted by permission.

"Once upon a time there was an old woman. Blind but wise." Or was it an old man? A guru, perhaps. Or a griot soothing restless children. I have heard this story, or one exactly like it, in the lore of several cultures.

"Once upon a time there was an old woman. Blind. Wise."

In the version I know the woman is the daughter of slaves, black, American, and lives alone in a small house outside of town. Her reputation for wisdom is without peer and without question. Among her people she is both the law and its transgression. The honor she is paid and the awe in which she is held reach beyond her neighborhood to places far away; to the city where the intelligence of rural prophets is the source of much amusement.

One day the woman is visited by some young people who seem to be bent on disproving her clairvoyance and showing her up for the fraud they believe she is. Their plan is simple: they enter her house and ask the one question the answer to which rides solely on her difference from them, a difference they regard as a profound disability: her blindness. They stand before her, and one of them says, "Old woman, I hold in my hand a bird. Tell me whether it is living or dead."

She does not answer, and the question is repeated. "Is the bird I am holding living or dead?"

Still she doesn't answer. She is blind and cannot see her visitors, let alone what is in their hands. She does not know their color, gender or homeland. She only knows their motive.

The old woman's silence is so long, the young people have trouble holding their laughter.

Finally she speaks and her voice is soft but stern. "I don't know", she says. "I don't know whether the bird you are holding is dead or alive, but what I do know is that it is in your hands. It is in your hands."

Her answer can be taken to mean: if it is dead, you have either found it that way or you have killed it. If it is alive, you can still kill it. Whether it is to stay alive, it is your decision.

19

Whatever the case, it is your responsibility.

For parading their power and her helplessness, the young visitors are reprimanded, told they are responsible not only for the act of mockery but also for the small bundle of life sacrificed to achieve its aims. The blind woman shifts attention away from assertions of power to the instrument through which that power is exercised.

Speculation on what (other than its own frail body) that bird-in-the-hand might signify has always been attractive to me, but especially so now thinking, as I have been, about the work I do that has brought me to this company. So I choose to read the bird as language and the woman as a practiced writer. She is worried about how the language she dreams in, given to her at birth, is handled, put into service, even withheld from her for certain nefarious purposes. Being a writer she thinks of language partly as a system, partly as a living thing over which one has control, but mostly as agency—as an act with consequences. So the question the children put to her: "Is it living or dead?" is not unreal because she thinks of language as susceptible to death, erasure; certainly imperiled and salvageable only by an effort of the will. She believes that if the bird in the hands of her visitors is dead the custodians are responsible for the corpse. For her a dead language is not only one no longer spoken or written, it is unvielding language content to admire its own paralysis. Like statist language, censored and censoring. Ruthless in its policing duties, it has no desire or purpose other than maintaining the free range of its own narcotic narcissism, its own exclusivity and dominance. However moribund, it is not without effect for it actively thwarts the intellect, stalls conscience, suppresses human potential. Unreceptive to interrogation, it cannot form or tolerate new ideas, shape other thoughts, tell another story, fill baffling silences. Official language smitherved to sanction ignorance and preserve privilege is a suit of armor polished to shocking glitter, a husk from which the knight departed long ago. Yet there it is: dumb, predatory, sentimental. Exciting reverence in schoolchildren, providing shelter for despots, summoning false memories of stability, harmony among the public.

Inquiry into Life, 12th edition, by Sylvia S. Mader

These excerpts, and the prominent college-level biology textbook from which they are drawn, represent some of the challenges presented by complex writing in natural science, including discipline-specific terms (*covalent bond, plasma membrane, neurotransmitter*), everyday language used in specialized ways (*shell, channel*), abbreviations (H^+ , *AChE*), and chains of cause-effect relationships that together describe sometimes elaborate processes. Although the figures the author, Sylvia S. Mader, refers to in the text are not included with these excerpts, students reading the larger work will have to integrate words, illustrations, and diagrams to make full sense of the ideas and concepts she describes. For these reasons and others, comprehension may be difficult for readers who have not had experience independently reading similar kinds of text and who lack a knowledge base in the subject. The author does employ a number of cohesive features to help readers understand the terminology and to link ideas. She repeats content words to let readers follow the flow of ideas; she sets up contrastive situations to illustrate the ideas (within, for example, the first and the third paragraphs below); and she uses transitional links ("In some synapses . . . In other synapses . . .") to help readers construct meaning.

Sample performance aligned with the Core Standards

Students discern the most important information in the description of covalent bonding and provide an accurate summary of the concept. [R-3]

from Inquiry into Life, 12th edition

Copyright © The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

A **covalent bond** results when two atoms share electrons in such a way that each atom has an octet of electrons in the outer shell. In a hydrogen atom, the outer shell is complete when it contains two electrons. If hydrogen is in the presence of a strong electron acceptor, it gives up its electron to become a hydrogen ion (H⁺). But if this is not possible, hydrogen can share with another atom and thereby have a completed outer shell. For example, one hydrogen atom will share with another hydrogen atom. Their two orbitals overlap, and the electrons are shared between them. Because they share the electron pair, each atom has a completed outer shell.

* * * * * * * *

The passage of salt (NaCl) across a plasma membrane is of primary importance to most cells. The chloride ion (Cl⁻) usually crosses the plasma membrane because it is attracted by positively charged sodium ions (Na⁺). First sodium ions are pumped across a membrane, and then chloride ions simply diffuse through channels that allow their passage.

As noted in Figure 4.2*a*, the genetic disorder cystic fibrosis results from a faulty chloride channel. Ordinarily, after chloride ions have passed though the membrane, sodium ions (Na⁺) and water follow. In cystic fibrosis, Cl⁻ transport is reduced, and so is the flow of Na⁺ and water.

* * * * * * * *

Once a neurotransmitter has been released into a synaptic cleft and has initiated a response, it is removed from the cleft. In some synapses, the postsynaptic membrane contains enzymes that rapidly inactivate the neurotransmitter. For example, the enzyme **acetylcholinesterase (AChE)** breaks down acetylcholine. In other synapses, the presynaptic membrane rapidly reabsorbs the neurotransmitter, possibly for repackaging in synaptic vesicles or for molecular breakdown. The short existence of neurotransmitters at a synapse prevents continuous stimulation (or inhibition) of postsynaptic membranes.

Sample business memo (ACT WorkKeys Reading for Information Test)

Though not a typical kind of reading in high school classrooms, the business communication, such as the one sampled here, is a form that career-ready students will need to be able to comprehend independently. This text, taken from ACT's WorkKeys Reading for Information Test, is challenging in large part because, like many such communications, it contains important, detailed information intended for a specialized audience. Structurally, the text offers little guidance on how it should be read. Potentially vital details appear throughout and are mingled with other details irrelevant to some readers (e.g., those without children). Even the paragraphing is somewhat inconsistent, especially between the first and second paragraphs. While the sentences are not particularly long and the language is not overly technical, the density of information and its lack of prioritization make this a complex text.

Sample performance aligned with the Core Standards

Students infer from the memo the conditions under which children who are under nineteen are not covered by the health plan. [R-1]

Sample business memo

WorkKeys Reading for Information Test has been reproduced with permission of ACT, Inc.

DETERMINING ELIGIBILITY FOR MEDICAL COVERAGE

All full-time employees of the company who work an average of at least 30 hours per week are eligible under this plan. Coverage begins on the first day of the month following the 30 days of active full-time employment. If employees enroll within 31 days of the date they are eligible, medical evidence of good health is not required. Temporary and part-time employees are not eligible. Employees are no longer eligible under this plan one month after the date they begin active duty in the armed forces of any country and continuing for the duration of their service.

If employees enroll their dependents within 31 days of the date they become eligible, medical evidence of good health is not required. If they do not, they will be required to submit evidence of good health for each dependent, at their expense, which is satisfactory to the company.

The following dependents are eligible under this plan: employees' spouses, employees' unmarried children under age 19, employees' unmarried dependent children under age 23 who are attending trade school, college, or university on a full-time basis, or employees' unmarried disabled children age 19 and over. Coverage ceases when spouses or children cease to be dependent upon employees for support. In the case of employees' spouses this is if they are legally separated or divorced. In the case of disabled children, this is when they are no longer disabled. Coverage will cease when dependents have served in the armed forces of any country for more than one month, or when maximum benefits have been paid.

FedViews, July 9, 2009, by Mary C. Daly (The Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco's Web site)

This text illustrates some of the difficulties posed by integrating information gained from words and graphics. This sort of challenge is common in writing designed to inform or explain, including writing in the workplace. The bullet point format used here means that the kind of explicit transitions between ideas typically found in prose are missing; readers will have to infer relationships between the points made by the author, Mary C. Daly, and synthesize the information into a coherent whole. Readers will furthermore have to analyze both the words and the graphics, integrate the information, and check to see whether each source of information supports the other. Daly also uses a great deal of specialized language; the terms *feedback loop, credit availability*, and *barriers to credit* all appear in just the first bullet point here.

Sample performance aligned with the Core Standards

Students synthesize information drawn from the text as well as the graphs in order to gain an overarching view of the economy on July 9, 2009. [R-11]

from FedViews, July 9, 2009

Reprinted from the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco's FedViews of July 9, 2009. The opinions expressed in this article do not necessarily reflect the views of the management of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, or of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Mary C. Daly, vice president and director of the Center for the Study of Innovation and Productivity at the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, states her views on the current economy and the outlook.

- Financial markets are improving, and the crisis mode that has characterized the past year is subsiding. The adverse feedback loop, in which losses by banks and other lenders lead to tighter credit availability, which then leads to lower spending by households and businesses, has begun to slow. As such, investors' appetite for risk is returning, and some of the barriers to credit that have been constraining businesses and households are diminishing.
- Income from the federal fiscal stimulus, as well as some improvement in confidence, has helped stabilize consumer spending. Since consumer spending accounts for two-thirds of all economic activity, this is a key factor affecting our forecast of growth in the third quarter.
- The gradual nature of the recovery will put additional pressure on state and local budgets. Following a difficult 2009, especially in the West, most states began the 2010 fiscal year on July 1 with even larger budget gaps to solve.
- Still, many remain worried that large fiscal deficits will eventually be inflationary. However, a look at the empirical link between fiscal deficits and inflation in the United States shows no correlation between the two. Indeed, during the 1980s, when the United States was running large deficits, inflation was coming down.

APPENDIX 13 - (B)(1) Internationally Benchmarked Common Core Standards - Public Drafts



Consumers hanging on

Real Personal Consumption Expenditures Chained 2000dollars, Seasonally Adjusted Annual Rate



State budget gaps pervasive in 2009



27

APPENDIX 13 - (B)(1) Internationally Benchmarked Common Core Standards - Public Drafts



The front page of the *New York Times*, Web version, August 18, 2009, 9:03 a.m. ET

The challenge offered by this online text and others like it is very different from that offered by a complex continuous text in, say, the sciences. The brief passages are not conceptually difficult, the language is not technical or esoteric, and the sentences are not particularly complex. But these characteristics belie the complexity of the reading task. An online text of this kind requires readers to apply their print-reading skills in tandem with their knowledge of how to use online periodicals. The editors and designers have assigned levels of importance to individual stories and images, as measured by their size and position in the layout. The page itself uses words, numbers, icons, and other visual elements (e.g., line, color, and shape) to guide readers further. Headings in various colors direct readers to particular sections (OPINION, MARKETS, HEALTH), while links direct readers to particular stories ("Taliban Talks Are Key Issue in Afghan Vote"). Time markers ("3 minutes ago") help readers assess how new the information in a given story is. The text requires readers to make choices about which links to follow based on their understanding of how online text is typically structured and on a minimum of additional information (e.g., an icon of a camera, a drop-down menu in an ad).

Sample performance aligned with the Core Standards

Students select an article and use search terms and other features of the online text to research a specific aspect of the subject in more depth. [R-12]

The front page of the *New York Times*, Web version, August 18, 2009, 9:03 a.m. ET

From The New York Times, August 18, 2009. The New York Times: All rights reserved. Used by permission and protected by the Copyright Laws of the United States. The printing, copying, redistribution, or retransmission of the Material without express written permission is prohibited. <u>http://www.nytimes.com</u>



504
Sample of Works Consulted

I. College Readiness

- A. Achieve, Inc. (2004). The American Diploma Project, *Ready or Not: Creating a High School Diploma that Counts*. Washington, DC: Achieve, Inc. (PDF)
- B. Achieve, Inc. (2008) Out of Many, One: Towards Rigorous Common Core Standards from the Ground Up. Washington, DC: Achieve, Inc. (PDF)
- C. ACT. (2009). *ACT College Ready English Standards*. Iowa City, IA: ACT. (<u>PDF</u>)
- D. ACT. (2006). *ACT National Curriculum Survey 2005-2006*. Iowa City, IA: ACT. (<u>PDF</u>)
- E. ACT. (2007). Aligning Postsecondary Expectations and High School Practice: The Gap Defined (Policy Implications of the ACT National Curriculum Survey Results 2005-2006). Iowa City, IA: ACT. (PDF)
- F. ACT. (2006). Reading Between the Lines: What the ACT Reveals about College Readiness in Reading. Iowa City, IA: ACT. (PDF)
- G. ACT. (2006). *Ready for College and Ready for Work: Same or Different?* Iowa City, IA: ACT. (PDF)
- H. ACT. (2007). *Rigor at Risk: Reaffirming Quality in the High*

School Core Curriculum. Iowa City, IA: ACT. (PDF)

- College Board (2008) AP English Language and Composition and English Literature and Composition Course Description. New York, NY: College Board. (PDF)
- J. College Board (2009) *AP European History Course Description*, New York, NY: College Board. (<u>PDF</u>)
- K. College Board (2009) *AP World History Course Description*, New York, NY: College Board. (PDF)
- L. College Board. (2006). *College Board Standards for College Success.* New York, NY: College Board. (PDF)
- M. Conley, D.T. (2003) Understanding University Success: A Report from Standards for Success. Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy Research.
- N. Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS).
 (2002) Academic Literacy: A Statement of Competencies Expected of Students Entering California's Public Colleges and Universities. (PDF)
- 0. Marzano, R.J. and Kendall, J.S. (2007). *The New Taxonomy of Educational Objectives.* Second Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

- P. Morreale, S. & Pearson, J. (2008) "Why communication education is important: The centrality of the discipline in the 21st century." *Communication Education*, 57(2), 224-240.
- Q. Milewski, G.B., Johnsen, D., Glazer, N., & Kubota, M. (2005). A Survey to Evaluate the Alignment of the New SAT® Writing and Critical Reading Sections to Curricula and Instructional Practices. New York, NY: College Entrance Examination Board. (PDF)
- R. Virginia Postsecondary Outreach Campaign and Data Collection, Essential English Skills Analysis. (Achieve).

II. Career Readiness

- A. Achieve, Inc. (2004). *The American Diploma Project, Ready or Not: Creating a High School Diploma that Counts*. Washington, DC: Achieve, Inc. (PDF)
- B. ACT. (2007). Aligning Postsecondary Expectations and High School Practice: The Gap Defined (Policy Implications of the ACT National Curriculum Survey Results 2005-2006). Iowa City, IA: ACT. (PDF)
- C. ACT. (2006). *Ready for College and Ready for Work: Same or Different?* Iowa City, IA: ACT. (<u>PDF</u>)
- D. ACT. (2007). *Rigor at Risk: Reaffirming Quality in the High*

School Core Curriculum. Iowa City, IA: ACT. (PDF)

- E. Casner-Lotto, J., Rosenblum, E., and Wright, M., (2009). *The Ill-*<u>Prepared Workforce: Exploring the</u> <u>Challenges of Employer-Provided</u> <u>Workforce Readiness Training.</u> The Conference Board.
- F. Florida American Diploma Project Survey Results. (Achieve).
- G. Hawai'i Career Ready Study.
 (2007). Commissioned by the Hawai'i P-20 Initiative.(PDF)
- H. *Missouri Career Prep Certificate Program Planning Guide*, Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (PDF)
- I. Morreale, S. & Pearson, J. (2008) "Why communication education is important: The centrality of the discipline in the 21st century." *Communication Education*, 57(2), 224-240.
- J. National Alliance of Business. (2002).*The American Diploma Project Workplace Study*. Washington, DC.
- K. Partnership for 21st Century Skills.
 (2009). *Framework for 21st* <u>Century Learning</u>. Tucson, AZ.
- L. Qualifications and Curriculum Authority. (2007). *Functional Skills and Standards.* (PDF)
- M. The Conference Board. (2008). <u>New Graduates' Workforce</u>

<u>Readiness.</u>

III. International Documents

- A. Alberta, Canada: English Language Arts Curriculum Outcomes, 2003. (PDF)
- B. British Columbia, Canada: English Language Arts Integrated Resource Package, Prescribed Learning Outcomes, 2007. (PDF)
- C. **British Columbia:** English Literature 12, Integrated Resource Package, 2003. (<u>PDF</u>)
- D. England: English Programme of Study for Key stage 4, 2007. (PDF)
- E. Finland: National Core Curriculum for Upper Secondary Schools for Mother Tongue and Literature, Finnish as the mother tongue, 2003. (PDF)
- F. Hong Kong: English Language Curriculum and Assessment Guide, 2007. (PDF)
- G. **Hong Kong:** Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment Authority, 2007 HKCEE English Language, Recommended Texts for the School-Based Assessment Component. (PDF)
- H. Ireland: Leaving Certificate/English Syllabus for Higher Level and Ordinary Level. (PDF)

- I. **Ireland:** Prescribed Material for English in the Leaving Certificate Examination in 2009. (PDF)
- J. New South Wales: English Stage 6 Syllabus, 1999. (PDF)
- K. **New South Wales**: 2009-2012 HSC, Prescribed Area of Study, Electives and Texts. (PDF)
- L. Ontario, Canada: The Ontario Curriculum, English, 2007. (PDF)
- M. **Singapore:** *English Language Syllabus 2001.* (PDF)
- N. **Singapore:** O-Level Literature in English (Syllabus 2015), Prescribed Texts for 2009. (PDF)
- 0. Victoria, Australia: Victorian Certificate of Education Study Design: English/English as a Second Language, 2006. (PDF)
- P. Victoria, Australia: VCE English/ESL Text List 2008-2009, VCE Literature Text List 2008. (PDF)
- Q. Achieve, Inc., National Governors Association, Council of Chief State School Officers. (2008). Benchmarking for Success: Ensuring U.S. Students receive a World Class Education. Washington, DC. (PDF)
- R. Education Commission of the States. (2008). From Competing to Leading: An International Benchmarking Blueprint. Denver, CO. (PDF)

- S. Education Commission of the States. (2009). *International Benchmarking Toolkit*. Denver, CO. (PDF)
- T. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. (2003). The PISA 2003 Assessment Framework: Mathematics, Reading, Science and Problem Solving Knowledge and Skills. Paris, France. (PDF)
- U. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. (2006). *PISA 2006: Science Competencies for Tomorrow's World, Vol. 1.* [see Chapter 6 for reading assessment results] Paris, France. (PDF)

IV. State and Other Standards Documents

- A. California: English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools. California Department of Education (1997). (PDF)
- B. **Florida:** 2006 Sunshine State Standards K-12 Reading and Language Arts. Florida Department of Education (2006). (PDF)
- C. **Georgia:** <u>Georgia ELA Standards</u> (<u>K-12</u>).
- D. Indiana: Reading List, Grades 9-12. (PDF)
- E. **Massachusetts**: *English Language Arts Curriculum Framework.* Massachusetts Department of

Education (June 2001). (PDF)

- F. **Minnesota:** *Minnesota Academic Standards, Language Arts (K-12),* (2003). (PDF)
- G. **Texas:** Texas College Readiness Standards, (2008). (PDF)
- H. National Council of Teachers of English and the International Reading Association. (1996). *Standards for the English Language Arts.* (PDF)
- I. U.S. Dept. of Education. (2009). *Reading Framework for the National Assessment of Educational Progress 2009*. Washington, DC: National Assessment Governing Board. (PDF)
- J. U.S. Dept. of Education. (2007). Writing Framework for the 2011 National Assessment of Educational Progress. Washington, DC: National Assessment Governing Board. (<u>MS</u> <u>Word Document</u>)

V. Disciplinary Literacy Research

- A. Carnegie Council on Advancing Adolescent Literacy. (2010). *Time to act: An agenda for advancing adolescent literacy for college and career success*. New York, NY: Carnegie Corporation of New York. (PDF)
- B. Fang, Z., & Schleppegrell, M. J. (2008). *Reading in secondary content areas.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

- C. Lee, C.D., Spratley, A. (2010). *Reading in the disciplines: The challenges of adolescent literacy.* New York, NY: Carnegie Corporation of New York. (PDF)
- D. Moje, E. B., Young, J. P., Readence, J. E., & Moore, D. W. (2000).
 Reinventing adolescent literacy for new times: Perennial and millennial issues. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 43*, 400–410.
- E. Schleppegrell, M. J. (2004). *The language of schooling: A functional linguistics perspective.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- F. Shanahan, T., & Shanahan, C. (2008). Teaching disciplinary literacy to adolescents: Rethinking content-area literacy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 78, 40–59.

APPENDIX 13 - (B)(1) Internationally Benchmarked Common Core Standards - Public Drafts

College and Career Readiness Standards for Mathematics

Draft for Review and Comment

September 21, 2009

APPENDIX 13 - (B)(1) Internationally Benchmarked Common Core Standards - Public Drafts

Contents 1

Introduction 2-4

How Evidence Informed Decisions in Drafting the Standards 5, 6

College and Career Readiness Standards for Mathematics 7-19

Mathematical Practice 8 Number 9 Quantity 10 Expressions 11 Equations 12 Functions 13 Modeling 14 Shape 15 Coordinates 16 Probability 17 Statistics 18 Example Tasks online at www.corestandards.org

Sample of Works Consulted 19-22

Introduction

The *College and Career Readiness Standards for Mathematics* consist of three interconnected parts: a Standard for Mathematical Practice, ten Standards for Mathematical Content, and a set of Example Tasks.

The Standard for Mathematical Practice has six Core Practices that describe the way proficient students approach mathematics. Proficient students attend to precision, construct viable arguments, make sense of complex problems and persevere in solving them, look for hidden structure, note regularity in repeated reasoning, and use technology intelligently. This approach to mathematics is an essential part of being ready for college and career.

The Standards for Mathematical Content form the backbone of this document. Each of these ten standards consists of Core Concepts, Core Skills, and a description of the student's Coherent Understanding. Students who encounter the subject with a focus on coherence will be better able to learn more mathematics at a deeper level and be better able to access and apply the mathematics they know. The ten Standards for Mathematical Content pull together topics previously studied and look ahead toward topics in further coursework and training programs.

The Standards for Mathematical Content are designed to draw greater attention to powerful organizing principles in mathematics, such as functional relationships or the laws of arithmetic. They also allow important distinctions to be made more clearly, such as that between Expressions and Equations. And they surface the deep connections that often underlie mathematical coherence, such as the blending of algebra with geometry represented by Coordinates. These ten are not categories or buckets of topics to cover; they are standards. They describe the coherence students need and deserve as they go forward to their mathematical futures.

The third component of the *College and Career Readiness Standards for Mathematics* is a Web-based collection of Example Tasks that exemplifies the variety of performances required. High standards demand that students *use* their knowledge, skills and good practices to solve problems from a variety of contexts, both within mathematics and from the world outside. Example Tasks exemplify the range and variety of use that is expected. Teachers and designers of curriculum and assessment will find in the collection of examples a guide to what these standards mean. Over time, the collection of tasks will grow.

Together, these three components establish an evidence-based standard for college and career readiness. The *College and Career Readiness Standards for Mathematics* have been created with attention to the expectations of the highest achieving countries. They have focus and depth, emphasizing the understanding of and connections among topics that are most important for success regardless of a student's pathway after reaching these standards.

DRAFT

A primary goal of developing these standards is to enable students to achieve *mathematical proficiency* (see sidebar). Students are expected to understand the knowledge described in the Core Concepts and in the Coherent Understandings at a depth that enables them to reason with that knowledge—to analyze, interpret and evaluate mathematical problems, make deductions, and justify results. The Core Skills are meant to be used strategically and adaptively to solve problems. Students' knowledge and skills come to life and take their value when melded with the ways they approach mathematics—as described by the Core Practices.

The specific verbs used to describe concepts and skills in these standards are not meant to limit or indicate levels of any taxonomy. Although using verbs to indicate levels of depth has been a common practice in this country's standards writing, high performing nations do not use verbs in this way. They describe depth and practices first in separate sections of their syllabi. We have adopted the high performing countries' practice of focusing on a clear statement of what mathematics should be learned when writing standards for knowledge and skills.

Instruction, curriculum and assessment designed to achieve these standards should range over all strands of proficiency in *Adding It Up*, all depths of knowledge in Norman L. Webb's Depth of Knowledge taxonomy, all levels of Bloom's Taxonomy, and all levels of cognitive demand. In the Core Skills and Core Practices we have sometimes used terms like "explore" to indicate a lighter treatment with a goal of awareness and experience rather than proficiency. We have used Example Tasks to show the depth of knowledge and deployment of skills expected. From Adding it up: Helping children learn mathematics (National Research Council, 2001, p. 116):

Recognizing that no term captures completely all aspects of expertise, competence, knowledge, and facility in mathematics, we have chosen mathematical proficiency to capture what we believe is necessary for anyone to learn mathematics successfully. Mathematical proficiency, as we see it, has five components, or strands:

conceptual understanding comprehension of mathematical concepts, operations, and relations

procedural fluency—skill in carrying out procedures flexibly, accurately, efficiently, and appropriately

strategic competence—ability to formulate, represent, and solve mathematical problems

adaptive reasoning—capacity for logical thought, reflection, explanation, and justification

productive disposition—habitual inclination to see mathematics as sensible, useful, and worthwhile, coupled with a belief in diligence and one's own efficacy.

These standards are measurable; that is, they are observable and verifiable through the broad spectrum of student performances that may be assessed during classroom observation, school-based examinations and large-scale testing. The *College and Career Readiness Standards for Mathematics* can guide the development of assessment frameworks that distribute the assessment responsibilities across multiple levels of the educational system: state, district, school and teacher.

Students reaching these levels will be prepared for non-remedial college mathematics courses and will be prepared for training programs for career-level jobs; however, the *College and Career Readiness Standards for Mathematics* should not be construed as grade twelve exit standards. Students interested in STEM fields, and those who wish to go beyond for other reasons, will need to reach these standards before their senior year in order to have time to include additional mathematics. A number of pathways for advanced learning are possible and may be integrated throughout the high school experience and beyond.

The Common Core State Standards Initiative

The *College and Career Readiness Standards for Mathematics* will anchor the next phase of the Common Core State Standards Initiative: development of K–12 Mathematics Standards. Those K–12 Standards are in turn expected to guide the development of a next generation of assessments, developed collaboratively by multiple states. The K–12 Mathematics Standards will serve as a guide and tool for aligning instruction, curriculum, assessment, teacher supports, and systems of accountability. To ensure alignment, the Standard for Mathematical Practice, the Standards for Mathematical Content, and the Example Tasks should all be taken into account.

Overview of the Mathematical Practice Standard

Attend to precision. Construct viable arguments. Make sense of complex problems and persevere in solving them. Look for structure. Look for and express regularity in repeated reasoning. Make strategic decisions about the use of technological tools.

Overview of the Mathematical Content Standards

Number. Procedural fluency in operations with real numbers and strategic competence in approximation are grounded in an understanding of place value. The rules of arithmetic govern operations on numbers and extend to operations in algebra.

Quantity. A quantity is an attribute of an object or phenomenon that can be specified using a number and a unit, such as 2.7 centimeters, 42 questions or 28 miles per gallon.

Expressions. Expressions use numbers, variables and operations to describe computations. The rules of arithmetic, the use of parentheses and the conventions about order of operations assure that the computation has a well-determined value.

Equations. An equation is a statement that two expressions are equal. Solutions to an equation are the values of the variables in it that make it true.

Functions. Functions model situations where one quantity determines another. Because nature and society are full of dependencies, functions are important tools in the construction of mathematical models.

Modeling. Modeling uses mathematics to help us make sense of the real world—to understand quantitative relationships, make predictions, and propose solutions.

Shape. From only a few axioms, the deductive method of Euclid generates a rich body of theorems about geometric objects, their attributes and relationships.

Coordinates. Applying a coordinate system to Euclidean space connects algebra and geometry, resulting in powerful methods of analysis and problem solving.

Probability. Probability assesses the likelihood of an event in a situation that involves randomness. It quantifies the degree of certainty that an event will happen as a number from 0 through 1.

Statistics. Decisions or predictions are often based on data—numbers in context. These decisions or predictions would be easy if the data always sent a clear message, but the message is often obscured by variability in the data.

How Evidence Informed Decisions in Drafting the Standards

The Common Core State Standards Initiative builds on a generation of standards efforts led by states and national organizations. On behalf of the states, we have taken a step toward the next generation of standards that are aligned to college- and career-ready expectations and are internationally benchmarked. These standards are grounded in evidence from many sources that shows that the next generation of standards in mathematics must be focused on deeper, more thorough understanding of more fundamental mathematical ideas and higher mastery of these fewer, more useful skills.

The evidence that supports this new direction comes from a variety of sources. International comparisons show that high performing countries focus on fewer topics and that the U.S. curriculum is "a mile wide and an inch deep." Surveys of college faculty show the need to shift away from high school courses that merely survey advanced topics, toward courses that concentrate on developing an understanding and mastery of ideas and skills that are at the core of advanced mathematics. Reviews of data on student performance show the large majority of U.S. students are not mastering the mile wide list of topics that teachers cover.

The evidence tells us that in high performing countries like Singapore, the gap between what is taught and what is learned is relatively smaller than in Malaysia or the U.S. states. Malaysia's standards are higher than Singapore's, but their performance is much lower. One could interpret the narrower gap in Singapore as evidence that they actually use their standards to manage instruction; that is, Singapore's standards were set within the reach of hard work for their system and their population. Singapore's Ministry of Education flags its webpage with the motto, "Teach Less, Learn More." We accepted the challenge of writing standards that could work that way for U.S. teachers and students: By providing focus and coherence, we could enable more learning to take place at all levels.

However, a set of standards cannot be simplistically "derived" from any body of evidence. It is more accurate to say that we used evidence to inform our decisions. A few examples will illustrate how this was done.

For example, systems of linear equations are covered by all states, yet students perform surprisingly poorly on this topic when assessed by ACT. We determined that systems of linear equations have high coherence value, mathematically; that this topic is included by all high performing nations; and that it has moderately high value to college faculty. Result: We included it in our standards.

A different and more complex pattern of evidence appeared with families of functions. Again we found that students performed poorly on problems related to many advanced functions (trigonometric, logarithmic, quadratic, exponential, and so on). Again we found that a number of states cover them, even though college faculty rated them lower in value. High performing countries include this material, but with different degrees of demand. We decided that we had to carve a careful line through these topics so that limited teaching resources could focus where most important. We decided that students should

develop deep understanding and mastery of linear and exponential functions. They should also have familiarity with other families of functions, and apply their algebraic, modeling and problem solving skills to them—but not develop in-depth technical mastery and understanding. Thus we defined two distinct levels of attention and identified which families of functions got which level of attention.

Why were exponential functions selected for intensive focus in the Functions standard instead of, say, quadratic functions? What tipped the balance was the high coherence value of exponential functions in supporting modeling and their wide utility in work and life. Quadratic functions were also judged to be well supported by expectations defined under Expressions and Equations.

These examples indicate the kind of reasoning, informed by evidence, that it takes to design standards aligned to the demands of college and career readiness in a global economy. We considered inclusion in international standards, requirements of college and the workplace, surveys of college faculty and the business community, and other sources of evidence. As we navigated these sometimes conflicting signals, we always remained aware of the finiteness of instructional resources and the need for deep mathematical coherence in the standards.

At the end of this document, there is a listing of a number of sources that played a role in the deliberations described above and more generally throughout the process to inform our decisions. A hyperlinked version of the bibliography can be found online at www.corestandards.org.

College and Career Readiness Standards for Mathematics

Proficient students expect mathematics to make sense. They take an active stance in solving mathematical problems. When faced with a non-routine problem, they have the courage to plunge in and try something, and they have the procedural and conceptual tools to carry through. They are experimenters and inventors, and can adapt known strategies to new problems. They think strategically.

Students who engage in these practices discover ideas and gain insights that spur them to pursue mathematics beyond the classroom walls. They learn that effort counts in mathematical achievement.^a These are practices that expert mathematical thinkers encourage in apprentices. Encouraging these practices in our students should be as much a goal of the mathematics curriculum as is teaching specific content topics and procedures.^b Taken together with the Standards for Mathematical Content, they support productive entry into college courses or career pathways.

Core Practices · Students can and do:

1 Attend to precision.

Mathematically proficient students organize their own ideas in a way that can be communicated precisely to others, and they analyze and evaluate others' mathematical thinking and strategies noting the assumptions made. They clarify definitions. They state the meaning of the symbols they choose, are careful about specifying units of measure and labeling axes, and express their answers with an appropriate degree of precision. Rather than saying, "let *v* be speed and let *t* be time," they would say "let *v* be the speed in meters per second and let *t* be the elapsed time in seconds from a given starting time." They recognize that when someone says the population of the United States in June 2008 was 304,059,724, the last few digits indicate unwarranted precision.

2 Construct viable arguments.

Mathematically proficient students understand and use stated assumptions, definitions and previously established results in constructing arguments. They make conjectures and build a logical progression of statements to explore the truth of their conjectures. They break things down into cases and can recognize and use counterexamples. They use logic to justify their conclusions, communicate them to others and respond to the arguments of others. They reason inductively about data, making plausible arguments that take into account the context from which the data arose.

3 Make sense of complex problems and persevere in solving them.

Mathematically proficient students start by explaining to themselves the meaning of a problem and looking for entry points to its solution. They consider analogous problems, try special cases and work on simpler forms. They evaluate their progress and change course if necessary. They try putting algebraic expressions into different forms or try changing the viewing window on their calculator to get the information they need. They look for correspondences between equations, verbal descriptions, tables, and graphs. They draw diagrams of relationships, graph data, search for regularity and trends, and construct mathematical models. They check their answers to problems using a different method, and they continually ask themselves, "Does this make sense?"

4 Look for and make use of structure.

Mathematically proficient students look closely to discern a pattern. For example, in $x^2 + 5x + 6$ they can see the 5 as 2 + 3 and the 6 as 2×3 . They recognize the significance of an existing line in a geometric figure and can add an auxiliary line to make the solution of a problem clear. They also can step back for an overview and shift perspective. They can see complicated things, such as some algebraic expressions, as single objects. For example, by seeing $5 - 3(x - y)^2$ as 5 minus a positive number times a square, they see that it cannot be more than 5 for any real numbers *x* and *y*.^b

5 Look for and express regularity in repeated reasoning.

Mathematically proficient students pay attention to repeated calculations as they carry them out, and look both for general algorithms and for shortcuts. For example, by paying attention to the calculation of slope as they repeatedly check whether points are on the line through (1, 2) with slope 3, they might abstract the equation (y - 2)/(x - 1) = 3. Noticing the regularity in the way terms cancel in the expansions of (x - 1)(x + 1), $(x - 1)(x^2 + x + 1)$, and $(x - 1)(x^3 + x^2 + x + 1)$ leads to the general formula for the sum of a geometric series. As they work through the solution to a problem, proficient students maintain oversight of the process, while attending to the details. They continually evaluate the reasonableness of their intermediate results.^b

6 Make strategic decisions about the use of technological tools.

Mathematically proficient students consider the available tools when solving a mathematical problem, whether pencil and paper, ruler, protractor, graphing calculator, spreadsheet, computer algebra system, statistical package, or dynamic geometry software. They are familiar enough with all of these tools to make sound decisions about when each might be helpful. They use mathematical understanding and estimation strategically, attending to levels of precision, to ensure appropriate levels of approximation and to detect possible errors. They are able to use these tools to explore and deepen their understanding of concepts.

(a) For the importance of students' beliefs about effort, see the National Mathematics Advisory Panel's Report of the Task Group on Learning Processes, p. 4-10 (2008). (b) Cuoco, A., Goldenberg, E. P., and Mark, J., *Journal of Mathematical Behavior*, 15 (4), 375-402, 1996; *Focus in High School Mathematics*. Reston, VA: NCTM, in press; Harel, G., What is Mathematics? A Pedagogical Answer to a Philosophical Question. In R. B. Gold & R. Simons (Eds.), *Current Issues in the Philosophy of Mathematics From the Perspective of Mathematicians*, Mathematical Association of America, 2008.

APPENDIX 13 - (B)(1) Internationally Benchmarked Common Core Standards - Public Drafts Number

Core Concepts · Students understand that:

- A The real numbers include the rational numbers and are in oneto-one correspondence with the points on the number line.
- B Quantities can be compared using division, yielding rates and ratios.
- C A fraction can represent the result of dividing the numerator by the denominator; equivalent fractions have the same value.
- D Place value and the rules of arithmetic form the foundation for efficient algorithms.

A Coherent Understanding of Number. Procedural fluency in operations with real numbers and strategic competence in approximation are grounded in an understanding of place value. The rules of arithmetic govern operations on numbers and extend to operations in algebra:

- Numbers can be added in any order with any grouping and multiplied in any order with any grouping.
- Adding 0 and multiplying by 1 both leave a number unchanged.
- All numbers have additive inverses, and all numbers except zero have multiplicative inverses.
- Multiplication distributes over addition.

Subtraction and division are defined in terms of addition and multiplication, so are also governed by these rules.

The place value system bundles units into 10s, then 10s into 100s, and so on, providing an efficient way to name large numbers. Subdividing in a similar way extends this to the decimal system, which provides an address system for locating all real numbers on the number line with arbitrarily high accuracy. Place value is the basis for efficient algorithms, reducing much computation to single-digit arithmetic. Mental computation strategies also make opportunistic use of the rules of arithmetic, as when the product $5 \times 177 \times 2$ is computed at a glance to obtain 1770, rather than methodically working from left to right.

An estimate may be more appropriate than an exact value, for example, when you want to know the number of calories in a meal. Often a result is reported using fewer digits than were calculated. A mature number sense includes having rules of thumb about how much accuracy is appropriate and understanding that accuracy to more than a few decimal places often takes substantial effort. Estimation and approximation are also useful in checking calculations.

Rational numbers represented as fractions can be located on the number line by seeing them as numbers expressed in different units; for example, 3/5 is 3 units, where each unit is 1/5. However, rational numbers do not fill out the number line. There are also irrational numbers, such as π or $\sqrt{2}$. Each point on the number line then corresponds to a real number that is either rational or irrational.

Connections to Expressions, Functions and Coordinates. The rules of arithmetic govern the manipulations of expressions and functions. Two perpendicular number lines define the coordinate plane.

Core Skills · Students can and do:

1 Compare numbers and make sense of their magnitude.

Include positive and negative numbers expressed as fractions, decimals, powers, and roots. Limit to square and cube roots. Include very large and very small numbers and the use of scientific notation.

- 2 Know when and how to use standard algorithms, and perform them flexibly, accurately and efficiently.*
- 3 Use mental strategies and technology to formulate, represent and solve problems.**
- 4 Solve multi-step problems involving fractions and percentages.

Include situations such as simple interest, tax, markups/markdowns, gratuities and commissions, fees, percent increase or decrease, percent error, expressing rent as a percentage of take-home pay, and so on.

5 Use estimation and approximation to solve problems.

Include evaluating answers for their reasonableness, detecting errors, and giving answers to an appropriate level of precision.

* This aligns with the concept of procedural fluency as in the National Research Council report Adding it up: Helping children learn mathematics. Specifically, "Procedural fluency refers to knowledge of procedures, knowledge of when and how to use them appropriately, and skill in performing them flexibly, accurately, and efficiently" (p. 121).

* This aligns with the concept of strategic competence as described in *Adding it up. "Strategic competence* refers to the ability to formulate mathematical problems, represent them, and solve them" (p. 124).

APPENDIX 13 - (B)(1) Internationally Benchmarked Common Core Standards - Public Drafts Quantity

Core Concepts · Students understand that:

- A The value of a quantity is not specified unless the units are named or understood from the context.
- B Quantities can be added and subtracted only when they are of the same type (length, area, speed, etc.).
- C Quantities can be multiplied or divided to create new types of quantities, called derived quantities.

A Coherent Understanding of Quantity. A quantity is an attribute of an object or phenomenon that can be specified using a number and a unit, such as 2.7 centimeters, 42 questions or 28 miles per gallon.

The length of a football field and the speed of light are both quantities. If we choose units of miles per second, then the speed of light has a value of approximately 186,000 miles per second. But the speed of light need not be expressed in miles per second; it may be approximated by 3×10^8 meters per second or in any other unit of speed. Bare numerical values such as 186,000 do not describe quantities unless they are paired with units.

Speed (distance divided by time), rectangular area (length multiplied by length), density (mass divided by volume), and population density (number of people divided by land area) are examples of derived quantities, obtained by multiplying or dividing quantities.

It can make sense to add two quantities, such as when a child 51 inches tall grows 3 inches to become 54 inches tall. To be added or subtracted, quantities must be of the same type (length, area, speed, etc.); to add or subtract their values, the quantities must be expressed in the same units. Converting quantities to have the same units is like converting fractions to have a common denominator before adding or subtracting. But, even when quantities have the same units it does not always make sense to add them. For example, if a wooded park with 300 trees per acre is next to a field with 30 trees per acre, they do not have 330 trees per acre.

Doing algebra with units in a calculation reveals the units of the answer, and can help reveal a mistake if, for example, the answer comes out to be a distance when it should be a speed.

Connections to Number, Expressions, Equations, Functions, Modeling and Statistics. Operations described under Number and Expressions govern the operations one performs on quantities, including the units involved. Quantity is an integral part of any application of mathematics, and has connections to solving problems using data, equations, functions and modeling.

Core Skills · Students can and do:

1 Know when and how to convert units in computations.

Include the addition and subtraction of quantities of the same type expressed in different units; averaging data given in mixed units; converting units for derived quantities such as density and speed.

2 Use and interpret quantities and units correctly in algebraic formulas.

Include specifying units when defining variables and attending to units when writing expressions and equations.

3 Use and interpret quantities and units correctly in graphs and data displays.

Include function graphs, data tables, scatterplots and other visual displays of dimensioned data.

4 Use units as a way to understand problems and to guide the solution of multi-step problems.

Include examples such as acceleration; currency conversions; people-hours; social science measures, such as deaths per 100,000; and general rates, such as points per game.

- A Expressions are constructions built up from numbers, variables, and operations, which have a numerical value when each variable is replaced with a number.
- B Complex expressions are made up of simpler expressions.
- C The rules of arithmetic can be applied to transform an expression without changing its value.
- D Rewriting expressions in equivalent forms serves a purpose in solving problems.

A Coherent Understanding of Expressions. Expressions use numbers, variables and operations to describe computations. The rules of arithmetic, the use of parentheses and the conventions about order of operations assure that the computation has a well-determined value.

Reading an expression with comprehension involves analysis of its underlying structure, which may suggest a different but equivalent way of writing it that exhibits some different aspect of its meaning. For example, p + 0.05p can be interpreted as the addition of a 5% tax to a price p. But rewriting p + 0.05p as 1.05p shows that adding a tax is the same as multiplying by a constant factor.

Algebraic manipulations are based on the conventions of algebraic notation and the rules of arithmetic. Heuristic mnemonic devices are not a substitute for procedural fluency. For example, factoring, expanding, collecting like terms, the rules for interpreting minus signs next to parenthetical sums, and adding fractions with a common denominator are all instances of the distributive law; the definitions for negative and rational exponents are based on the extension of the exponent laws for positive integers. The laws of exponents connect multiplication of numbers to addition of exponents and thus express the deep relationship between addition and multiplication captured by the parallel nature of the rules of arithmetic for these operations.

Complex expressions are made up of simpler expressions using arithmetic operations and substitution. When simple expressions within more complex expressions are treated as single quantities, or chunks, the underlying structure of the larger expression may be more evident.

Connections to Equations and Functions. Setting expressions equal to each other leads to equations. Expressions can define functions of the variables that appear in them, with equivalent expressions defining the same function.

Core Skills · Students can and do:

1 See structure in expressions.

For example, recognize: that the expressions $x^4 - y^4$ and $(x + y)^2 - (x - y)^2$ are differences of squares; that there are different ways to rewrite the latter expression, e.g., by expanding and collecting like terms or by factoring as a difference of squares; that *p* is a common factor in p + 0.025p; that an expression in the form $(x - 3)^2 + 14$ reveals its minimum value.

2 Manipulate simple expressions.

Show procedural fluency in the following cases: factoring out common terms; factoring expressions with quadratic structure; writing in standard form sums, differences, and products of polynomials. Include completing the square and rewriting in standard form sums, differences, products, and quotients of simple rational expressions; rewriting expressions with negative exponents and those involving square or cube roots of a single term involving exponents.

3 Define variables and write an expression to represent a quantity in a problem.

Include contextual problems.

4 Interpret an expression that represents a quantity in terms of the context.

Include interpreting parts of an expression, such as terms, factors and coefficients.

APPENDIX 13 - (B)(1) Internationally Benchmarked Common Core Standards - Public Drafts Equations

Core Concepts · Students understand that:

- A An equation is a statement that two expressions are equal.
- B The solutions of an equation are the values of the variables that make the resulting numerical statement true.
- C The steps in solving an equation are guided by understanding and justified by logical reasoning.
- D Equations not solvable in one number system may have solutions in a larger number system.

A Coherent Understanding of Equations. An equation is a statement that two expressions are equal. Solutions to an equation are the values of the variables in it that make it true. If the equation is true for all values of the variables, then we call it an identity; identities are often discovered by manipulating one expression into another.

The solutions of an equation in one variable form a set of numbers; the solutions of an equation in two variables form a set of ordered pairs, which can be graphed in the plane. Equations can be combined into systems to be solved simultaneously.

An equation can be solved by successively transforming it into one or more simpler equations. The process is governed by deductions based on the properties of equality. For example, one can add the same constant to both sides without changing the solutions, but squaring both sides might lead to extraneous solutions. Strategic competence in solving includes looking ahead for productive manipulations and anticipating the nature and number of solutions.

Some equations have no solutions in a given number system, stimulating the formation of expanded number systems (integers, rational numbers, real numbers and complex numbers).

A formula is a type of equation. The same solution techniques used to solve equations can be used to rearrange formulas. For example, the formula for the area of a trapezoid, $A = {\binom{b_1+b_2}{2}}h$, can be solved for *h* using the same deductive process.

Inequalities can be solved in much the same way as equations. Many, but not all, of the properties of equality extend to the solution of inequalities.

Connections to Functions, Coordinates, and Modeling. Equations in two variables may define functions. Asking when two functions have the same value leads to an equation; graphing the two functions allows for the approximate solution of the equation. Equations of lines involve coordinates, and converting verbal descriptions to equations is an essential skill in modeling.

Core Skills · Students can and do:

1 Understand a problem and formulate an equation to solve it.

Extend to inequalities and systems.

2 Solve equations in one variable using manipulations guided by the rules of arithmetic and the properties of equality.

Solve linear equations with procedural fluency. For quadratic equations, include solution by inspection, by factoring, or by using the quadratic formula. Understand that the quadratic formula comes from completing the square. Include simple absolute value equations solvable by direct inspection and by understanding the interpretation of absolute value as distance.

3 Rearrange formulas to isolate a quantity of interest.

Exclude cases that require extraction of roots or inverse functions.

4 Solve systems of equations.

Focus on pairs of simultaneous linear equations in two variables. Include algebraic techniques, graphical techniques and solving by inspection.

5 Solve linear inequalities in one variable and graph the solution set on a number line.

Emphasize solving the associated equality and determining on which side of the solution of the associated equation the solutions to the inequality lie.

6 Graph the solution set of a linear inequality in two variables on the coordinate plane.

Emphasize graphing the associated equation, using a dashed or solid line as appropriate and shading to indicate the half-plane on which the solutions to the inequality lie.

APPENDIX 13 - (B)(1) Internationally Benchmarked Common Core Standards - Public Drafts Functions

Core Concepts · Students understand that:

- A A function is a rule, often defined by an expression, that assigns a unique output for every input.
- B The graph of a function f is a set of ordered pairs (x, f(x)) in the coordinate plane.
- C Functions model situations where one quantity determines another.
- D Common functions occur in families where each member describes a similar type of dependence.

A Coherent Understanding of Functions. Functions model situations where one quantity determines another. For example, the return on \$10,000 invested at an annualized percentage rate of 4.25% is a function of the length of time the money is invested. Because nature and society are full of dependencies between quantities, functions are important tools in the construction of mathematical models.

In school mathematics, functions usually have numerical inputs and outputs and are often defined by an algebraic expression. For example, the time in hours it takes for a plane to fly 1000 miles is a function of the plane's average ground speed in miles per hour, v; the rule T(v) = 1000/v expresses this relationship algebraically and defines a function whose name is T.

The set of possible inputs to a function is called its domain. We often infer the domain to be all inputs for which the expression defining a function has a value, or for which the function makes sense in a given context. The graph of a function is a useful way of visualizing the relationship the function models, and manipulating the expression for a function can throw light on the function's properties.

Two important families of functions characterized by laws of growth are linear functions, which grow at a constant rate, and exponential functions, which grow at a constant percent rate. Linear functions with an initial value of zero describe proportional relationships.

Connections to Expressions, Equations, Modeling and Coordinates. Determining an output value for a particular input involves evaluating an expression; finding inputs that yield a given output involves solving an equation. The graph of a function *f* is the same as the solution set of the equation y = f(x). Questions about when two functions have the same value lead to equations, whose solutions can be visualized from the intersection of the graphs. Since functions describe relationships between quantities, they are frequently used in modeling. Sometimes functions are defined by a recursive process, which can be modeled effectively using a spreadsheet or other technology.

Core Skills · Students can and do:

1 Recognize proportional relationships and solve problems involving rates and ratios.

Include being able to express proportional relationships as functions.

2 Describe the qualitative behavior of common types of functions using graphs and tables.

Identify: intercepts; intervals where the function is increasing, decreasing, positive or negative; relative maximums and minimums; symmetries; end behavior; and periodicity. Use technology to explore the effects of parameter changes on the graphs of linear, power, quadratic, polynomial, simple rational, exponential, logarithmic, sine and cosine, absolute value and step functions.

3 Analyze functions using symbolic manipulation.

Include slope-intercept and point-slope form of linear functions; vertex form of quadratic functions to identify symmetry and find maximums and minimums; factored form to find zeros. Use manipulations as described under Expressions.

4 Use the families of linear and exponential functions to solve problems.

For linear functions f(x) = mx + b, understand *b* as the intercept or initial value and *m* as the slope or rate of change. For exponential functions $f(x) = a \cdot b^x$, understand *a* as the intercept or initial value and *b* as the growth factor.

5 Find and interpret rates of change.

Compute the rate of change of linear functions and make qualitative observations about how the rate of change varies for nonlinear functions.

APPENDIX 13 - (B)(1) Internationally Benchmarked Common Core Standards - Public Drafts Modeling

Core Concepts · Students understand that:

- A Mathematical models involve choices and assumptions that abstract key features from situations to help us solve problems.
- B Even very simple models can be useful.

A Coherent Understanding of Modeling. Modeling uses mathematics to help us make sense of the real world—to understand quantitative relationships, make predictions, and propose solutions.

A model can be very simple, such as a geometric shape to describe a physical object like a coin. Even so simple a model involves making choices. It is up to us whether to model the solid nature of the coin with a three-dimensional cylinder, or whether a two-dimensional disk works well enough for our purposes. For some purposes, we might even choose to adjust the right circular cylinder to model more closely the way the coin deviates from the cylinder.

In any given situation, the model we devise depends on a number of factors: How precise an answer do we want or need? What aspects of the situation do we most need to understand, control, or optimize? What resources of time and tools do we have? The range of models we can create and analyze is constrained as well by the limitations of our mathematical and technical skills. For example, modeling a physical object, a delivery route, a production schedule, or a comparison of loan amortizations each requires different sets of tools. Networks, spreadsheets and algebra are powerful tools for understanding and solving problems drawn from different types of real-world situations. One of the insights provided by mathematical modeling is that essentially the same mathematical structure might model seemingly different situations.

The basic modeling cycle is one of (1) identifying the key features of a situation, (2) creating geometric, algebraic or statistical objects that describe key features of the situation, (3) analyzing and performing operations on these objects to draw conclusions and (4) interpreting the results of the mathematics in terms of the original situation. Choices and assumptions are present throughout this cycle.

Connections to Quantity, Equations, Functions, Shape, Coordinates and Statistics. Modeling makes use of shape, data, graphs, equations and functions to represent real-world quantities and situations.

Core Skills · Students can and do:

1 Model numerical situations.

Include readily applying the four basic operations in combination to solve multi-step quantitative problems with dimensioned quantities; making estimates to introduce numbers into a situation and get problems started; recognizing proportional or near-proportional relationships and analyzing them using characteristic rates and ratios.

2 Model physical objects with geometric shapes.

Include common objects that can reasonably be idealized as two- and three-dimensional geometric shapes. Identify the ways in which the actual shape varies from the idealized geometric model.

3 Model situations with equations and inequalities.

Include situations well described by a linear inequality in two variables or a system of linear inequalities defining a region in the plane.

4 Model situations with common functions.

Include situations well described by linear, quadratic or exponential functions; and situations that can be well described by inverse variation (f(x) = k/x). Include identifying a family of functions that models features of a problem, and identifying a particular function of that family and adjusting it to fit by changing parameters. Understand the recursive nature of situations modeled by linear and exponential functions.

5 Model situations using probability and statistics.

Include using simulations to model probabilistic situations; describing the shape of a distribution of values and summarizing a distribution with measures of center and variability; modeling a bivariate relationship using a trend line or a regression line.

6 Interpret the results of applying a model and compare models for a particular situation.

Include realizing that models seldom fit exactly and so there can be error; identifying simple sources of error and being careful not to over-interpret models. Include recognizing that there can be many models that relate to a situation, that they can capture different aspects of the situation, that they can be simpler or more complex, and that they can have a better or worse fit to the situation and the questions being asked.

APPENDIX 13 - (B)(1) Internationally Benchmarked Common Core Standards - Public Drafts Shape

Core Concepts · Students understand that:

- A Shapes and their parts, attributes, and measurements can be analyzed deductively.*
- B Congruence, similarity, and symmetry can be analyzed using transformations.
- C Mathematical shapes model the physical world, resulting in practical applications of geometry.
- D Right triangles and the Pythagorean theorem are central to geometry and its applications, including trigonometry.

A Coherent Understanding of Shape. From only a few axioms, the deductive method of Euclid generates a rich body of theorems about geometric objects, their attributes and relationships. Once understood, those attributes and relationships can be applied in diverse practical situations—interpreting a schematic drawing, estimating the amount of wood needed to frame a sloping roof, rendering computer graphics, or designing a sewing pattern for the most efficient use of material.

Understanding the attributes of geometric objects often relies on measurement: a circle is a set of points in a plane at a fixed distance from a point; a cube is bounded by six squares of equal area; when two parallel lines are crossed by a transversal, pairs of corresponding angles are congruent.

The concepts of congruence, similarity and symmetry can be united under the concept of geometric transformation. Reflections and rotations each explain a particular type of symmetry, and the symmetries of an object offer insight into its attributes—as when the reflective symmetry of an isosceles triangle assures that its base angles are congruent. Applying a scale transformation to a geometric figure yields a similar figure. The transformation preserves angle measure, and lengths are related by a constant of proportionality. If the constant of proportionality is one, distances are also preserved (so the transformation is a rigid transformation) and the figures are congruent.

The definitions of sine, cosine and tangent for acute angles are founded on right triangle similarity, and, with the Pythagorean theorem, are fundamental in many practical and theoretical situations.

Connections to Coordinates, Functions and Modeling. The Pythagorean theorem is a key link between geometry, measurement and distance in the coordinate plane. Parameter changes in families of functions can be interpreted as transformations applied to their graphs and those functions, as well as geometric objects in their own right, can be used to model contextual situations.

Core Skills · Students can and do:

1 Use multiple geometric properties to solve problems involving geometric figures.

Properties include: measures of interior angles of a triangle sum to 180°; vertical angles are congruent; when a transversal crosses parallel lines, alternate interior angles are congruent and corresponding angles are congruent; measures of supplementary angles sum to 180°; two lines parallel to a third are parallel to each other; points on a perpendicular bisector of a segment are exactly those equidistant from the segment's endpoints; and a line tangent to a circle is perpendicular to the radius meeting it.

2 Prove theorems, test conjectures and identify logical errors.

Include theorems establishing the properties in Core Skill 1 and other theorems about angles, parallel and perpendicular lines, similarity and congruence of triangles.

3 Construct and interpret representations of geometric objects.

Include classical construction techniques and construction techniques supported by modern technologies. Include moving between twodimensional representations and the threedimensional objects they represent, such as in schematics, assembly instructions, perspective drawings and multiple views.

4 Solve problems involving measurements.

Include measurement (length, angle measure, area, surface area, and volume) of a variety of figures and shapes in two- and three-dimensions. Compute measurements using formulas and by decomposing complex shapes into simpler ones.

5 Solve problems involving similar triangles and scale drawings.

Include computing actual lengths, areas and volumes from a scale drawing and reproducing a scale drawing at a different scale.

6 Apply properties of right triangles and right triangle trigonometry to solve problems.

Include using the Pythagorean theorem and properties of special right triangles, and applying sine, cosine and tangent to determine lengths and angle measures of right triangles. Use right triangles and their properties to solve real-world problems. Limit angle measures to degrees.

^{*}In this document, deductive analysis aligns with the notion of adaptive reasoning as defined in *Adding it Up*, and includes empirical exploration, informal justification, and formal proof.

- A Locations in the plane or in space can be specified by pairs or triples of numbers called coordinates.
- B Coordinates link algebra with geometry and allow methods in one domain to solve problems in the other.
- C The set of solutions to an equation in two variables forms a curve in the coordinate plane—such as a line, parabola, circle—and the solutions to systems of equations correspond to intersections of these curves.

A Coherent Understanding of Coordinates. Applying a coordinate system to Euclidean space connects algebra and geometry, resulting in powerful methods of analysis and problem solving.

Just as the number line associates numbers with locations in one dimension, a pair of perpendicular axes associates pairs of numbers with locations in two dimensions. This correspondence between numerical coordinates and geometric points allows methods from algebra to be applied to geometry and vice versa. The solution set of an equation becomes a geometric curve, making visualization a tool for doing and understanding algebra. Geometric shapes can be described by equations, making algebraic manipulation into a tool for geometric understanding, modeling and proof.

Coordinate geometry is a rich field for exploration. How does a geometric transformation such as a translation or reflection affect the coordinates of points? How is the geometric definition of a circle reflected in its equation?

Adding a third perpendicular axis associates three numbers with locations in three dimensions and extends the use of algebraic techniques to problems involving the threedimensional world we live in.

Connections to Shape, Quantity, Equations and Functions. Coordinates can be used to reason about shapes. In applications, coordinate values often have units (such as meters and bushels). A one-variable equation of the form f(x) = g(x) may be solved in the coordinate plane by finding intersections of the curves y = f(x) and y = g(x).

Core Skills · Students can and do:

1 Translate fluently between lines in the coordinate plane and their equations.

Include predicting visual features of lines by inspection of their equations, determining the equation of the line through two given points, and determining the equation of the line with a given slope passing through a given point.

2 Identify the correspondence between parameters in common families of equations and the location and appearance of their graphs.

Include common families of equations—the graphs of Ax + By = C, y = mx + b and x = a are straight lines; the graphs of $y = a(x - h)^2 + k$ and $y = Ax^2 + Bx + C$ are parabolas; and the graph of $(x - h)^2 + (y - k)^2 = r^2$ is a circle.

3 Use coordinates to solve geometric problems.

Include proving simple theorems algebraically, using coordinates to compute perimeters and areas for triangles and rectangles, finding midpoints of line segments, finding distances between pairs of points and determining when two lines are parallel or perpendicular.

- A Probability models outcomes for situations in which there is inherent randomness, quantifying the degree of uncertainty in terms of relative frequency of occurrence.
- B The law of large numbers provides the basis for estimating certain probabilities by use of empirical relative frequencies.
- C The laws of probability govern the calculation of probabilities of combined events.
- D Interpreting probabilities contextually is essential to rational decision-making in situations involving randomness.

A Coherent Understanding of Probability. Probability assesses the likelihood of an event in a situation that involves randomness. It quantifies the degree of certainty that an event will happen as a number from 0 through 1. This number is generally interpreted as the relative frequency of occurrence of the event over the long run.

The structure of a probability model begins by listing or describing the possible outcomes for a random situation (the sample space) and assigning probabilities based on an assumption about long-run relative frequency. In situations such as flipping a coin, rolling a number cube, or drawing a card, it is reasonable to assume various outcomes are equally likely.

Compound events constructed from these simple ones can be represented by tree diagrams and by frequency or relative frequency tables. The probabilities of compound events can be computed using these representations and by applying the additive and multiplicative laws of probability. Interpreting these probabilities relies on an understanding of independence and conditional probability, approachable through the analysis of two-way tables.

Converting a verbally-stated problem into the symbols and relations of probability requires careful attention to words such as *and*, *or*, *if*, and *all*, and to grammatical constructions that reflect logical connections. This is especially true when applying probability models to real-world problems, where simplifying assumptions are also usually necessary in order to gain at least an approximate solution.

Connections to Statistics and Expressions. Probability is the foundation for drawing valid conclusions from sampling or experimental data. Counting has an advanced connection with Expressions through Pascal's triangle and binomial expansions.

Core Skills · Students can and do:

1 Compute theoretical probabilities by systematically counting points in the sample space.

Make use of symmetry and equally likely outcomes. Include permutation and combination problems as long as small numbers are involved or technology is used, so that formulas are not required.

2 Interpret probabilities of compound events using concepts of independence and conditional probability.

Include reading conditional probabilities from two-way tables.

3 Compute probabilities of compound events.

Make use of the additive and multiplicative laws of probability, tree diagrams and frequency or relative frequency tables in real contexts. Do not emphasize fluency with the related formulas

4 Estimate probabilities empirically.

Include using data from simulations carried out with technology to estimate probabilities.

5 Identify and explain common misconceptions regarding probability.

Include misconceptions about long-run versus short-run behavior of relative frequencies (the law of large numbers). Include attention to the use and misuse of probability in the media, especially in terms of interpreting charts and tables and in the contextual meaning of terms connected to probability, such as 'odds' or 'risk.'

6 Adapt probability models to solve realworld problems.

Include the use of conditional probability to assess subsets of data (e.g., what does the data say about males and females separately). Include the use of independence as a simplifying assumption (e.g., find the probability that two students both contract the disease this year).

- A Statistical methods take variability into account to support making informed decisions based on quantitative studies designed to answer specific questions.
- B Visual displays and summary statistics condense the information in data sets into usable knowledge.
- C Randomness is the foundation for using statistics to draw conclusions when testing a claim or estimating plausible values for a population characteristic.
- D The design of an experiment or sample survey is of critical importance to analyzing the data and drawing conclusions.

A Coherent Understanding of Statistics. Decisions or predictions are often based on data—numbers in context. These decisions or predictions would be easy if the data always sent a clear message, but the message is often obscured by variability in the data. Statistics provides tools for describing variability in data and for making informed decisions that take variability into account.

Data are gathered, displayed, summarized, examined and interpreted to discover patterns. Data can be summarized by a statistic measuring center, such as mean or median, and a statistic measuring spread, such as interquartile range or standard deviation. Different distributions can be compared numerically using these statistics or visually using plots. Which statistics to compare, and what the results of a comparison might mean, depend on the question to be investigated and the real-life actions to be taken.

Randomization has two important uses in drawing statistical conclusions. First, collecting data from a random sample of a population makes it possible to draw valid conclusions about the whole population, taking variability into account. Second, randomly assigning individuals to different treatments allows a fair comparison of the effectiveness of those treatments. A statistically significant outcome is one that is unlikely to be due to chance and this can be evaluated only under the condition of randomness.

In critically reviewing uses of statistics in public media and other reports, it is important to consider the study design, how the data were collected, and the analyses employed as well as the data summaries and the conclusions drawn.

Connections to Probability, Functions and Modeling. Valid conclusions about a population depend on designed simulations or other statistical studies using random sampling or assignment and rely on probability for their interpretation. Functional models may be used to approximate data. If the data are approximately linear, the relationship may be modeled with a trend line and the strength and direction of such a relationship may be expressed through a correlation coefficient. Technology facilitates the study of statistics by making it possible to simulate many possible outcomes in a short amount of time, and by generating plots, function models, trend lines and correlation coefficients.

Core Skills · Students can and do:

1 Formulate questions that can be addressed with data. Identify the relevant data, collect and organize it to respond to the question.

> Include determining whether a question can best be addressed through a sample survey, randomized experiment or observational study. Include unbiased selection for a sample and randomization of assignment to treatment for an experiment.

2 Use appropriate displays and summary statistics for data.

Include univariate, bivariate, categorical and quantitative data. Include the thoughtful selection of displays and measures of center and spread to summarize data.

3 Interpret data displays and summaries critically; draw conclusions and develop recommendations.

Include paying attention to the context of the data, interpolating or extrapolating judiciously, and examining the effects of extreme values of the data on summary statistics of center and spread. Include data sets that follow a normal distribution. Include observing and interpreting linear trends in bivariate quantitative data.

4 Draw statistical conclusions involving population means or proportions using sample data.

Conclusions should be based on simulations or other informal techniques, rather than formulas.

5 Evaluate reports based on data.

Include looking for bias or flaws in the way the data were gathered or presented, as well as unwarranted conclusions, such as claims that confuse correlation with causation.

Sample of Works Consulted

I. National Reports and Recommendations

- A. Adding it Up: Helping Children Learn Mathematics. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Mathematics Learning Study Committee, 2001.
- B. Crossroads in Mathematics, 1995 and Beyond Crossroads, 2006.
 American Mathematical Association of Two-Year Colleges (AMATYC).
- C. Curriculum Focal Points for Prekindergarten through Grade 8 Mathematics: A Quest for Coherence. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 2006.
- D. Foundations for Success: Final Report of the National Mathematics Advisory Panel (NMAP), 2008.
- E. Guidelines for Assessment and Instruction in Statistics Education (GAISE) project http://www.amstat.org/education/gaise/.
- F. Habits of Mind: An Organizing Principle for a Mathematics Curriculum. Cuoco, A., Goldenberg, E. P., and Mark, J. (1996). Journal of Mathematical Behavior, 15 (4), 375-402. Last retrieved July 15, 2009, from http://www2.edc.org/CME/showcase/Habit sOfMind.pdf.
- G. How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School. Bransford, J.D., A.L. Brown and R.R. Cocking, eds.. Committee on Developments in the Science of Learning, Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, National Research Council, 1999.
- H. Mathematics and Democracy, The Case for Quantitative Literacy, edited by Lynn Arthur Steen. National Council on Education and the Disciplines, 2001.
- 1. The Opportunity Equation: Transforming Mathematics and Science Education for Citizenship and the Global Economy. The Carnegie Corporation of New York and the

Institute for Advanced Study, 2009. Online: http://www.opportunityequation.org/

- J. Principles and Standards for School Mathematics. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 2000.
- K. Quantitative Literacy and Mathematical Competencies. Niss, Mogen. Last retrieved July 15, 2009, from <u>http://www.maa.org/Ql/pgs215_220.pdf</u>
- L. A Research Companion to Principles and Standards for School Mathematics. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 2003.
- M. Focus in High School Mathematics: Reasoning and Sense Making. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. Reston, VA: NCTM, in press.
- N. What is Mathematics? A Pedagogical Answer to a Philosophical Question. Harel, G.. In R. B. Gold & R. Simons (Eds.), Current Issues in the Philosophy of Mathematics from the Perspective of Mathematicians, Mathematical Association of America, 2008.
- O. Blum, W., Galbraith, P. L., Henn, H-W. and Niss, M. (Eds) Applications and Modeling in Mathematics Education, ICMI Study 14. Amsterdam: Springer.

II. College Readiness

- A. ACT College Readiness Benchmarks[™] last retrieved July 14, 2009, from <u>http://www.act.org/research/policymakers</u> /pdf/benchmarks.pdf
- B. ACT College Readiness Standards™
- C. ACT National Curriculum Survey™
- D. Adelman, Cliff. The Toolbox Revisited: Paths to Degree Completion From High School Through College, 2006. <u>http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/research/pubs</u> /toolboxrevisit/index.html

- E. Advanced Placement Calculus, Statistics and Computer Science Course Descriptions. May 2009, May 2010. College Board, 2008.
- F. Aligning Postsecondary Expectations and High School Practice: The Gap Defined (Policy Implications of the ACT National Curriculum Survey Results 2005-2006). Last retrieved July 14, 2009, from www.act.org/research/policymakers/pdf/N CSPolicyBrief.pdf
- G. Condition of Education, 2004: Indicator 30, Top 30 Postsecondary Courses, U.S. Department of Education, 2004.
- H. Condition of Education, 2007: High School Course-Taking. U.S. Department of Education, 2007.
- I. Conley, D.T. *Knowledge and Skills for University Success*, 2008.
- J. Conley, D.T. *Toward a More Comprehensive Conception of College Readiness*, 2007.
- K. Crisis at the Core: Preparing All Students for College and Work. ACT, Last retrieved July 14, 2009, from www.act.org/research/policymakers/pdf/cr isis_report.pdf
- L. Achieve, Inc., Florida Postsecondary Survey, 2008.
- M. Golfin, Peggy, et. al. CNA Corporation. Strengthening Mathematics at the Postsecondary Level: Literature Review and Analysis, 2005.
- N. Camara, W.J., Shaw, E., and Patterson, B. (June 13, 2009). First Year English and Math College Coursework. College Board: New York, NY (Available from authors).
- O. CLEP Precalculus Curriculum Survey: Summary of Results. The College Board, 2005.
- P. College Board Standards for College Success: Mathematics and Statistics. College Board, 2006. <u>http://www.collegeboard.com/prod_downl_oads/about/association/academic/mathem_atics-statistics_cbscs.pdf</u>.
- Q. Miller, G.E., Twing, J., and Meyers, J. "Higher Education Readiness Component

(HERC) Correlation Study." Austin, TX: Pearson.

- R. On Course for Success: A Close Look at Selected High School Courses That Prepare All Students for College and Work. ACT. Last retrieved July 14, 2009, from www.act.org/research/policymakers/pdf/su ccess_report.pdf
- S. Out of Many, One: Towards Rigorous Common Core Standards from the Ground Up. Achieve, 2008.
- T. Ready for College and Ready for Work: Same or Different? ACT. Last retrieved July 14, 2009, from www.act.org/research/policymakers/pdf/R eadinessBrief.pdf
- U. Ready or Not: Creating a High School Diploma That Counts. American Diploma Project, 2004. http://www.achieve.org/ReadyorNot
- V. Rigor at Risk: Reaffirming Quality in the High School Core Curriculum. ACT, Last retrieved July 14, 2009, from www.act.org/research/policymakers/pdf/ri gor_report.pdf
- W. The Forgotten Middle: Ensuring that All Students Are on Target for College and Career Readiness before High School. ACT, Last retrieved July 14, 2009, from <u>http://www.act.org/research/policymakers</u> /reports/ForgottenMiddle.html
- X. Achieve, Inc., Virginia Postsecondary Survey, 2004.

III. Career Readiness

- A. ACT Job Skill Comparison Charts
- B. Achieve's Mathematics at Work, 2008. http://www.achieve.org/mathatwork
- C. The American Diploma Project Workplace Study. National Alliance of Business Study, 2002.
- D. Carnevale, Anthony and Desrochers, Donna. Connecting Education Standards and Employment: Course-taking Patterns of Young Workers, 2002.

530

APPENDIX 13 - (B)(1) Internationally Benchmarked Common Core Standards - Public Drafts

DRAFT

http://www.edroundtable.state.in.us/pdf/a dp/ADPWorkplaceStudy.pdf

- E. Colorado Business Leaders Top Skills, 2006.
- F. Hawai'i Career Ready Study: access to living wage careers from high school, 2007.
- G. Ready or Not: Creating a High School Diploma That Counts. American Diploma Project, 2004. http://www.achieve.org/ReadyorNot
- H. States' Career Cluster Initiative. *Essential Knowledge and Skill Statements*, 2008.
- I. WorkKeys Occupational Profiles™

http://www.act.org/workkeys/profiles/ occuprof/index.html

IV. International Documents

STANDARDS [High performing countries/countries of interest]

A. Alberta

Alberta Learning, *Pure Mathematics* 10–20– 30 (Senior High), 2002. (Grades 10-12)

B. Belgium

Department for Educational Development: Core Curriculum. (Grades 9-10 and 11-12) Retrieved June 24, 2009 from <u>http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/dvo/english</u> /corecurriculum/corecurriculum.htm

C. China

Compulsory mathematics curriculum for senior secondary, as submitted to the APEC consortium. (Grades 10-12) Last retrieved July 13, 2009, from http://www.apecknowledgebank.org/file.as px?id=1895

- D. Chinese Taipei
 - Curriculum Guidelines for the Required Subject Math in Senior High Schools, as submitted to the APEC consortium. (Grades 10-11) Last retrieved July 13, 2009 from

http://www.apecknowledgebank.org/fi le.aspx?id=1900

- Curriculum Guidelines for the Elective Subject Math (I) in Senior High Schools, as submitted to the APEC consortium. (Grades 12) Last retrieved July 13, 2009, from <u>http://www.apecknowledgebank.org/fi</u> <u>le.aspx?id=1901</u>
- E. England

Qualifications and Curriculum Authority. Programme of Study for Key Stage 4, National Curriculum, 2007. (Grades 10-11)

F. Finland

Finnish National Board of Education. National Core Curriculum For Upper Secondary Schools 2003. (Grades 10-12)

G. Hong Kong

Learning Objectives for Key Stage 4. (Grades 10-11)

- H. India
 - The National Curriculum Framework, 2005. (Grades 9-12). National Council of Educational Research and Training. Last retrieved July 13, 2009, from <u>http://ncert.nic.in/html/pdf/schoolcurr</u> <u>iculum/framework05/prelims.pdf</u>
 - Secondary School Curriculum, (2010). (Grades 9-10). Central Board of Education.
 - Senior School Curriculum, (2010). (Grades 11-12). Central Board of Secondary Education.
- I. Ireland
 - Junior Certificate Mathematics Syllabus (Higher, Ordinary and Foundation Level). (Grades 7-9). National Council for Curriculum and Assessment, 2000.
 - The Leaving Certificate Mathematics Syllabus. (Higher, Ordinary and Foundation Level). (Grades 10-12). National Council for Curriculum and Assessment, 2000.
- J. Japan

The Courses of Study in Japan, Provisional and Unofficial Translation, 2004, as submitted to the APEC consortium. (Grades 10-12). Last retrieved July 13, 2009, from http://www.apecknowledgebank.org/file.as px?id=1896.

K. Korea

The Seventh National School Curriculum, as submitted to the APEC consortium. (Grades 7-10). Last retrieved July 13, 2009, from http://www.apecknowledgebank.org/file.as px?id=1897 and http://www.apecknowledgebank.org/file.as px?id=1898

L. Singapore

Secondary Mathematics Syllabuses, 2007, as submitted to the APEC consortium. (Grades ≈7-10/11). Last retrieved July 13, 2009, from

http://www.moe.gov.sg/education/syllabus es/sciences/files/maths-secondary.pdf.

ASSESSMENTS [Key international assessments with global reach]

- A. Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2006.
- B. Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), 2007.
- C. International Baccalaureate, Mathematics Standard Level, 2006.

- D. University of Cambridge International Examinations: General Certificate of Secondary Education in Mathematics, 2009.
- E. EdExcel, General Certificate of Secondary Education, Mathematics, 2009.
- F. Lundsgaard Hansen, Birthe and Vagn. Reference levels in School Mathematics, Education in Europe, National Presentation, Denmark, 2001. Last retrieved July 15, 2009, from <u>http://www.emis.de/projects/Ref/doc_ems_pdf/EMS_NATIONAL_PRESENTATIONS/EM</u>

V. State Documents

S DENMARK.pdf

- A. California State Standards
- B. Florida State Standards
- C. Georgia State Standards
- D. Massachusetts State Standards
- E. Mathematics Curriculum Framework Revision Panel [Revised Progress Report]. Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2009. Last retrieved July 15, 2009, from <u>http://www.doe.mass.edu/boe/docs/0</u> 509/item5_report.pdf.
- F. Minnesota State Standards

APPENDIX 14 - (B)(2) Next Generation Assessment Task Force - Assessments

Recommendations of the Next Generation Assessment Task Force

CRAFTING A BALANCED SYSTEM OF ASSESSMENT IN WISCONSIN

WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

This publication is available from:

Office of Educational Accountability Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction 125 South Webster Street Madison, WI 53703 608.267.1072 http://dpi.wi.gov/oea.html

With support from Great Lakes West Comprehensive Assistance Center

August 2009

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction Tony Evers, State Superintendent Madison, Wisconsin

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction does not discriminate on the basis of sex, race, color, religion, creed, age, national origin, ancestry, pregnancy, marital status or parental status, sexual orientation, or disability.

534

FORWARD



Much has been written about the changing American economy and the skills our students need to be successful in the 21st century. Education, in turn,

must respond to the changing needs of the state and the nation. This includes the standards to which we hold students and how we measure progress in meeting those standards.

Within this context, we convened the Next Generation Assessment Task Force to formulate Wisconsin's path forward. We listened to leaders from business and technology sectors as well as leaders from PK-12 and higher education.

In this summary we share the process, definitions, assumptions, and recommendations of the task force. Our aim is to use these findings as a blueprint for the next generation of assessment.

I believe the work of the task force will have a lasting impact. Internationally benchmarked standards working in concert with a balanced assessment system will ensure a quality education for all Wisconsin students.

Elizabeth Burmaster State Superintendent 2001–2009 isconsin students are being educated to compete in a global society. How we assess the performance of those students, from their primary years through high school, should also reflect our state's commitment to excellence.

As co-chairs of the Next Generation Assessment Task Force, we were pleased to work with a group of statewide leaders from education, business, and civic leaders in an examination of Wisconsin's assessment system. We heard a vigorous discussion about how that system could be improved. Members of the task force took a hard look at the status quo, reviewed best practices in other states, and embraced the notion of creating a more balanced assessment system. A balanced system of formative, benchmark, and summative assessment is necessary to inform classroom teachers, to hold schools accountable, and to effectively report back to parents, community leaders, and students.

The work of the task force is timely in several respects. It comes at a time when the national debate over assessment has been revived; when the economic recession has reinforced the need for more and better knowledge-based workers; and when Wisconsin's content standards are being revised to reflect 21st century skills and to enhance career and college readiness.

In the near future and over the long-term, the recommendations of this task force can contribute to producing a bettereducated citizenry and workforce in Wisconsin. We commend the work of the task force and look forward to seeing their ideas put into action.

Tom Still, President, Wisconsin Technology Council (Co-Chair)

Joan Wade, Administrator, CESA 6 (Co-Chair)

INTRODUCTION

ur current Wisconsin Student Assessment System (WSAS) consists of two standardized assessments: the Wisconsin Knowledge & Concepts Exam (WKCE) and the Wisconsin Alternate Assessment for Students with Disabilities (WAA-SwD). These large-scale, summative assessments provide annual "snapshots" of student achievement in relation to state standards, the Wisconsin Model Academic Standards, and are required by law.

State law requires testing students in reading, mathematics, science, social

studies, and language arts in Grades 4, 8, and 10. In addition, federal law requires all states to test reading and mathematics content in Grades 3-8 and once in high school. As such, these summative tests are designed to meet state and federal accountability requirements and must adhere to technical quality standards of large-scale assessment. The WSAS was one of the first in the nation to meet all of the rigorous federal standards of technical quality and alignment to state academic standards.

The focus of the assessment system, therefore, is to gauge overall academic achievement of schools and districts across Wisconsin and to provide information on the relative strengths or gaps in curriculum and instruction as they relate to the Wisconsin Model Academic Standards. Summative assessments like the WKCE are typically given annually, meant to track long-term progress of schools and districts. Information at the student level can be limited. Large-scale assessments can only provide general information vis-à-vis individual student strengths and needs within a content area.

Wisconsin educators are increasingly interested in receiving more frequent and more detailed data on the strengths and needs of their individual students. Benchmark assessments, typically given on a monthly or quarterly basis, can produce immediate information about student progress so teachers can adjust instruction to meet student needs. These assessments benchmark progress throughout a school year and often provide diagnostic information to pinpoint a student's needs. Unlike the WKCE, such assessments yield specific information on a student's level of progress, while providing less information about the overall progress of schools and districts.



Even more student-specific and immediate are the formative assessment strategies that teachers use on a daily basis to gauge student understanding while they move through a unit of instruction. Assessing students formatively allows teachers to immediately adjust their instruction. Often these are teacherdeveloped strategies and are tailored to the teacher's lesson or unit of instruction. Formative assessment strategies provide the most detailed information about a student's understanding, but the least amount of data at aggregate school/ district levels.

There is increased recognition in the education community that all assessment strategies—formative, benchmark, and summative—are essential and need to work in unison to improve student achievement. Each component has its strengths and limitations; one assessment type cannot meet all needs. An assessment system must work together with curriculum and instruction to provide a coherent system of learning.

WORK OF THE TASK FORCE

he Next Generation Assessment Task Force was convened by State Superintendent Burmaster in September 2008. The task force included a diverse group of leaders from business, technology, and education. The members met four times throughout the school year and conducted the following activities:

- Reviewed the history of Wisconsin's assessment system and education trends over time from a national perspective;
- Developed an understanding of the different types and purposes of formative, benchmark, and summative assessment;
- Considered the importance of implementing a balanced assessment system;
- Identified characteristics of positive assessment experiences and considered ways of building these characteristics into our system;
- Worked in small groups outlining key components and devising an ideal system of assessment— one that balances the three different types of assessment; and
- Considered PK-12 assessment through a systems perspective.

To gain an external perspective, task force members heard from five states with assessment systems that have innovative features: Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, and Oregon.

Ultimately, the task force concluded five foundational assumptions and seven recommendations were needed to implement a balanced assessment system in Wisconsin. It was agreed that Wisconsin needs an assessment system that provides timely and relevant feedback to students and teachers alike, and one that helps teachers make instructional decisions to improve student achievement. In addition, the assessment strategies must address 21st century skills, preparing Wisconsin students to be college and work-ready.

These goals cannot be accomplished with one type of assessment administered once

a year. It requires a system of assessments formative, benchmark, and summative that work in concert to inform classroom teachers; hold schools accountable; and report back to parents, community leaders, and to students themselves.









DEFINING A BALANCED ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

Balanced Assessment System

Purpose: to provide students, educators, parents, and the public with a range of information about academic achievement and to determine the best practices and policies that will result in improvements to student learning.

Characteristics: includes a continuum of strategies and tools that are designed specifically to meet discrete needsdaily classroom instruction, periodic checkpoints during the year, and annual snapshots of achievement.

Formative Strategies

Purpose: to inform instruction within and between lessons, for both student and teacher.

Characteristics: seamless integration of assessment strategies and instruction by providing immediate feedback helps teachers determine what to do next. instructionally and involves students in evaluating their own learning.

- Student: What do I need to learn before I understand this completely?
- Teacher: What learning comes next for this student?

Benchmark Assessment

Purpose: to diagnose student learning and/or monitor progress locally during the year.

Characteristics: may be teacher, school, district, state, or commercially developed; can be used multiple times during the year to make instructional adjustments for students or groups of students.

- Are my students on track? How well are they progressing?
- How well is this program/ instructional unit working?

Summative Assessment

Purpose: to monitor national, state, district, and school progress over time.

Characteristics: standardized administration annually; data is best used at the aggregate level for accountability rather than at the student level, as data is general not specific.

- Are there any gaps in our district's curriculum and instruction?
- How does the achievement of districts and schools compare to one another? How do achievement levels compare over time?





FOUNDATIONAL ASSUMPTIONS

he task force identified the following prerequisites to the implementation of task force recommendations. These foundational assumptions need to be in place for the recommendations to be successfully implemented and to have the necessary impact.

- 1. Wisconsin must have clear, rigorous, and world-class academic content and achievement standards that reflect 21st century skills. These standards and expectations should be internationally benchmarked, gradelevel specific, and clearly delineated so that students across the state are working toward common goals.
- 2. The culture and climate of schools must reflect collaboration and transparency around student achievement within and across grade levels as well as content areas. Opportunities for exploring and sharing

a range of data and instructional strategies should be at the core of school organization.

3. Curriculum, instruction, and assessment must work together as a continuous cycle of the learning process. Assessment viewed in isolation will not improve student achievement.

- 4. An effective assessment system has multiple components and balances strategies that meet varied purposes and stakeholder needs. One assessment cannot meet all purposes. The information needs for all stakeholders-from parents to policymakersmust be reflected in the assessment system.
- 5. Proficiency, as defined in the assessments used for federal accountability, must not be an end-point instructionally, nor the only achievement goal for our students.
Recommendations for Implementation

1. Professional development is critical if assessment is to be effectively used together with curriculum and instruction to improve student learning. Partnering with higher education and Wisconsin educational organizations to develop assessment literacy, specifically understanding the framework of balanced assessment systems, in teacher preparation programs, graduate programs, and ongoing professional development must be a priority.

2. **Teachers should be deeply involved** in assessment development throughout all parts of the assessment system. Formative classroom strategies should be developed and shared



by teachers. Benchmark assessment should be teacher-driven, district-facilitated, and state-supported. Summative assessment should involve teachers in creating assessment strategies, test items, and scoring criteria.

- 3. The assessment system should have both formative and benchmark components that **provide timely, relevant feedback** about student achievement to be used throughout the year, to identify student needs, and to make changes as needed to instructional programs. Students should have **multiple opportunities** to demonstrate their learning throughout the school year. These should not be tied to state or federal accountability, but rather used on a local and optional basis to inform teachers, parents, and students throughout the learning cycle.
- 4. All students should be **motivated by relevant, engaging assessments** that are linked to 21st century skills, including high school assessments linked to career/college readiness.
- 5. **Innovative assessment strategies** should be pursued that would allow for varied demonstrations of student learning. Innovative strategies should offer opportunities for students to demonstrate learning in multiple ways, and need not be limited by traditional testing protocols.



- 6. Summative assessment used for federal and state accountability should document trends over time. Efficient summative assessment strategies should be considered. Other assessments, such as highquality benchmark and formative strategies, are more appropriately used to inform instruction throughout the school year, and to meet information needs at the classroom, school, and local level.
- 7. Educating stakeholders on the meaning and importance of balanced assessment systems is key. Developing assessment literacy among school boards, district and school administrators, teachers, parents, students, policymakers, and the media must be broad and ongoing.



The work of this task force concludes at an opportune time for Wisconsin. Our state is well positioned to bring to scale all the components of a statewide system of learning:

- World-class standards that sharpen our expectations for students
- Rich instructional units that engage and challenge students
- A comprehensive assessment system that provides timely and targeted feedback on student, school, and district performance
- A statewide longitudinal data system linking state and local data that allows us to track performance and identify best practices

This system of learning will allow educators to measure student success, identify areas that require targeted interventions, and can facilitate improvement planning for schools and districts alike. A comprehensive system of learning not only reinforces the connections among the critical elements of standards, curriculum, instruction, and assessment—but ensures that Wisconsin students are well-prepared for their futures in a global society.

Tony Evers State Superintendent

MOVING FORWARD

hese recommendations are critical for decisionmaking around the future of Wisconsin's state assessment system. Assessment needs to be viewed together with content standards, curriculum, instruction, and intervention to form a complete system of learning designed to improve student achievement. Assessment by itself cannot lead to improvements in student

learning. Only when results are used in conjunction with other data that affect changes in programs and practices will student achievement improve.

As state and federal opportunities are made available, these recommendations will help the Department of Public Instruction (DPI) map a course for changes to Wisconsin's assessment system. Rather than focusing only on large-scale, summative assessments used for federal and state accountability, DPI will use these recommendations to seek grants and write requests for proposals for future assessment contracts that take a more balanced approach to assessment at the state, district, school, and classroom levels.

Additionally, these recommendations can inform professional development planned by districts, **Cooperative Educational** Service Agencies (CESAs), professional organizations, and teacher education programs. Professional development that promotes a balanced approach to assessment can help classroom professionals, and training that targets pre-service teachers will benefit our future educators. Principals, administrators, and school boards will also benefit from a focus on balanced assessment, and these audiences should be taken into consideration when delivering professional development around the next generation of assessment.

NEXT GENERATION ASSESSMENT TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Co-Chairs

Tom Still, President Wisconsin Technology Council

Joan Wade, Administrator CESA 6, Oshkosh

Task Force Members

Russ Allen, Consultant Wisconsin Education Association Council

Nell Anderson, Director of Bilingual, ELL, and Equity Programs, Wausau School District

Norm Andrews, President Wisconsin State Reading Association

Patrice Ball, Curriculum Specialist Milwaukee Public Schools

Nissan Bar-Lev, Special Education Director CESA 7, Green Bay

Brian Bartel, Science Teacher West High School, Appleton

Dee Bauman, Director of Curriculum and Instruction Hamilton School District

Rick Chandler, President Chandler Consulting

Mary Cimbalnik, Special Education Director Pewaukee School District

Yvette Dunlap, Assistant Superintendent for Student Services, Appleton Area School District

Charles Fitzgerald, President Rhinelander School Board

Keith Fuchs, Superintendent Menasha School District

Holly Hart, Charter School Consultant Eau Claire Patricia Herdrich, Superintendent West Bend School District

Dacia Hopfensperger, Assessment Coordinator Hartland-Lakeside J3 School District

Peggy Jones, Principal Bonduel and Navarino Elementary Schools

Kurt Keifer, Director of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, Madison Metropolitan School District

Pam Knorr, Superintendent Walworth J1 School District

Linda Kunelius, Superintendent Bayfield School District

Deb Lindsey, Director of Research and Assessment Milwaukee Public Schools

Phil McDade, Vice President Monona Grove School Board

Colleen McHugh-Moore, Special Education and Pupil Services Director, Greendale School District

Demond Means, Superintendent Mequon-Thiensville School District

Laurie Mitchell, Science Teacher Tomahawk Middle School

Joseph Moylan, Principal Oconomowoc High School

John Peterson, Special Education Director Fort Atkinson School District

Karen Reiss, Instructional Specialist Germantown School District

Mary Richards, Math Specialist Waupaca Elementary Learning Center

Diane Rozanski, Instructional Technology Specialist Milwaukee Public Schools Brian Rude, Director of External Relations Dairyland Power Cooperative, La Crosse

Judy Sargent, Director, School Improvement Services CESA 7, Green Bay

Ron Sandoval, Assistant Principal Edward Bain School of Language and Art, Kenosha

Julie Seefeldt, Associate Director of ELL Programs Green Bay Area School District

Chris Van Hoof, Director of Instruction Clintonville School District

Wendell Waukau, Superintendent Menominee Indian School District

Bart Wepking, Language Arts Teacher Wheatland Center Elementary School

Lori Weyers, President Northcentral Technical College

John Whitsett, Director, Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment, Fond du Lac School District

Jim Wollack, Director, Testing and Evaluation Services, UW-Madison

Betty Womack, UW Board of Regents Assistant Superintendent of Pupil Services Kettle Moraine School District APPENDIX 14 - (B)(2) Next Generation Assessment Task Force - Assessments

APPENDIX 15 - (B)(2) MOSAIC Consortium MOU and State Participants

MOSAIC

Multiple Options for Student Assessment and Instruction Consortium

Memorandum of Understanding

This Non-Binding Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") is entered into by and between the lead state(s): Wisconsin, Nebraska, and Missouri, and ______("Your State"). The purpose of this agreement is to establish a framework of collaboration, as well as articulate tasks in support of a Multi-State Consortium in its implementation of an approved Standards and Assessment Section of a Race to the Top grant. States might choose to participate in this Consortium even if their Race to the Top grant application is not funded.

I. PROJECT PROPOSAL

A. PARTICIPATING SEA RESPONSIBILITIES

A Consortium of states proposes to build a balanced assessment system of formative and benchmark assessment in a Race to the Top grant application. A state might choose to participate in this agreement through funding of its own choosing. The name of the system to be built is Multiple Options (for) Student Assessment (and) Instruction Consortium (MOSAIC). The MOSAIC system will be designed to complement a summative assessment system aligned to the Common Core such as the one being proposed under the SMARTER Consortium or any other Consortia that may develop a summative assessment aligned to the Common Core.

The proposed Consortium tasks and activities described in the Race to the Top application include the tasks that follow below. States participating in the Consortium will need to determine which of the tasks they wish to undertake with this Consortium. This decision may be made after the submission of the MOU.

Task 1.1.1 COMMON CORE: The consortium states will adopt the Common Core Standards. Within one year of state adoption, all districts within the consortium states will have adopted the Common Core Standards, will have integrated the standards to their local curriculum, and will have aligned professional development to familiarize staff with the college and careerready expectations.

Task 1.1.2 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—CURRICULAR INTEGRATION: The consortium states will develop and build professional development materials around the instructional integration of Common Core standards. This will include curricular frameworks aligned to the Common Core, defining of learning progressions within content areas, materials on instructional strategies, and suggested interventions. All materials will be disseminated across the states within the consortium and made available in a web-banked system.

Task 1.1.3 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT SYSTEM: The consortium states will have access to a computerized system that will provide opportunities for districts to load the system with formative/local assessment tasks, items, and instructional materials including performance assessments. These can be shared across states, and customized for local use. All will be aligned with the Common Core and will be available electronically to students and teachers with timely data turn-around. Task 1.1.4 STATE FLEXIBILITY: Each state will define the level at which districts/schools in their state participate in the formative/benchmark assessment system. This may vary from state to state, depending on how each state defines voluntary versus optional participation. (One level of required participation within a state might be to require the state's persistently low performing schools and districts to participate in this comprehensive assessment system, and to require that student performance data be tracked over time for growth and improvement.)

Task 1.1.5 REPORT DEVELOPMENT: Each state will contribute to the development of district, school, and student-level performance reports on the Common Core. Reports will be generated in parent-friendly and teacher-friendly formats to track progress on the Common Core standards. Emphasis will be placed upon growth and improvement over time, with customized feedback about suggested next-steps based on the student's performance.

Task 1.1.6 BENCHMARK ASSESSMENT SYSTEM: Each state will contribute to the development of a benchmark assessment item bank with the capabilities for adaptive testing. From this item bank, common diagnostic/benchmark tests will be developed across the "total package" consortia states through a consortia bid process to a single vendor. Each state will contribute field-tested items to the bank. This bank will be used to diagnose student strengths and deficiencies and serve as an "early warning" system. Common performance standards and cut scores for these diagnostic/benchmark tests will be set across the consortium of states. The common tests will be loaded into the computerized system for immediate data turn around. The common tests will be available to districts/schools within each state as defined by that state – varying levels of participation will require different cost to each state to implement, most likely on a per-pupil basis. (States participating at the Partner or Associate level may access items in the bank, but may not utilize the consortia-developed common assessments).

Task 1.1.7 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—USING DATA TO IMPROVE INSTRUCTION: Each state will contribute to the development of hands-on training and workshop modules for educators that focus on user-friendly strategies to make data-informed instructional decisions based upon formative, benchmark, and summative assessment results. All materials will be disseminated across the collaborating states.

The selection of tasks by each SEA participating in the Consortium will determine the level of participation of each respective state. There are three levels of participation that may be selected by each SEA in the Consortium. While the level of participation does not need to be selected at the time of signing the MOU, by its signature the state is indicating its interest in participating at a minimum of Level Three.

- Level One: "Total Package" The state participates in all seven tasks with a common vendor, and shares in all resources available through the project, including all formative/benchmark assessments developed under the project. The state has an active role in developing, disseminating and sharing professional development tasks and materials.
- Level Two: "Partner" The state contributes to the item bank (Tasks 1.1.1, 1.1.2, and 1.1.6) and professional development materials, and may use components in their state for state-specific work. (ex: state does not use common assessments developed from the bank; instead, uses the bank to create their own assessment tools with a separate vendor)
- Level Three: "Associate" The state contributes to the item bank, (Task 1.1.6 only) and may use components in their state for state-specific work. The state does not contribute to or have access to professional development components developed through the project.

B. RESPONSIBILITIES OF ALL SEA PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSORTIUM

- 1) Each participating SEA in the Consortium will appoint a key contact person for the Race to the Top grant.
- 2) These key contacts from each State and the lead state(s) will maintain frequent communication to facilitate cooperation under this MOU.
- 3) Participating SEA grant personnel will work together to determine appropriate timelines for project updates and status reports throughout the whole grant period.

This Non-binding Memorandum of Understanding shall be effective beginning with the date of the last signature hereon:

SEA Superintendent/- Participating State Chief/Commissioner (or equivalent authorized signatory)

Signature Y F.UPPS

______Date 1/06/40 Date Superintendent

Date

Print Name

Title

Authorized Lead SEA Official - Lead State

By its signature below, the lead state(s) hereby accepts the SEA as a Participating SEA in the Consortium

Official State Designee

Print Name

Title

Please email this signed page by January 5, 2010 to <u>Ivnette.russell@dpi.wi.gov</u> and <u>pat.roschewski@nebraska.gov</u> or fax to (Fax) 608.266.8770 and (Fax) 402.471.4311 **PLEASE email this signed page only by January 5, 2010**

APPENDIX 15 - (B)(2) MOSAIC Consortium MOU and State Participants

States participating in the MOSAIC consortium

The following states have submitted a signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to participate in the Multiple Options for Student Assessment and Instruction Consortium (MOSAIC) consortium to provide high-quality summative assessments. Listed below are the states that have submitted a signed MOU to participate in MOSAIC.

State	Date MOSAIC	Lead or Participating State
	MOU-Received	
Delaware	January 5 th , 2010	Participating
Hawaii	December 31 st , 2009	Participating
Idaho	December 22 nd , 2009	Participating
Illinois	January 8 th , 2010	Participating
Iowa	January 5 th , 2010	Participating
Kansas	January 5 th , 2010	Participating
Kentucky	January 5 th , 2010	Participating
Maryland	January 5 th , 2010	Participating
Michigan	January 4 th , 2010	Participating
Minnesota	January 8,2010	Participating
Mississippi	January 5 th , 2010	Participating
Missouri	January 5 th , 2010	Lead
Montana	January 7 th , 2010	Participating
Nebraska	January 6 th , 2010	Lead
New Jersey	January 5 th , 2010	Participating
North Dakota	January 5 th , 2010	Participating
Ohio	January 6 th , 2010	Participating
Oregon	January 6 th , 2010	Participating
Pennsylvania	January 8 th , 2010	Participating
South Carolina	January 6 th , 2010	Participating
South Dakota	January 4 th , 2010	Participating
Tennessee	January 5 th , 2010	Participating
Utah	January 5 th , 2010	Participating
Washington	January 4 th , 2010	Participating
Wisconsin	January 6 th , 2010	Lead
Wyoming	January 4 th , 2010	Participating
Total # of states that have		
submitted signed MOUs for MOSAIC*	26	

* As of 1/8/2010

^{ative} Multi-State Assessment Resources for Leachers and Educational Researchers APPENDIX 16 - (B)(2) SMARTER Consortium MOU and Participant Summary

Summative Multi-State Assessment Resources for Teachers and Educational Researchers (SMARTER) Memorandum of Understanding

This non-binding Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is entered into by and between the states of Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Nebraska, Oregon, Tennessee, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin and Wyoming to initiate a consortium of states (Consortium) to serve as a framework of collaboration as required to submit a proposal for a Multi-State Consortium Common Assessment Race to the Top grant. The working title for the proposal is the "Summative Multi-State Assessment Resources for Teachers and Educational Researchers" (SMARTER). In the event the proposal is approved and fully funded by the U.S. Department of Education, the final proposal will serve as the official agreement.

The signatory states shall be referred to as "Lead States" and hereby authorize Oregon to be the signatory for the Lead States in entering into MOUs with additional states that desire to participate under the same terms (Participating States). The terms of the MOU among the Lead States and between the Lead States and subsequent Participating States are set forth below.

- 1. States in the Consortium will assign a key contact to assist in the drafting of the proposal, and to the extent practicable will engage their teachers, school and district administrators and institutions of higher education in the development and review of the proposal to ensure the design of the assessment system meets the needs of a variety of stakeholders.
- 2. States may withdraw from the Consortium prior to the establishment of the draft budget for the proposal. The anticipated date for the draft budget is 30 days before the proposal is due to the U.S. Department of Education.
- 3. States in the Consortium agree in principle to the following elements to be included in a proposal to the U.S. Department of Education:
 - a. The purpose of the proposal is to develop a high quality summative assessment system that is aligned to the Common Core Standards, mutually adopted by Consortium states.
 - b. The assessment system will use online adaptive tests, innovative item design and open-ended items to assess the full breadth of cognitive demand described by the Common Core Standards.
 - c. Proposal writing will be governed by staff from the Lead States that have agreed to this MOU. Governance protocols for proposal development will be established by 2/1S/2010.
 - d. If funded, the assessment system will be governed by staff from states that are members of the Consortium, and will be guided with the support of selected technical experts. Governance protocols for the assessment system will be a deliverable of the grant.
 - e. The assessment system will include teachers, school and district administrators, state departments of education and institutions of higher education in the design, administration, scoring and reporting of the assessments.
 - f. States in the Consortium will report student, school, district and state results based upon a single common set of rigorous achievement standards. Additionally, states in the consortium may choose to report student achievement benchmarked to a variety of achievement standards including NAEP, international assessments, and benchmarks predictive of student success in college and careers.
 - g. States in the Consortium will use the summative assessment system to measure school and district effectiveness to meet federal accountability requirements
 - h. The assessments will be designed based on principles of Universal Design and will be consistent with professional standards as described by the APA/AERA/NCME *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*.
 - i. The Consortium will coordinate with the MOSAIC consortium as appropriate and with other interested multi-state formative and benchmark assessment initiatives so that schools and districts will have access to a variety of high quality instructionally supportive assessment options that together yield a coherent balanced assessment system.
 - j. The assessment system will use open source software applications accessible to any vendor procured by states in the Consortium.

Summative Multi-State Assessment Resources for Ter Consortium Mote safer Participant Summary

- k. States in the Consortium will create and adhere to common administration guidelines including accommodations and allowable tools and assistive devices based on high quality research regarding student learning and assessment.
- I. Grant funds allocated to LEAs will in part be used to ensure participation opportunities for teachers. The estimated allocation and purpose of funds will be described in the budget section of the proposal.
- m. States in the Consortium will participate in common procurement practices and deliverables to the extent the procurements are directly related to Consortium-wide activities described in the proposal. Lead states will construct a procurement process taking into account minimum procurement standards used in all participating states.
- n. States in the Consortium will share a common reporting format consistent with a goal of aligning reporting systems.
- o. States in the Consortium will share common security protocols regarding test items.
- p. States in the Consortium will work with their institutions of higher education and teacher preparation institutions to ensure teachers are prepared to use and contribute to the summative assessment system.

This non-binding Memorandum of Understanding shall be effective beginning with the date of the last signature hereon:

Lead State SEA Superintendent/Chief/Commissioner

(or equivalent authorized signatory)

Signature Sague Print Name

Date Le Superintendent

Please sign and date this agreement by no later than January 8th, 2010. FAX signed copy to Tony Alpert at: (503) 378-5156 or email scanned copy to <u>Tony.Alpert@state.or.us</u>

Page 2 of 2

States participating in the SMARTER consortium

The following states have submitted a signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to participate in the Summative Multi-State Assessment Resources for Teachers and Educational Researchers (SMARTER) consortium to provide high-quality summative assessments.

State	Date SMARTER	Lead or Participating State
	MOU-Received	
Nebraska	January 4 th , 2010	Lead
Washington	January 4 th , 2010	Lead
Hawaii	January 4 th , 2010	Lead
Wyoming	January 5 th , 2010	Lead
Utah	January 5 th , 2010	Lead
Tennessee	January 5 th , 2010	Lead
Wisconsin	January 6 th , 2010	Lead
Kentucky	January 6 th , 2010	Participating
Kansas	January 6 th , 2010	Participating
Minnesota	January 6 th , 2010	Lead
Michigan	January 6 th , 2010	Participating
Ohio	January 6 th , 2010	Participating
South Carolina	January 6 th , 2010	Participating
Oregon	January 6 th , 2010	Lead
Montana	January 8 th , 2010	Participating
Illinois	January 8 th , 2010	Lead
Idaho	January 7 th , 2010	Lead
Delaware	January 7 th , 2010	Lead
Mississippi	January 11 th , 2010	Participating
District of Columbia	January 11 th , 2010	Participating
Total # of states that have submitted signed MOUs for SMARTER	20	
District of Columbia Total # of states that have submitted signed MOUs for SMARTER	January 11 th , 2010 20	Participating

Listed below are the states that have submitted a signed MOU to participate in SMARTER. In addition, also included are those states that have submitted formal statements of their intent to participate in SMARTER, but are not able to submit a signed MOU in time for the Race To the Top first round application deadlines.

State	Status of SMARTER MOU
Nebraska	Signed
Washington	Signed
Hawaii	Signed
Wyoming	Signed
Utah	Signed
Tennessee	Signed
Wisconsin	Signed
New Mexico	To be signed after AG review
Kentucky	Signed
Kansas	Signed
Minnesota	Signed
Michigan	Signed
Ohio	Signed
South Carolina	Signed

APPENDIX 16 - (B)(2) SMARTER Consortium MOU and Participant Summary

Anticipated total # of states that will participate in SMARTER	22
Colorado	To be signed 1/12/09
District of Columbia	Signed
Mississippi	Signed
Delaware	Signed
Idaho	Signed
Illinois	Signed
Montana	Signed
Oregon	Signed

APPENDIX 17 - (B)(2) Balanced Assessment Consortium MOU and Participant Summary

MOU for a State Consortium Developing Balanced Assessments of the Common Core Standards

This Non-Binding Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") is entered into by and between the Balanced Assessment Consortium and ______Wisconsin______("Your State"). The purpose of this agreement is to establish a framework of collaboration for states in supporting assessment of the common core standards. The agreement also articulates tasks in support of a Multi-State Consortium in its implementation of an approved Standards and Assessment Section of a Race to the Top grant. The MOU outlines a set of working principles, the roles of states and local districts within the consortium, and a set of tasks that the Consortium would undertake.

Working Principles

A consortium of states developing a balanced assessment system for evaluating the common core standards would start with working principles derived from an examination of successful state systems in the U.S. and high-achieving systems internationally. For example:

1) Assessments are grounded in a thoughtful, standards-based curriculum and are managed as part of a tightly <u>integrated system</u> of standards, curriculum, assessment, instruction, and teacher development.

- Curriculum guidance is lean, clear, and focused on what students should know and be able to *do* as a result of their learning experiences. Assessment expectations are described in the curriculum frameworks or course syllabi and are exemplified by samples of student work.
- Curriculum and assessments are organized around a well-defined set of learning progressions within subject areas. These guide teaching decisions, classroom-based assessment, and external assessment.
- Teachers and other curriculum experts are involved in developing curriculum and assessments which guide professional learning and teaching. Thus, everything that comes to schools is well-aligned and pulling in the same direction.

2) Assessments elicit <u>evidence of actual student performance</u> on challenging tasks that prepare students for the demands of college and career in the 21st century. Curriculum and assessments seek to teach and evaluate a broad array of skills and competencies that generalize to higher education and work settings. They emphasize deep knowledge of core concepts within and across the disciplines, including problem solving, analysis, synthesis, and critical thinking, and include essays and open-ended tasks and problems, as well as selected response items.

3) <u>Teachers are involved</u> in the development of curriculum and the development and scoring of assessments. Scoring processes are moderated to ensure consistency and to enable teachers to deeply understand the standards and to develop stronger curriculum and instruction leading to greater student proficiency. The moderated scoring process is a strong professional learning experience that helps drive the instructional improvements that enable student learning, as teachers become more skilled at their own assessment practices and their development of curriculum to teach the standards. The assessment systems are designed to increase the capacity of teachers to prepare students for the contemporary demands of college and career.

4) Assessments are structured to <u>continuously improve teaching and learning</u>. Assessment *as, of,* and *for* learning is enabled by several features of assessment systems:

- The use of school-based, curriculum-embedded assessments provides teachers with models of good curriculum and assessment practice, enhances curriculum equity within and across schools, and allows teachers to see and evaluate student learning in ways that can feed back into instructional and curriculum decisions.
- Close examination of student work and moderated teacher scoring of both school-based components and externally developed open-ended examinations are sources of ongoing professional development that improve teaching.
- Developing both school-based and external assessments around learning progressions allows teachers to see where students are on multiple dimensions of learning and to strategically support their progress.

5) Assessment and accountability systems are designed to <u>improve the quality of learning</u> and schooling. Assessments aim to encourage and support the learning of ambitious intellectual skills in the way they are designed and used for informing teaching, learning, and schooling. Accountability systems publicly report outcomes and take these into account, along with other indicators of school performance, in a well-designed system focused on continual improvement for schools.

6) Assessment and accountability systems <u>use multiple measures</u> to evaluate students and schools.

Multiple measures of learning and performance are used to evaluate skills and knowledge. Students engage in a variety of tasks and tests that are both curriculum-embedded and ondemand, providing many ways to demonstrate and evaluate their learning. These are combined in reporting systems at the school and beyond the school level. School reporting and accountability are also based on multiple measures. Assessment data are combined with other information about schools' resources, capacities, practices, and outcomes to design intensive professional development supports and interventions that improve school performance.

7) <u>New technologies enable greater assessment quality</u> and information systems that support accountability.

New technologies enhance and transform the way the assessment process is developed, delivered, and used, providing adaptive tools and access to information resources for students to demonstrate their learning, and providing appropriate feedback by supporting both teacher scoring and computer-based scoring (now possible for both selected response and some forms of constructed-response items). By using technology to reduce costs for delivery of more openended assessment formats, scoring, and reporting, resources can be redirected to improvements in assessment quality.

Technology also organizes data about student learning, enhancing system accountability for instruction and reporting by providing more efficient, accurate, and timely information to teachers, parents, administrators, and policymakers. Technology helps to integrate information at as part of longitudinal data systems, contributing to a rich profile of accomplishment for every student.

State and Local Roles within a Consortium

States working within the Consortium would:

Adopt and augment the Common Core standards as appropriate to their context.

- Create and deploy curriculum frameworks that address the standards—drawing on exemplars and tested curriculum models.
- Build and manage an assessment system that includes both on-demand and curriculumembedded assessments that evaluate the full range of standards and allow evaluation of student progress. The Consortium may develop both joint assessments (commonly implemented by states) as well as other assessment tasks and items linked to the standards (and grounded in curriculum units) that can be incorporated into states' individual assessment plans for formative or summative purposes.
- Develop rubrics that embody the standards, and clear examples of good work, benchmarked to performance standards.
- Create oversight / moderation / audit systems for ensuring the comparability of locally managed and scored assessment components.
- Ensure that teacher and leader education and development infuse knowledge of learning, curriculum, and assessment.
- Implement high-quality professional learning focused on examination of student work, curriculum and assessment development, and moderated scoring.

Districts and schools would:

- Examine the standards and evaluate current curriculum, assessment, and instructional practice in light of the standards.
- Evaluate state curriculum guidance, and further develop and adapt curriculum to support local student learning, select and augment curriculum materials, and continually evaluate and revise curriculum in light of student learning outcomes.
- Incorporate formative assessments into the curriculum, organized around the standards, curriculum, and learning sequences to inform teaching and student learning.
- Participate in administering and scoring relevant portions of the on-demand and curriculum-embedded components of the assessment system, and examining student work and outcomes.
- Help design and engage in professional development around learning, teaching, curriculum, & assessment.
- Engage in review and moderation processes to examine assessments and student work, within and beyond the school.

Tasks the Consortium Would Undertake

The consortium of states would build on successful efforts already launched in a number of states, seeking to integrate the best knowledge and exemplars from existing efforts, so as to use resources efficiently, take advantage of well-tested approaches, and avoid reinventing the wheel. It would bring together leading curriculum and assessment experts to advise and support efforts to create a system for evaluating the Common Core, building on the most credible and well-vetted knowledge available in the field. With these supports, the Consortium could:

1. Support the Development of Curriculum Frameworks: When the Common Core standards have been released, vetted, and adopted, consortia of states would work with curriculum and assessment experts to develop (or adapt from previously successful work) curriculum frameworks, syllabi, and other materials mapped to the standards. There has been enormous investment in the United States in high-quality curriculum, for example through NSF and other

organizations at the national level, and in many states and districts. Other English-speaking nations have also developed high quality curriculum materials linked to standards and learning progressions that could be evaluated in this process. This effort would inventory and cull from efforts with a strong evidence base of success to support states in building out curriculum frameworks around which they can organize deeper curriculum development at the local level, state and local assessment development, instructional supports, and professional development.

2. Create a Digital Curriculum and Assessment Library: The results of this effort should ultimately be made available on-line in a digital platform that offers materials for curriculum building and, eventually, model syllabi for specific courses linked to the standards, formative and summative assessment tasks and instruments linked to the curriculum materials, and materials for training teachers and school leaders in both strategies for teaching specific curriculum concepts / units and assessment development and scoring. In addition, as described below, an electronic scoring platform supporting training, calibrating, benchmarking, and reporting would be developed and made available across the states.

3. Develop State and Local Assessments: The state consortium would work to create a common reference examination, which includes selected-response, constructed response and performance components aimed at higher-order skills, linked to the Common Core standards for grades 3-8, like the NECAP assessment recently developed by a set of New England states. This assessment would be designed to incorporate more rigorous and analytic multiple-choice and open-ended items than many tests currently include and would include strategically selected curriculum-embedded performance assessments at the classroom level that can be part of the summative evaluation, while also providing formative information.

These curriculum-embedded components would be developed around core concepts or major skills that are particularly salient in evaluating students' progress in English language arts and mathematics. (Eventually, work on science could be included.) Exemplars to evaluate and build upon are already available in many states and in nations like England that have developed a set of "tests and tasks" for use in classrooms that help teachers evaluate students' learning in relation to well-described learning progressions in reading, writing, mathematics, and other subjects.

Curriculum-embedded components would link to the skills evaluated in the "on-demand" test, allowing for more ambitious tasks that take more time and require more student effort than can be allocated in a 2 or 3-hour test on a single day; these components would evaluate skills in ways that expect more student-initiated planning, management of information and ideas, interaction with other materials and people, and production of more extended responses that reveal additional abilities of students (oral presentations, exhibitions, and product development, as well as written responses) that are associated with college and career success.

In the context of summative assessments, curriculum-embedded tasks would be standardized, scored in moderated fashion, and scores would be aggregated up to count as part of the external assessment. Curriculum-embedded assessments would also include marker tasks that are designed to be used formatively to check for essential understandings and to give teachers useful information and feedback as part of ongoing instruction. Thoughtful curriculum guidance would outline the scaffolding and formative assessment needed to prepare students to succeed on the summative assessments.

All components of the system would incorporate **principles of universal design** that seek to remove construct-irrelevant aspects of tasks that could increase barriers for non-native English speakers and students with other specific learning needs. In addition, designers who are skilled at developing linguistically supportive assessments and tests for students with learning disabilities would be engaged from the beginning in considering how to develop the assessments for maximum access, as well as how to design appropriate accommodations and modifications to enable as many students as possible to be validly assessed within the system.

The emphasis on evaluating **student growth over time** and on tying standards to a conception of learning progressions should encourage a growth oriented frame for both the "on-demand" examination and the more extended classroom assessments. The Consortium may consider the viability of incorporating computer-based adaptive testing that creates vertically scaled assessments based on the full range of learning progressions in ELA and math. This would allow students to be evaluated in ways that give greater information about their abilities and their growth over time. This approach would not preclude the evaluation of grade-level standards, which could be part of any students' assessment, nor would it preclude a significant number of constructed response, open-ended items, as the technology for machine-scoring structured open-ended items is now fairly well-developed. Strategic use of partial teacher scoring for these items would also be a desirable element of the system to support teachers' understanding of the standards and assessments, and their planning for instruction.

The emphasis on evaluating student growth should also inform the development of the curriculum-embedded elements of the system, which should be selected or developed to strategically evaluate students' progress along the learning continuum. Centrally developed tasks administered and scored by teachers with moderation (see below), using common rubrics, would be part of the set of reported scores. In states with experience and capacity, it may be possible to begin to incorporate information about student learning that teachers develop from their own classroom evidence, linked to the standards and learning progressions and guided by the curriculum frameworks. This could be an optional aspect of the Consortium's work for states and communities with interest and capacity.

At the **high school level**, the Consortium might explore one or both of two options for assessment:

• **Course- or syllabus-based systems** like those in England, Australia, Singapore, Hong Kong, Alberta (Canada), as well as the International Baccalaureate. Generally conceptualized as end-of-course-exams in this country, this approach should become a more comprehensive course assessment approach like that pursued in these other countries. Such an approach would include within-course performance assessments that count toward the examination score, as well as high-quality assessment end-of-course components that feature constructed response as well as selected response items. Within-course performance assessments would tap central modes of inquiry in the disciplines, ensuring that students have the opportunity to engage in scientific investigations, literary analyses and other genres of writing, speaking and listening; mathematical modeling and applications; social scientific research. Such an approach might require an ELA and math assessment at a key juncture that evaluates an appropriate benchmark level for high school standards, and then, as in high-achieving nations, allow for pursuit of other courses/ assessments that are selected by students

according to their interests and expertise. These could serve as additional information on the diploma for colleges and employers.

- Standards-driven systems that might include a more comprehensive benchmark assessment in ELA and mathematics complemented by collections of evidence that demonstrate students' abilities to meet certain standards within and across the disciplines. This set of assessments would allow more curriculum flexibility in how to meet the standards. Systems like these are used in some provinces in Canada and Australia, in states like Rhode Island, Wyoming, Nebraska, and New Hampshire, and in systems of schools like the New York Performance Standards Consortium, the Asia Society, and Envision Schools. Sometimes these sets of evidence are organized into structured portfolios, such as the Technology portfolio in New Hampshire and the broader Graduation portfolios in these sets of schools that require specific tasks in each content area, scored with common rubrics and moderation.
- A mixed model could combine elements of both course- and standards-driven models, allowing some demonstrations of proficiency to occur in any one of a range of courses (rather than a single, predetermined course) or even outside the bounds of a course, like the efforts by some states to allow students to pass courses via demonstrations of competence rather than seat time (e.g. NH, OH). Such a system could also include specific components intended to develop and display research and inquiry skills that might also be interdisciplinary, such as the Project Work requirements in England, Singapore, and the International Baccalaurate, and the Senior Project requirements in Pennsylvania and Ohio.

4. Develop Moderation and Auditing Systems for Teacher-Scored Work: The consortium would develop protocols for managing moderation and auditing systems and training scorers so as to enable comparable, consistent scoring of performance assessments. In other nations' and states' systems that include these features routinely, procedures have been developed to ensure both widespread teacher involvement – often as part of professional development time – and to create common standards and high levels of reliability in evaluating student work. A range of models are possible, and the consortium would serve as a resource to individual states in developing and implementing strong, efficient approaches.

5. Develop Technology to Support the Assessment System: Technology should be used to enhance these assessments in a number of ways: by delivering the assessments; in on-line tasks of higher-order abilities, allowing students to search for information or manipulate variables and tracking information about the students' problem-solving processes; in some cases, scoring the results or delivering the responses to trained scorers / teachers to assess from an electronic platform. Such a platform may also support training and calibration of scorers and moderation of scores, as well as efficient aggregation of results in ways that support reporting and research about the responses. This use of technology is already being used in the International Baccalaureate assessment system, which includes both on-demand and classroom-based components.

APPENDIX 17 - (B)(2) Balanced Assessment Consortium MOU and Participant Summary

In order to gain the efficiency and cost benefits of machine scoring and the teaching and learning benefits of teachers' moderated scoring, a mixed system could be developed where computerbased scoring is incorporated on constructed response tasks where useful - though teachers would score some of these tasks for anchoring and learning purposes - while other tasks that require human scoring engage most teachers in scoring to support improvements in instruction.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF ALL SEAS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSORTIUM

- 1) Each participating SEA in the Consortium will appoint a key contact person.
- 2) These key contacts from each State will maintain frequent communication with the parties administering the PALS Consortium to facilitate cooperation under this MOU.
- 3) Participating SEA grant personnel will work together to determine appropriate timelines for project updates and status reports throughout the whole grant period.

This Non-binding Memorandum of Understanding shall be effective beginning with the date of the last signature hereon:

SEA Superintendent/- Participating State Chief/Commissioner (or equivalent authorized signatory)

ONY EVER,

Signature

Print Name

1/06/10 Date

State Superintendent Title

7

Please email this signed page to

Tammy Morrill Tammy.Morrill@maine.gov

PLEASE email by January 7, 2010

Balanced Assessment Consortium Participation (Signed MOU)

List of States

- 1 Alabama
- 2 Arizona
- 3 Arkansas
- 4 California
- 5 Connecticut
- 6 Delaware
- 7 Illinois
- 8 Indiana
- 9 Georgia
- 10 Iowa
- 11 Kansas
- 12 Kentucky
- 13 Maine
- 14 Maryland
- 15 Massachusetts
- 16 Michigan
- 17 Mississippi
- 18 Missouri
- 19 Montana
- 20 Nebraska
- 21 New Hampshire
- 22 New Jersey
- 23 North Carolina
- 24 North Dakota
- 25 Ohio
- 26 Oklahoma
- 27 Pennsylvania
- 28 Rhode Island
- 29 South Carolina
- 30 South Dakota
- 31 Tennessee
- 32 Utah
- 33 Washington DC
- 34 West Virginia
- 35 Wisconsin
- 36 Wyoming

PALS - STATES THAT HAVE SIGNED MOU as of 13th January 2010

Alabama Arizona Arkansas California Connecticut Delaware Illinois Indiana Kansas Kentucky Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Mississippi Missouri Montana New Hampshire New Jersey North Dakota Ohio Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Utah Washington DC West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming

APPENDIX 19 - (B)(2) ACHIEVE MOU Common Assessment Principles



BOARD OF DIRECTORS

CO-CHAIRS

Governor Phil Bredesen State of Tennessee

Craig R. Barrett Former CEO/Chairman of the Board Intel Corporation

BOARD MEMBERS

Governor Jennifer Granholm State of Michigan

Edward B. Rust, Jr. Chairman & Chief Executive Officer State Farm Insurance

Governor Donald L. Carcieri State of Rhode Island

Mark B. Grier Vice Chairman Prudential Financial, Inc.

Jeff Wadsworth President & Chief Executive Officer Battelle

Governor Dave Heineman State of Nebraska

Governor Deval Patrick State of Massachusetts

CHAIR EMERITUS

Louis Gerstner, Jr. Former Chairman & CEO **IBM** Corporation

PRESIDENT

Michael Cohen

TREASURER

Peter Savre Controller Prudential Financial, Inc. January 15, 2010

Dr. Anthony Evers State Superintendent Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction PO Box 7841 Madison, WI 53707-7841

Dear Superintendent Evers:

Achieve is pleased to confirm Wisconsin's participation in an assessment partnership committed to pursuing the development and implementation of summative assessments that are aligned to the common core standards, that can be used within states as part of statewide assessment systems, and that will enable comparability of results across a maximum number of states.

We have received your formal request to join the other states in this partnership and acknowledge your acceptance of the attached Statement of Principles which will guide our collective work.

Wisconsin's participation in this partnership is critical to its success. We look forward to continuing our important work together in the coming months.

Sincerely,

Cohen

Michael Cohen President

States Committed to Assessment Partnership (As of 10:00 am EST on January 15, 2010)

- 1. Alabama
- 2. Arizona
- 3. Arkansas
- 5. Delaware
- 6. District of Columbia
- 7. Florida
- 8. Georgia
- 9. Hawaii

- 4. California

- 10. Illinois 11. Indiana 12. Kentucky 13. Louisiana
- 14. Maryland
- 15. Massachusetts
- 16. Michigan
- 17. Minnesota
- 18. New Hampshire

- 19. New Mexico
- 20. North Carolina
- 21. Ohio
- 22. Oklahoma
- 23. Pennsylvania
- 24. Rhode Island
- 25. Tennessee
- 26. Utah
- 27. Wisconsin

APPENDIX 19 - (B)(2) ACHIEVE MOU Common Assessment Principles



Comparing Student Performance on Common College- and Career-Ready Standards Statement of Principles

Our state is committed to an education system that prepares all of our students for success in college, careers, and life in the 21st century. We believe in setting *high* expectations for our students and schools that are firmly grounded in what it takes to be successful. We believe in setting *common* expectations across states, and are committed to working with like-minded states to adopt common standards and assessment systems anchored in college and career readiness.

Our state supports common assessments that meet the following principles:

- Aligned to the common core standards
- Anchored in college and career readiness
- Allow for comparison of student results across a maximum number of states
- Enable to the maximum extent possible benchmarking performance against NAEP and international standards
- Cover grades 3 through 8 and high school, including college/career ready measures at the end of high school
- Address three overarching goals: measuring student proficiency, ensuring accountability, and improving teaching and learning
- Enable measurement of student achievement and growth
- Are summative in nature but designed in a manner consistent with more comprehensive assessment systems that also include interim and formative assessments
- Provide valid and reliable measures of student knowledge, understanding of, and ability to apply crucial concepts through the use of a variety of item types and formats
- Leverage technology and economies of scale in order to minimize costs and create assessments that accurately measure student performance
- Provide for timely release of results to better inform practice and support decisionmaking
- Include the assessment of students identified with disabilities and English language learners and to the extent feasible, use universal design principles

We understand that Achieve will work with other national partners to build on the work of the common core standards and convene states to pursue a common assessment strategy that meets these principles. We are prepared to work with Achieve and its partners in as large a consortium of states as possible to explore the development and implementation of summative assessments that are aligned to the common core standards, that can be used within states as part of statewide assessment systems, and that will enable comparability of results across states. We understand that in pursuing this effort, Achieve and its partners will work closely with other consortia that have been formed to explore areas of common ground and determine whether and how efforts could be combined to achieve comparability of results.

Appendix 20 - (C)(3)(iii) VARC Data Use Agreement

DATA USE AGREEMENT BETWEEN

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

and

University of Wisconsin Wisconsin Center for Education Research (WCER) Value-Added Research Center (VARC)

This Data Use Agreement is made and entered into on 09/14/09 by and between the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI), hereafter "Holder," and University of Wisconsin Value-Added Research Center (VARC), hereafter "Recipient."

- 1. This agreement sets forth the terms and conditions pursuant to which Holder will disclose certain protected educational information, hereafter "PEI," in the form of a Limited Data Set to the Recipient.
- 2. Terms used, but not otherwise defined, in this Agreement shall have the meaning given the terms in the **United States Department of Education Regulations** 20 U.S.C. § 1232g; 34 CFR Part 99.
- 3. Purpose
 - 3.1 The statewide data are required to provide an important reference group for valueadded analysis. Large districts, such as Milwaukee and Madison, require an external reference group to determine, for example, whether an "above average" school in the district is also "above average" in the state as a whole. Smaller districts and CESAs require the state reference group for the same reason, and for the additional reason that smaller districts with fewer schools have fewer bases for comparison without the state reference group.
 - 3.2 The VARC analysis provides information about both attainment and growth that can be used to improve educational outcomes. Including student variables such as economic status allows the model to control for student differences, thereby allowing "apples to apples" comparisons necessary to make inferences about school effectiveness. This work is expected to assist districts with data-informed decision making, promote assessment literacy, and improve our understanding of value-added modeling for various educational entities. The modeling done by VARC is transparent and subject to review by researchers and practitioners.
- 4. Permitted Uses and Disclosures
 - 4.1 Except as otherwise specified herein, Recipient may make all uses and disclosures of the Limited Data Sets necessary to conduct the research described herein:

As a follow-up to the Wisconsin Statewide Value-Added Demonstration project, and in consultation with districts and Cooperative Education Service Agencies (CESAs), VARC proposes to make value-added determinations for all Wisconsin public schools, and to provide this information to DPI in a data file that meets the

Appendix 20 - (C)(3)(iii) VARC Data Use Agreement

requirements defined in section 5.7. To accomplish this, Holder will provide Recipient the Limited Data Set. Recipient may use the Limited Data Set in their contracted work with Wisconsin school districts, providing Recipient and contracted districts comply with district, state, and federal privacy rules (see section 5.5); and that Recipient provides an annual summary of this contracted work to Holder (see section 5.9). - 57

- 4.2 In addition to the Recipient, the individuals, or classes of individuals, who are permitted to use or receive the Limited Data Set for purposes of the Research Project include: Robert Meyer, Ph.D., (Principal Investigator); Michael Christian, Ph.D.; Chris Thorn, Ph.D.; and other VARC staff directly involved with the collection and/or analysis of data. To the extent that the classes of persons are not part of the Recipient's workforce and are directly involved in the Research Project, the Recipient shall enter into a data agreement with the other classes of persons before such release of the Limited Data Sets.
- 5. Recipient Responsibilities
 - 5.1 Recipient will not use or disclose the Limited Data Set for any purpose other than permitted by this Agreement pertaining to the Research Project or as required by law. If disclosure of data of any kind is deemed necessary it will take place only after prior notification of the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.
 - 5.2 Recipient will use appropriate administrative, physical and technical safeguards to prevent use or disclosure of the Limited Data Set other than as provided for by this Agreement.
 - 5.3 Recipient will report to the Holder any use or disclosure of the Limited Data Set not provided for by this Agreement of which the Recipient becomes aware within 24 hours of becoming aware of such use or disclosure.
 - 5.4 Recipient will ensure that any agent, including a subcontractor, to whom it provides the Limited Data Set, agrees to the same restrictions and conditions that apply through this Agreement to the Recipient with respect to the Limited Data Set.
 - 5.5 Recipient will not identify the information contained in the Limited Data Set. Any reports or materials developed by Recipient or subcontractors that use data provided under this agreement will not contain any personally identifiable information that is protected by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), 34 CFR 99; sec. 118.125 Wisconsin statutes; and low income information under the National School Lunch Act, 42 USC 1758(b)(2)(C)(iii) to (v). Recipient shall ensure that all reports and materials developed will include no personally identifiable information. Recipient shall implement suppression rules that prevent both direct and indirect disclosure of personally identifiable student information. Recipient will make these suppression rules available to Holder upon request.
 - 5.6 Recipient will not contact the individuals who are the subject of the PEI contained in the Limited Data Set.

- 5.7 Recipient will provide to Holder, within 90 days of receiving the Limited Data Set, or on a date agreed upon by both parties, a data file containing the output of the statewide value-added analysis ("Results"). The Results shall remain the property of Recipient. Recipient grants to Holder at no cost a non-exclusive, non-transferable right to use, reuse, copy, and create derivative works of the Results, as Holder determines, at Holder's sole discretion. The format and content of the output file are to be mutually agreed upon, but shall at a minimum contain data required to produce a "value-added and attainment quadrant" for each school and district in the state against the state average (see sample reports in Meyer, et al., *Wisconsin Value-Added Model: A Demonstration Project Final Report*, May 2009). The output file shall include slope coefficients and standard errors for demographic variables at the state level. The output file shall include, for each school and district in the state, for both Reading and Mathematics, at a minimum:
 - Value-added effect (in scale score and tier units)
 - Standard deviation or standard error
 - Confidence interval
 - N
 - state percentile
 - WKCE percent proficient
 - Value-added quadrant
- 5.8 Recipient will provide to Holder, within 90 days of receiving the Limited Data Set, or on a date agreed upon by both parties, a description of the statistical model used to generate the Results.
- 5.9 Recipient will provide to Holder a brief report summarizing use of and activities related to the statewide value-added analysis of the prior year, including at a minimum a list of districts and CESAs contracted for services using the state data set; questions, issues, and conclusions from the Research Project to date, and recommended next steps. This report shall be delivered to Holder not later than June 30, 2010 and each June 30 thereafter if additional data are provided to Recipient. The report shall be property of DPI and shall be of publishable quality as defined in the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, 5e*.

6. Term and Termination

- 6.1 The terms of this Agreement shall be effective as of 09/14/09 and shall remain in effect until all PEI in the Limited Data Sets provided to the Recipient are destroyed or returned to the Holder.
- 6.2 The terms of this Agreement shall govern use of existing data (provided for the demonstration project) from the 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08 school years; data for the 2008-09 school year; and, if requested by Recipient and provided at Holder's sole discretion, school years 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13.
- 6.3 Upon the Holder's knowledge of a material breach of this Agreement by the Recipient, the Holder shall provide an opportunity for Recipient to cure the breach or

end the violation. If efforts to cure the breach or end the violation are not successful within the reasonable time period specified by the Holder, the Holder shall discontinue disclosure of PEI to the Recipient. The Holder shall immediately discontinue disclosure of the Limited Data Set to the Recipient if the Holder determines cure of the breach is not possible.

- 6.4 Both Holder and Recipient shall have the right to terminate this Data Use Agreement for any reason by providing sixty (60) days notice of termination of this Data Use Agreement to the other party (Holder or Recipient).
- 7. General Provisions
 - 7.1 Recipient and Holder understand and agree that individuals who are the subject of Personal Educational Information are not intended to be third party beneficiaries of this Agreement.
 - 7.2 This Agreement shall not be assigned by Recipient without the prior written consent of the Holder.
 - 7.3 Each party agrees that it will be responsible for its own acts and the results thereof to the extent authorized by law and shall not be responsible for the acts of the other party or the results thereof.
- 8. Data Confidentiality and Security
 - 8.1 Recipient shall implement and adhere to policies and procedures that restrict access to the Limited Data Set. A complete list of individuals with access to the Limited Data Set will be identified and maintained.
 - 8.2 Persons retrieving data/using data from the Limited Data Set will never copy any student-level data to a laptop/desktop hard drive for any reasons. Tables and charts to be included in a project report will be acceptable to store outside of the secure hard drive or other secure data storage where the Limited Data Set is stored.
 - 8.3 All individuals permitted to use or receive the Limited Data Set for purposes of the Research Project shall read and agree to follow the pupil data access policy and procedures in **DPI Policy Bulletin 4.300** (attachment 2) and in the **Student Data** Access Policy and Procedures Guidebook (attachment 3). These documents were developed to ensure proper handling of pupil data in order to maintain privacy and confidentiality. All individuals using or receiving the Limited Data Set must follow the data access procedures on pages 18 and 25, and sign and return to Holder the **Data Access Form**, PI-1274, on page 19 in the guidebook.
- 9. Transmission of Data
 - 9.1 All student data will be sent to the Recipient via a secure FTP or other method selected by the Holder.
 - 9.2 During this transmission data will be secured based upon a method selected by the Holder.

- 10. Data storage
 - 10.1 Student data will be kept, for a period not to exceed 10 years, in a secure electronic format by the Recipient. All personally identifiable information connected with this Research Project shall be destroyed when no longer needed for the purposes for which the project was conducted. Recipient shall give Holder written notice of planned destruction of study records at least 30 days prior to such destruction. All student information will be permanently erased from Recipient's storage devices upon completion or termination of the project.
- 11. Data Elements
 - 11.1 Attached is a Data Request (attachment 1) listing variables to be provided by Holder to Recipient for use with the Research Project. All data remains the property of Holder.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto execute this agreement as follows:

Date: <u>9-16-09</u>

Date: 09.16.2009

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction soll By: Director, Office of Educational Accountability Japan

By: <u>other</u> Pupil Data Policy Advisor

University of Wisconsin Wisconsin Center for Education Research Value-Added Research Center (VARC)

Date: _____9/16/09

mull no By:

⁽Title of recipient or person with authority to sign agreement for the recipient)



WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION Wisconsin Department of Health Services, Division of Public Health

DATA EXCHANGE AGREEMENT

I. <u>PARTIES</u>

The parties to this agreement are the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (hereafter referred to as DPI) and Wisconsin Department of Health Services, Division of Public Health (hereafter referred to as DPH). This MOU is for data sharing for the Wisconsin Childhood Lead Levels and Educational Outcomes (WCLLEO) project. The University of Wisconsin-Madison, Population Health Sciences (hereafter referred to as UWPHS) has primary responsibility for research associated with this project and providing funding that enables this research. UWPHS has an MOU with DPH to share and analyze data. DPI will provide data to the DPH Wisconsin Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program (WCLPPP) on behalf of parents that have elected to participate in this research and signed a UW Education Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved consent form.

II. <u>TERM</u>

This Agreement shall remain in effect for a period of two years from the signature date of the IT Director, DPI. Both parties may agree to renew, amend or terminate the agreement, unless sooner suspended under the terms and conditions set forth in Article XIII.

III. <u>DEFINITIONS</u>

- A. The DPH data steward is the individual designated by the Division Administrator that will work to ensure all use of this data is in accordance with Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and this agreement. In addition this person will coordinate and administer amendments to this agreement.
- B. The DPI IT Director is the individual designated by the Agency Superintendent to perform day-to-day security functions, including:
 - 1. Protecting the privacy of pupil data and adherence to FERPA
 - 2. Monitoring compliance with this agreement by DPI staff.
 - 3. Requesting that DPH terminate or modify access to this research data for any individual whose job functions or use of access merits such a change. Coordinate and administer amendments (attachments) to this agreement.
 - 4. Coordinating data exchange request between DPI and DPH data steward.
 - 5. Consult with the DPH data steward regarding access issue.

APPENDIX 21 - (C)(3)(iii) DPI-DHS Lead Study MOA

C. The DPI IT Director and DPH data steward are identified in Attachment A.

IV. <u>PURPOSE</u>

The purpose of this agreement is to allow the Wisconsin Department of Health Services, Division of Public Health (DPH) data extracts containing standardized test scores and other educational/demographic data obtained from the Wisconsin Student Assessment System (WSAS). Information obtained through the WSAS will be used by DPH in accordance with the <u>Research Participant Information and Consent Form</u>, the UW IRB application and DPH rules and regulations and solely for the following purposes: (1) study associations of children's blood lead levels with educational performance and (2) look at confounding variables such as enrollment in free/reduced lunch program and other school environment and child demographic variables.

V. DATA/INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED AND PURPOSES

DPI WSAS data will be provided for the children identified by the DPH data steward and verified by DPI for the purposes of analyzing blood lead levels and standardized test scores. A signed parental consent form will be required before any WSAS data is released. The data extracts obtained from DPI are intended only for analyses in support of the WCLLEO project. Specific data items are listed in <u>Attachment B –</u> <u>WCLLEO Required WSAS Data Items</u>.

These following steps will be performed:

APPENDIX 21 - (C)(3)(iii) DPI-DHS Lead Study MOA

- DPI will send a letter of request to the Wisconsin Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program Manager (WCLPPP) (see attachment C). This request will ask the WCLPPP to provide a sample list of names of children who have been tested for blood lead and fit the overall requirements for inclusion in the study. This letter of request enables the DPH to share these data with DPI.
- 2) Once the letter of request has been made by DPI, a list of names (with DOB and gender) will be provided by the DPH data steward to DPI. This list will be matched with the DPI databases to determine a) if the child is currently enrolled in a Wisconsin Public School, b) if the child has taken the 4th grade WKCE or WAA and c) if consistent with School District Policy, the name of the school the child is presently attending. DPI will provide a comma delimited file within 3 weeks for those children who meet qualifications a) and b) and if appropriate the school most recently attended. The estimated time to complete this task is 5 working days.
- 3) Once WCLLEO staff have identified the sample for the study and obtained parental consent, the names of the first 100 children will be sent by the DPH data steward to DPI along with copies of the parental consents. DPI will provide WSAS identified variables for all of these children and return a comma delimited file within 2 weeks to the WCLPPP data steward. The estimated time to complete this task is 5 working days.
- 4) After the first 100 cases have been sent and the programming (by DPI) to create the datasets completed, subsequent groups of names and their consent forms will be sent to DPI. The response time for each subsequent group is estimated at 2 weeks. Up to 4,500 cases may be provided to DPI. The estimated time for the DPI IT team to complete this task for one subsequent group of 500 cases is one (1) working day.
- 5) DPI IT will be reimbursed for its efforts at a rate of \$100/hour.

VI. OFFICIALS WITH AUTHORITY TO REQUEST INFORMATION

Officials with authority to request access to DPI data or changes to this agreement are identified in Attachment A. Only the DPH data steward will have complete access to DPI and DPH data. Analysts on the WCLLEO project will only have access to de-identified data, i.e., with name and address data removed. Contractors APPENDIX 21 - (C)(3)(iii) DPI-DHS Lead Study MOA and others working on recruitment of study subjects will have access to identifying information but not DPI test score data.

VII. REIMBURSEMENT FOR EXTRAORDINARY COSTS INCURRED BY DWD/DWS and/or DPI IN PROVIDING INFORMATION

Reimbursement for services required to administer and conduct this data exchange will be accomplished by purchase order through the University of Wisconsin-Madison, Population Health Sciences (UWPHS). DPI IT staff will submit project time sheets to UWPHS and this will be considered an invoice for services. UWPHS will then reimburse DPI as appropriate for documented work performed.

VIII. PROTECTION OF CONFIDENTIALITY: PROTECTION AGAINST UNAUTHORIZED ACCESS OR DISCLOSURE

The DPH and WCLLEO Project agree to comply with the following measures to protect the confidentiality of any information provided under this agreement and to protect such information against unauthorized access or disclosure:

- A. DPH will not use the information for any purposes not specifically authorized under this agreement.
- B. Paper documentation (consent forms) that DPI receives from DPH containing confidential pupil information shall be stored in a place physically secure from access by unauthorized persons in conformance with DPI security policy. DPI will store and maintain copies of signed consent forms in a locked cabinet until such time as they no longer require them and will destroy these documents. DPH will store confidential paper files in the same manner.
- C. Information stored in electronic format, such as magnetic tapes or discs or on hard drives, shall be stored and processed in such a way that unauthorized persons cannot retrieve the information by any means.
- D. DPH shall require all employees and WCLLEO personnel with access to the information covered under this agreement to sign a DPH confidentiality and nondisclosure agreement (Confidentiality Non-Disclosure Acknowledgement Employee <u>http://dhfsweb/forms/F8/F81020.doc;</u> Confidentiality Non-Disclosure Agreement Contractor <u>http://dhfsweb/forms/F8/F81020A.doc</u>) regarding the safeguarding of confidential client information required by State and Federal law.
- E. DPH agrees that its requirements regarding confidentiality of information set forth in applicable state and federal statutes, administrative rules, employee handbooks, and policy manuals shall apply equally to information obtained under this agreement.

APPENDIX 21 - (C)(3)(iii) DPI-DHS Lead Study MOA

F. Confidential DPI information may only be accessed and utilized by authorized DPH employees and WCLLEO personnel, and only for the specific purposes as defined under Article IV. Discussion, use or release of this information by the DPH or any of its employees for any purposes other than those defined under Article IV is strictly prohibited.

IX. <u>CONFIDENTIALITY ACKNOWLEDGMENT</u>

The Authorized Representative of the DPH attests that all personnel with access to confidential information in the DPI datasets covered under this agreement will be required to adhere to the policies and procedures of DPH regarding confidentiality and the DPH confidentiality and nondisclosure form.

X. DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION

In accordance with this agreement and in compliance with federal and state law, Wis. Stats. 146.82 and 255, the DPH will abide by the requirements of the UW IRB, the consent form signed by the parent and DPH rules and regulations regarding disclosure of information.

XI. SUSPENSION OF THIS AGREEMENT BY DPI FOR DEFAULT

Notwithstanding the term of this agreement as specified in Article II, the DPI shall suspend this agreement in accordance with state and federal requirements or within forty-five (45) days if no state/federal requirements apply, in the event of the following:

A. The UWPHS fails to reimburse the DPI for work performed as required by Article VII.

XII. SUSPENSION OF THIS AGREEMENT BY DPI FOR GOOD CAUSE

The provisions of Article XI, Section A above, apply as a last resort. Suspension of this agreement will typically not occur in isolated instances of the DPH staff committing a violation of this agreement.

XIII. CURE DEFAULT TO REINSTATE AGREEMENT

Any suspension of this agreement for the reasons specified in Article XI shall last until the DPI is satisfied that the DPH is again in compliance with the terms. If a new agreement is required, all drafting and associated work will be the responsibility of the DPI agreement coordinator.

XIV. SUSPENSION OR TERMINATION OF THIS AGREEMENT BY DPH

APPENDIX 21 - (C)(3)(iii) DPI-DHS Lead Study MOA Upon forty-five (45) days written notice to the DPI, the DPH may suspend or terminate this Agreement without cause.

XV. <u>SURVIVAL</u>

The confidentiality and disclosure requirements in Articles IX of this agreement survive the termination, for whatever reason, of the agreement itself, subject to applicable state and federal laws.

XVII. AMENDMENT OF THIS AGREEMENT

All or part of this agreement may be amended at any time by written amendment signed by the Authorized Representative of the DPH and DPI. It is acknowledged that this agreement is subject to federal and state law, both of which are subject to change. If either applicable state or federal law changes, this agreement will be considered immediately modified in accordance with each such change, without notice or written amendment.

XVIII. IMPACT OF STATE OR FEDERAL LAW CHANGE

Each party agrees to give the other party written notice within thirty (30) days after becoming aware of any state or federal law change which may impact upon the performance of either party under this agreement.

SIGNATURE BLOCK

Approval of this agreement is given by the following:

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction:

Rodney Packard, IT Director Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

Date

DHS/DPH

Seth Foldy, MD, MPH State Health Officer and Administrator Division of Public Health Wisconsin Department of Health Services

Date

APPENDIX 21 - (C)(3)(iii) DPI-DHS Lead Study MOA ATTACHMENT A

AGREEMENT COORDINATORS AND SECURITY OFFICERS

DHS/DPH hereby designates Jeff Havlena to serve as the data steward for WCLLEO, as specified in Article III (A) of this agreement. DPI hereby designates Rod Packard to serve as the agreement coordinator and security officer, responsible for approving all requests for access to DPI student level data.
APPENDIX 21 - (C)(3)(iii) DPI-DHS Lead Study MOA

ATTACHMENT B

WCLLEO Required WSAS Data Items

See Excel File "DPI variables.xls"

APPENDIX 21 - (C)(3)(iii) DPI-DHS Lead Study MOA <u>ATTACHMENT C</u>

[DRAFT REQUEST FOR DPI TO REQUEST NAMES OF CHILDREN SUBJECT TO LEAD TESTING]

Margie Coons, Program Manager Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program Wisconsin Department of Health Services

Dear Ms. Coons:

This is a request, pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 146.82 (2) (a) 5, for the names of a sample of children you will select from your program's database who have been tested for lead exposure. The purpose of this request is to enable the Department of Public Instruction to provide the Department of Health Services, Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program, with data it needs for the study titled, Wisconsin Children's Lead Levels and Educational Outcomes. The data the Department of Public Instruction receives from the Department of Health Services in response to this request will not be released to anyone who is not involved in providing the information to you or with the study.

Sincerely,

Richard Grobschmidt Assistant State Superintendent

ChildhoodLeadDataSharing_DPI

Appendix (D)(1)(i) - A

Wisconsin - Race to the Top (D) Great Teachers and Leaders

The State's applicable statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents regarding Wisconsin alternative routes to certification for both teachers and principals.

Wisconsin Statute

115.28 (7) LICENSING OF TEACHERS. (a) License all teachers for the public schools of the state, make rules establishing standards of attainment and procedures for the examination and licensing of teachers within the limits prescribed in ss. 118.19 (2) and (3), 118.192 and 118.195, prescribe by rule standards and procedures for the approval of teacher preparatory programs leading to licensure, file in the state superintendent's office all papers relating to state teachers' licenses and register each such license.

Wisconsin Administrative Code PI 34

PI 34.17 Initial educator license. (6) LICENSE BASED ON EQUIVALENCY.

(c) An initial educator license may be issued to an applicant who has completed an alternative training program approved by the state superintendent that is provided by, but not limited to, a college or university, school, school district, CESA, consortia, technical college, private enterprise or agency. Each alternative training program shall be based on the standards under subchapter II and shall include assessment of candidate performance as measured against the standards, including any standardized examinations prescribed by the state superintendent for licensure.

(d) 1. The state superintendent shall insure that program providers under pars. (b) and (c) have adequate resources to support teaching by faculty and learning by students. The state superintendent shall insure that program providers under pars. (b) and (c) have sufficient budgetary resources to fulfill their mission and offer quality programs.

2. The program provider, in collaboration with the department, shall systematically evaluate and report to the public graduate performance in obtaining employment in Wisconsin schools or school districts as well as graduate performance in advancing from the initial to professional educator license and master educator license after the first 5 years of employment.

Wisconsin Educator Preparation Program Approval Handbook for the review of Wisconsin Alternative Route Programs that Prepare Educators for Wisconsin Schools

Available at: http://dpi.wi.gov/tepdl/vprogprovider.html

Appendix (D)(1)(i) – B

Wisconsin RTTT – Great Teachers Great Leaders

Appendix C:

Alternative Route Program Application Review

The PI 34 requirements for alternative route program approval are organized into six components. This tool, *Alternative Route Program Application Review*, is used during PHASE I when a program provider submits an application seeking approval to begin an alternative route to licensure program in Wisconsin. After reading the complete application, the review team uses this tool to record findings and to determine whether the alternative route program provider meets all the requirements for PHASE I program approval. The tool can also be utilized by the program provider to prepare the application materials.

Component I	Program Purpose
Component II	Financial and Education Resources
Component III	Instructional Design
Component IV	Student Admission and Advising
Component V	Student Assessment
Component VI	Program Evaluation



Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative PI 34 Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction Tony Evers, State Superintendent

COMPONENT I – PROGRAM PURPOSE

The alternative and research b	The alternative-route to licensure program will fulfill an identified need in Wisconsin, has a mission/vision and research based philosophy, and has identified specific goals and objectives.							
PI 34 Item	Application Requirement Met DPI Comment-Additional information required							
PI 34.17 (6) (c) Need	A description of the need for the program based on	TYes						
	research that supports the identified need anddata specific to Wisconsin.	🗌 No						
PI 34.17 (6) (c) Mission/Vision	A description of the program's mission/vision, including the	TYes						
	name of the program and the program provider(s).	🗌 No						
PI 34.17 (6) (c) Philosophy	A description of the program's philosophy based on research	Yes						
	that supports the philosophy.	🗌 No						
PI 34.17 (6) (c) Goals and	A description of the program goals and specific objectives for	TYes						
Objectives	each goal, including goals and objectives which address:	D No						
	• increasing the diversity of Wisconsin educators and/or							
	• eliminating shortages of licensed educators in specific							
	license categories or in specific geographic locations.							

The alternative	e –route to licensure program v	vill have adeq	uate educational and financial resources available
PI 34 Item	program. Application Requirement	Mot	DPI Comment-Additional information required
PI 34.17 (6) (d) Financial Resources	 A budget and supporting financial documentation which ensures sufficient budgetary resources to fulfill the program mission and offer quality programs, adequate resources to support teaching by faculty and learning by students, and financial stability through program completion and follow-up. 	Yes	Di i Comment-Additional information required
	 A description of the student fees and tuition costs that will be charged and financial aid and scholarships available to students. A description of the financial support or obligations due to collaborative or partnership efforts, if applicable. 	 ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ No 	
PI 34.17 (6) (d) Facility and Material Resources	 A description of the program's facilities and/or access to facilities and instructional resources which support teaching by faculty and learning by students. 	☐ Yes ☐ No	
PI 34.17 (6) (d) Human Resources	A plan for all personnel in the program which will clarify roles and responsibilities and ensure educational and financial support for the program. Include position descriptions. The name of the administrator identified for the program and	Yes No Yes No	
	The names of the faculty identified for the program and their supporting qualifications.	☐ Yes ☐ No	
	The names of clinical supervisors/ mentors identified for the program and their supporting qualifications.	Yes No	
PI 34.17 (6) (d) Marketing	A marketing plan which includes both recruitment goals and strategies.	Yes No	

COMPONENT II – FINANCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES

The alternative route program instructional design will ensure that individuals recommended for initial educator licensure will be proficient in the Wisconsin educator standards including the knowledge, skills and dispositions developed for each standard. **Application Requirement** Met **DPI Comment-Additional information required** PI 34 Item PI 34.02 A description of the 2 Yes PI 34.03 • instructional design of the PI 34.04 program which confirms the 🗌 No Instructional program has Design • adopted the Wisconsin educator standards in PI 34 subch. II. A description of the knowledge, 2 Yes skills, and dispositions that the program has developed for each 🗌 No educator standard. A description of 2 Yes • how the instruction will lead to proficiency in the standards 🗌 No and • how it will be delivered to program participants. A description of the common Yes courses and/or experiences that will be part of the instructional 🗌 No design. A description of how the 🗌 Yes program will determine the completion of a major or the 🗌 No equivalent of a major for content area licensure.

COMPONENT III – INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN

The alternative route program instructional design will ensure candidates recommended for licensure in teaching, pupil services, or any administration programs where prior licensure is not a prerequisite will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the statutory requirements and provisions identified in PI 34.15 (4) and s. 118.19.

Item	Application Requirement	Met	DPI Comment-Additional information required
PI 34.15 (4) Cooperative Marketing and Consumer Cooperatives 118.19 (6)	A description of how the program will address (a) Cooperative marketing and consumer cooperatives for licenses in economics, social studies or agriculture.	☐ Yes ☐ No	
PI 34.15 (4) (b) Environmental Education 118.19 (6)	A description of how the program will address (b) Environmental education including conservation of natural resources for licenses in agriculture, early childhood, middle childhood to early adolescence, science and social studies.	☐ Yes ☐ No	

4

The alternative route program instructional design will ensure candidates recommended for licensure in					
teaching, pupil	services, or any administration	n programs w	here prior licensure is not a prerequisite will		
PI 34.15 (4) an	d s. 118.19.	t the statutory	requirements and provisions identified in		
PI 34 Item	Application Requirement	Met	DPI Comment-Additional information required		
PI 34.15 (4) (c) Minority Group	A description of how the	□ Yes	i i		
Relations	(c) Minority group relations				
118.19 (8)	the following: 1. The history, culture and tribal sovereignty of American Indian tribas and hands in Wissensin				
	 The history, culture and contributions of women and various racial, cultural, language and economic groups in the 	☐ Yes ☐ No			
	United States				
	3. The philosophical and psychological bases of attitude				
	development and change.				
	4. The psychological and social implications of discrimination, especially racism and sexism in the American society.	☐ Yes			
	5. Evaluating and assessing the forces of discrimination,	Yes			
	especially racism and sexism on faculty, students, curriculum, instruction, and assessment in the school program.	🗌 No			
	6. Minority group relations through direct involvement with various racial cultural language	☐ Yes			
	and economic groups in the United States.	🗌 No			
PI 34.15 (4) (d) Conflict Resolution	(d) Conflict resolution for all licenses including all of the following:	TYes			
118.19 (9)	1. Resolving conflicts between pupils and school staff.	🗌 No			
	2. Assisting pupils in learning methods of resolving conflicts between pupils and between	TYes			
	pupils and school staff, including training in the use of peer mediation to resolve conflicts between pupils.	L No			
	3. Dealing with crisis, including violent, disruptive, potentially violent or potentially disruptive situations that may arise in school activities supervised by school staff as a result of conflicts between pupils or between pupils and other persons.	☐ Yes ☐ No			

The alternative route program instructional design will ensure candidates recommended for licensure in teaching, pupil services, or any administration programs where prior licensure is not a prerequisite will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the statutory requirements and provisions identified in PL 34 15 (4) and s. 118 19

1154.15 (4) all			
PI 34 Item	Application Requirement	Met	DPI Comment-Additional information required
PI 34.15 (4) (f) Reading and Language Arts 118.19 (12)	(f) Teaching reading and language arts using appropriate instructional methods including phonics for licenses to teach reading and language arts to pupils in grades PK to 6. In this paragraph "phonics" means a method of teaching beginners to read and pronounce words by learning the phonetic value of letters, letter groups and syllables.	☐ Yes ☐ No	
PI 34.15 (4) (g) Children with Disabilities	(g) Procedures used for assessing and providing education for children with disabilities, including roles and responsibilities of regular and special education providers.	☐ Yes ☐ No	
PI 34.15 (4) (h) Modifying curriculum	(h) Modifying the regular education curriculum when instructing pupils with disabilities.	☐ Yes ☐ No	

The alternative route program ensures candidates will complete clinical program requirements along with					
confirmation t	hat the statutory requirement f	for student tea	ching is met (applicable for any teacher		
education prog	gram)	Mat	DDI Comment Additional information required		
PI 34 Item PI 34.15 (5) (a) Prestudent Teaching	Application Kequirement A description of the pre student teaching or pre practicum experiences in the clinical program.	Yes	DPI Comment-Additional information required		
PI 34.15 (5) (b) PI 34.15 (4) (e)	A description of the student teaching clinical program.	☐ Yes			
Student Teaching 118.19 (3) (a) full semester assignment for	The student teaching clinical program ensures compliance with the statutory requirements identified in s. 118.19 (3) (a), Stats. for candidates seeking their first initial educator license to teach.	Yes			
following the daily schedule and semester calendar of the cooperating school	A description of the criteria for placements for student teaching.	☐ Yes ☐ No			
PI 34.15 (5) (c) Practicum pupil services administration	A description of the practicum experience for candidates seeking a pupil services or administrator license.	Yes No			
	A description of the criteria for placements for practicum experiences.	☐ Yes ☐ No			
PI 34.17 (6) (c) PI 34.15 (5) Clinical program supervision and evaluation	A description of the qualifications, including appropriate licensure, established for on-site supervisor/ cooperating teacher/ mentor.	☐ Yes ☐ No			
	A description of the supervision and evaluation responsibilities of	TYes			
	 the program supervisor, and the on-site supervisor/ cooperating teacher/ mentor . 	L] No			
	A description of the number of written evaluations from the program supervisor and the on- site supervisor/cooperating teacher/ mentor. Include examples of the developed evaluations.	☐ Yes ☐ No			
	The application includes a description of partnerships established with collaborating schools	☐ Yes ☐ No			

COMPONENT IV – STUDENT ADMISSION AND ADVISING

The alternative obtaining licen	The alternative route program will ensure admission requirements for success in the program and in obtaining licensure and program advising to support candidates throughout the program.						
PI 34 Item	Application Requirement	Met	DPI Comment-Additional information required				
PI 34.17 (6) (d) Admission	A description of the student admission process which addresses each of the following:Degree requirements	□ Yes □ No					
	 GPA or equivalent Prior experience Interview process Criminal background checks Other (e.g. letters of reference, community involvement, etc.). 						
	A description of policies the program has developed for exceptions or waivers to the admission process.	☐ Yes ☐ No					
	A description, if applicable, of the partnership agreement with an accredited IHE of granting a bachelors degree if students are not required to have a BS/BA degree for program admission.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ NA					
PI 34.17 (6) (d) Advising	A plan for student retention and career counseling.	☐ Yes ☐ No					
	A plan for dealing with students who are not successful.	☐ Yes ☐ No					
PI 34.17 (6) (d) Completion	A timeline for students to complete the proposed program.	Yes No					

COMPONENT V – STUDENT ASSESSMENT

The alternative and profession demonstrate pr	The alternative route program will ensure candidates are assessed on communication skills, human relations and professional dispositions, pedagogical knowledge, content knowledge, and clinical practice that will demonstrate proficiency in the Wisconsin educator standards (teacher, pupil services, and administrator).						
PI 34 Item	Application Requirement	Met	DPI Comment-Additional information required				
PI 34.17 (6) (c) Assessment System	A description of the assessment plan and how it will ensure proficiency in the Wisconsin educator standards.	☐ Yes ☐ No					
	 A description of the assessments of a student's communication skills* including: Passing the Praxis I reading, writing, and math tests Listening Speaking Media and Technology 	☐ Yes ☐ No					
	A description of the multiple and ongoing assessments in human relations and professional dispositions.	☐ Yes ☐ No					
	A description of the multiple and ongoing assessments in pedagogy.	☐ Yes ☐ No					
	 A description of the multiple and ongoing assessments in content knowledge including Passing the Praxis II content exam Performance tasks and levels of proficiency used to assess content knowledge. 	☐ Yes ☐ No					
	 A description of the multiple and ongoing assessments of the clinical practice including Pre student teaching Student teaching Practicum 	☐ Yes ☐ No					
	 A description of the required documentation within a student's portfolio including written evaluations from the clinical experiences and documentation that will demonstrate proficiency in the educator standards, pupil learning, and student self reflection and self evaluation 	☐ Yes ☐ No					

* PI 34.01 (9) "Communication skills" means proficiency in reading, writing, mathematics, speaking, listening, media and technology including computers and emerging technology along with the ability to use those skills for instruction.

The alternative studies as pres	The alternative route program will systematically evaluate their program, conduct graduate follow-up studies as prescribed in PI 34.17 (6) (d) 2, and complete all state and federal reporting requirements.						
PI 34 Item	Application Requirement	Met	DPI Comment-Additional information required				
PI 34.17 (6) (d) Program Evaluation	A plan for assessing how the program has reached its goals and objectives.	☐ Yes ☐ No					
PI 34.17 (6) (d) 2 Graduate Follow-up Studies	A description of how the program will systematically conduct graduate follow-up studies with candidates and employers and report to the public graduate performance in obtaining employment in Wisconsin schools and districts A plan for tracking graduates in order to report to the public their progress through the stages of licensure including advancing from initial to professional educator license and master	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ No					
	educator license after the first 5 years of employment.						
PI 34.17 (6) (d) 2 Federal reporting	A plan for collaborating with the department in the evaluation and reporting of graduate performance including completer data and Title II reporting requirements.	☐ Yes ☐ No					
PI 34.17 (6) (d) Program Improvement	A plan for using the information evaluated and reported to affect positive change in the program.	☐ Yes ☐ No					

COMPONENT VI – PROGRAM EVALUATION

Appendix (D)(1)(ii)

Wisconsin - Race to the Top (D) Great Teachers and Leaders

A list of the alternative certification programs operating in the State under the State's alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice), and for each:

• The elements of the program:

Teacher Licensure

Currently, nine alternative route programs prepare candidates for **teaching licenses**. These programs are operated by non-profit agencies, public and private colleges/universities, and a for-profit organization. Additionally, the state is divided geographically into 12 Cooperative Education Service Agency (CESA) regions. Each CESA serves as a link between the school districts within the CESA and the state. Three CESA agencies have state approved alternative route certification programs. The nine programs currently operating include:

Proficiency Based Licensure (PBL) – CESA 1

- **On-the-job clinical model**: Candidates are hired as teachers of record then enroll in the program. Upon enrollment candidates participate in a number of performance assessments. A baseline profile which communicates proficiency levels is developed and reviewed with the candidate. Working closely with their coach, a learning plan is designed to address the needs determined by the baseline profile. Proficiencies are developed through professional learning communities, on-line support, and coach support. An ongoing performance-based assessment is used.
- *Licenses offered*: Special Education, Bilingual/bicultural, Bilingual/Special Education; Early Adolescence-Adolescence Math and Science; and Early Childhood-Adolescence Business Education, English as a Second Language, World Language, Music, and Technology Education.

Residency in Teacher Education (RITE) – CESA 6

- **On-the-job clinical model**: Qualified candidates must secure a teaching position in a school district unsuccessful in hiring a qualified applicant. After meeting qualifying criteria, candidates enroll in RITE to work towards full licensure. A summer academy begins the experience followed by weekend and evening accelerated instruction. Supervisors from RITE and mentors from each candidate's school district are assigned to work with candidates throughout the program.
- *Licenses offered*: Special Education, Bilingual/bicultural and regional shortage areas.

Teacher Development Center (TDC) – CESA 7

• **On-the-job clinical model**: Candidates who are hired by a school district in a high need area with an emergency license or permit are eligible to enroll and seek licensure in critical shortage areas. A one-two year accelerated, compacted, and performance-based intensive teacher preparation program. Teachers already licensed, are eligible to enroll to add on licensure in bilingual, early childhood, and special education licensure areas.

• *Licenses*: Shortage areas and Bilingual/bicultural, Early Childhood, and Special Education.

College of Menominee Nation

- *Student teaching clinical model*: This program was approved in 2008 to build on the community college associate degree in early childhood education. Candidates prepare for the completion of a bachelors degree and certification simultaneously. The preparation program focuses on the preparation of teachers for the Menominee Indian reservation school system. No candidates have completed the program yet.
- *Licenses*: Early Childhood, Middle Childhood-Early Adolescence (grades 1-8)

Accelerated Teacher Certification - Concordia University Wisconsin

- *Student teaching clinical model*: The program provides Early Adolescence-Adolescence (ages 10-21) and Early Childhood Adolescence (birth to age 21) teacher preparation in many content areas of licensure. A candidate's major, transcripts, and experience are reviewed to determine program eligibility. Courses are offered in an accelerated format at three satellite campuses in Madison, Mequon, and Appleton. The program takes 16 months to complete, which includes a full semester of student teaching. The program is contemplating transitioning to a post-baccalaureate preparation program in the future.
- *Licenses*: Critical shortage areas and regional shortage areas.

Milwaukee Teacher Education Center (mTec) – 501c non-profit

- **On-the-job clinical model**: The mTec program has a partnership agreement to prepare and provide teachers for high-need areas identified by the Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS). Candidates must commit to a two-year employment agreement with MPS. The program will prepare teachers on demand to fill these shortage areas. The program also partners with other public school districts. Instruction is accelerated and mentor/coaches provide instructional support and induction support for candidates in program.
- *Licenses*: Critical shortage areas and Special Education

Norda, Inc. Project Teaching and Norda, Inc. 10SPED – for profit organization

- *Student teaching clinical model*: Career changers seeking to become teachers enroll in the program. Candidates prepare in a cohort model of instructional delivery and demonstrate competence in the teaching standards through a portfolio of evidence. An 18 week student teaching placement completes the process. Project Teaching prepares for shortage area licenses while 10SPED prepares for special education licensure.
- *Licenses*: Critical shortage areas and Special Education

Urban Education Fellows – Alverno College and Mount Mary College

• **On-the-job clinical model**: Candidates are employed in urban private schools in the Milwaukee area teaching in grades 1 through 8. Candidates complete a summer academy followed by cohort model of instruction through a two year period. Instruction is provided by private college partners. Mentor/coaches from the program provide continuous support and evaluate competence. A performance-based portfolio of evidence and oral defense is required to demonstrate competence in the teaching standards. Preparation included for the national board process.

• *Licenses*: Middle Childhood-Early Adolescence (grades 1-8); anticipated expansion to Early Adolescence-Adolescence Math and Science

Alternative Careers in Teaching (ACT!) – University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh and University of Wisconsin-Fox Valley, anticipated expansion to include additional UW system two-year campuses

- *Student teaching clinical model*: Candidates enroll in ACT! after completing an intensive interview and application process to elicit academic knowledge and prior learning. Prior work experience is considered in developing a plan of studies for each candidate. The program draws on instruction provided through UW-Oshkosh, a four-year bachelor degree granting institution and UW-Fox Valley, a two-year associate degree granting institution. ACT! is expanding to broaden their consortium with additional two-year UW system campuses.
- *Licenses*: Early Adolescence-Adolescence Math and Science

Three alternative routes which began preparing candidates for teacher licensure in 2004 have stopped enrolling candidates or moved their programs into post-baccalaureate licensure programs; Marquette University, University of Wisconsin Green Bay, and University of Wisconsin Platteville. Data on these programs are provided in Table 1 that follows, as the last candidates recently completed or are currently completing the program.

Administrative Licensure

Currently, administrative licensure is offered through two alternative route programs. Candidates must complete a master's degree or the equivalent for most all administrator licenses. Candidates seeking a superintendent license, must complete a specialist degree or the equivalent for licensure.

New Leaders for New Schools

- **On-the-job clinical model**: Candidates are recruited and trained as urban principals for Milwaukee Public Schools. Each candidate is employed as a principal while enrolled. Instruction, with an emphasis on urban leadership, begins with a summer academy provided through the national New Leaders project. A mentoring structure is in place to support candidates during the residency.
- *Licenses*: Principal

Norda, Inc. WiscAd

- **Practicum model or On-the-job model**: Candidates seeking to become school administrators, who already hold or are working towards a master's degree, enroll in the program. Some candidates are currently employed as administrators in high-need districts on emergency licensure. Other candidates complete a practicum experience while continuing to teach. Accelerated instruction and a competency based practicum experience offer a convenience to candidates.
- *Licenses*: Principal, Director of Instruction, Director of Pupil Services and Special Education, Superintendent, and School Business Manager

One program, Partners Advancing Values in Education (PAVE) is no longer enrolling candidates in their program. However, data on the program are provided in Table 2 that follows, as the last candidates are completing their program.

• The number of teachers and principals that successfully completed each of these alternative certification programs in the previous academic year.

• The total number of teachers and principals certified statewide in the previous year.

Table 1							
Alternative Route	People	Licenses	Licenses	Licenses	Licenses	Licenses	Licenses
Program Provider	certified	Issued	Issued	Issued	Issued	Issued	Issued
	to date	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year
		2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Teaching Licenses							
CESA 1-PBL							
	145	49	22	20	31	23	47
CESA 6-RITE							
	81	28	15	19	10	15	15
CESA 7-TDC							
	30			8	11	12	2
Concordia University-							
Wisconsin	131				40	66	28
MTEC							
	344	29	64	74	83	82	47
Norda, Inc.							
Project Teaching	425	E /	E 1	104	07	02	02
10SPED	423	54	51	104	57	92	33
Follows	24		10	1	10	1	
	24		10	1	15	T	
ACT	15				Э	10	10
Marguatta University	15				5	10	10
Marquette University	25		2	1.4	0	1	
Liniversity of	25		2	14	9	T	
Wissensin Creen Dev	2			1	2		2
wisconsin Green Bay	3			L	2		2
	11		C	2	2	2	
	11	4.60	6	2	2	2	244
Totals	1,234*	160	170	243	301	312	244

*Candidates may have completed more than one license during their program preparation. The *"People certified to date"* column indicates an unduplicated count of individual people. The *"Licenses issued"* columns indicate the total amount of licenses issued to candidates during the given year.

APPENDIX 24 - (D)(1)(ii) List of Wisconsin Alternative Certification Programs

Table 2

I ubic I							
Alternative Route	People	Licenses	Licenses	Licenses	Licenses	Licenses	Licenses
Program Provider	certified	Issued	Issued	Issued	Issued	Issued	Issued
	to date	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year
		2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Administrative License	S						
Norda, Inc.							
WiscAd	53			4	26	37	11
New Leaders for New							
Schools	7					4	3
PAVE							
	4			1	1		2
Totals	64*			5	20	27	11

*Candidates may have completed more than one license during their program preparation. The *"People certified to date"* column indicates an unduplicated count of individual people. The *"Licenses issued"* columns indicate the total amount of licenses issued to candidates during the given year.

Appendix (D)(2)(ii)

Race to the Top Performance Measures Survey

- 1. Please note that all survey responses are confidential.
 - LEA Name: LEA Number: Email Address: Phone Number:

2. Student Growth Models

- Y N a) Other than the WKCE, our district tracks student progress across time (for example: MAPS, ThinkLink, etc.)
- Y N b) Our district provides **teachers** with student growth data for their students, classes, and schools
- Y N c) Our district provides **principals** with student growth data for their students, classes, and schools

TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEM

3. Does your district use any of these methods/models/measures <u>within your teacher</u> <u>evaluation system</u>?

- Y N a) State standardized test results WKCE, WIDA-ACCESS
- Y N b) Student growth models
- Y N c) Classroom observations
- Y N d) Portfolios containing teacher artifacts
- Y N e) Analysis of classroom artifacts
- Y N f) Teacher self reports of practices
- Y N g) High school graduation rates; attendance rates
- Y N h) College enrollment rates
- Y N i) Evidence of leadership roles (mentoring, leading professional learning communities) that increase the effectiveness of other teachers in the school or LEA
- Y N j) National Board Professional Teaching Standards certification
- Y N k) Wisconsin Master Educator Assessment Process licensure
- Y N l) A purchased product such as: *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching* by Charlotte Danielson; CLASS; Teacher Advancement Program (TAP), etc.

4. We use our current <u>teacher evaluation</u> system results to:

- Y N a) Develop teachers provide relevant coaching, induction support, and/or professional development based on teachers needs
- Y = N = b) Compensate teachers offer incentives, additional compensation, etc.
- Y N c) Promote teachers be given additional responsibilities or leadership roles
- Y = N = d) Retain effective teachers offer incentives to stay
- Y N e) Grant tenure (non probationary status)
- Y N f) Remove ineffective probationary and/or non probationary teachers after they have had ample opportunities to improve

PRINCIPAL EVALUATION SYSTEM

5. Does your district use any of these methods/models/measures <u>within your principal</u> evaluation system?

- Y N a) State standardized test results WKCE, WIDA-ACCESS
- Y N b) Student growth models
- Y N c) Building site visits
- Y N d) Portfolios containing artifacts
- Y N e) Principal self reports of practices
- Y N f) High school graduation rates; attendance rates
- Y N g) College enrollment rates
- Y N h) Evidence of supportive teaching and learning conditions
- Y N i) Instructional leadership
- Y N j) Family and community engagement
- Y N k) Wisconsin Master Educator Assessment Process Licensure
- Y N l) A purchased principal evaluation product such as: *Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education (VAL-ED)*

6. We use our current principal evaluation system results to:

- Y N a) Develop principals provide relevant coaching, induction support, and/or professional development based on needs
- Y N b) Compensate principals offer incentives, additional compensation, etc.
- Y N c) Promote principals be given additional responsibilities or leadership roles
- Y N d) Retain effective principals offer incentives to stay
- Y N e) Grant tenure (non probationary status)-
- Y N f) Remove ineffective principals

Appendix (D)(3)(i)

Wisconsin - Race to the Top (D) Great Teachers and Leaders

Wisconsin Teacher Quality Data 2007-08

School Type	# core academic classes	# core academic classes taught by HQ	% of core academic classes taught by HQ	# core academic classes taught by NOT HQ	% of core academic taught by NOT HQ
ALL SCHOOLS	50,952	50,283	98.7	669	1.3
Elem. High poverty	7,062	6,863	97.2	199	2.8
Elem. Low poverty	6,679	6,650	99.6	29	0.4
All Elementary	27,082	26,796	98.9	286	1.1
Secondary High					
Poverty	4,327	4,135	95.6	192	4.4
Secondary Low					
Poverty	7,109	7,067	99.4	42	0.6
All Secondary	23,870	23,487	98.4	383	1.6

1. Need for Project: Overview

Wisconsin has taken full advantage of federal advocacy and fiscal support for Longitudinal Data Systems (LDS) over the past four years. The state is poised to take dramatic positive steps towards a more comprehensive, informative, and efficient LDS.

Advancing and Enriching Education in Wisconsin: Leveraging Partnerships to Accelerate Progress toward A *Meaningful Longitudinal Data System* is a proposal that will enable our LDS to better meet the objectives of State Superintendent Tony Evers's goal that Wisconsin provide a quality education for every student, with every child a graduate prepared for further education and the workforce. We are committed to closing the achievement gap, preparing students to be innovative and productive members of the 21st century workforce, and successful participants in higher education. Specifically, we aim to:

- Accelerate postsecondary alignment through the distribution of sub grants to our partner institutions;
- Develop important new online licensure tools to gather meaningful information about educators, the institutions they attend, and workforce trends in education; and
- Forge new paths within the state by completing a feasibility analysis of including early childhood education program information in our LDS.

Our progress to date has been impressive. The foundation of our longitudinal data warehouse is fully functional, and we are piloting a new reporting and analysis tool, which will be widely available in January of 2010. Additionally, we are working to create consensus around common data elements with our postsecondary partners that will enable new research opportunities and program evaluations using longitudinal data. Wisconsin is confident the agenda items presented in this grant will propel our state further towards an LDS that includes easily accessed, high quality data used to inform instruction and improve education in general.

President Obama's recent visit to Wisconsin to discuss education was a testament to the hard work in our state, not only to pull out all stops to produce genuine change in how we educate our students, but also to develop a concrete plan to improve the quality and accessibility of the data we collect to inform that change. As President Obama said, states that are "committed to real change in the way they educate their children," and are "willing to hold themselves accountable…we'll offer you a big grant to help you make that plan a reality." The President went on to say, "In states like…Wisconsin, you're seeing steps taken…so we can have a clear look at how well our children are learning and what can be done to help them learn better."¹

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI) is dedicated to leveraging current momentum—as evidenced by President Obama's recent visit as well as state legislative action to adjust state laws in accordance with Race to the Top requirements—to accelerate progress towards an LDS that will help us better understand the characteristics both of high quality teachers and students prepared to succeed in higher education. Such a data system must include

¹ Obama, Barack. Speech at Wright Middle School. Madison, Wisconsin, November 4, 2009.

information about our educators and the institutions in which they were trained, must link students with their teachers, and it must provide information about graduates of our public high schools that continue in higher education.

President Obama's visit to Wisconsin coincided with a period of dramatic legislative action to align our state laws with the priorities of Race to the Top and place us in a position to greatly improve the service we provide the students and families of our state. The legislature recently passed laws that will greatly change:

- How data are exchanged among DPI and institutions of higher education;
- What information can be collected about educators, and in what ways that information can be used; and
- The ability for DPI to create authentic and lasting change in school districts.

Specifically, the legislation—called by Governor Doyle a "critical step [to] move Wisconsin forward"—repeals a ban on allowing student test results to be used as part of teacher evaluation, authorizes DPI and institutions of higher education in the state to study each other's education programs, and requires the establishment of an LDS to collect and manage our student data. (Please see Appendix A for copies of the Acts referenced above.)

The result of four years of diligent work by DPI is apparent both in our technological capacities to maintain a quality, secure LDS as well as our broad stakeholder support for more comprehensive data exchange. Stakeholders in Wisconsin understand the importance of expanding our LDS to include information about our public school educators—including data from teacher preparation programs—and about our students' transitions to higher education. Additionally, state agency partners, such as the Wisconsin Department of Children and Families, are fully supportive of our efforts to expand our LDS and look forward to assisting with an exploration of early childhood education data possibilities.

This Grant Supplements Current Momentum

DPI currently has the infrastructure, support, and momentum to continue work towards goals aligned with our previous and current SLDS grants:

- The release and continued support of our first secure access reporting and analysis tool;
- The development of a comprehensive Data Dictionary to supplement our LDS and data reporting efforts;
- The creation of a course completion collection to be added into our longitudinal data warehouse;
- The integration of our Vocational Education Enrollment Reporting System (VEERS) data into the LDS;
- The harnessing of the information in our longitudinal collection, including the data from VEERS and our course completion collection, to design innovative and meaningful public and private reports.

However, progress <u>beyond current efforts</u> to add internal datasets into the LDS and develop interactive research and analysis tools to evaluate educational programs and interventions is not possible without additional fiscal support. In particular, valuable postsecondary connections will remain only minimally operative and time consuming if data standards and elements are not

aligned among DPI and postsecondary institutions. Additionally, though efforts to reorganize and revitalize our educator licensure system are widely supported and seen as an appropriate investment, a challenging fiscal reality in the state may leave the project stalled for years to come.

The agenda items we propose in this application represent a holistic approach to improving our data system. First, recognizing the pressing need to expand our LDS to include data beyond high school, we propose to include information about students in higher education. Second, in an effort to greatly improve the data we collect about educators—teachers and administrators—in our state, we propose to develop an integrated, online licensure system that will serve educators, districts, institutions of higher education, and a multitude of partner agencies in the state. Finally, to better understand the quality and impact of early childhood education programs, we intend to conduct an assessment and feasibility study of early childhood education data to include in our LDS.

The three agendas below supplement our current LDS work and compliment current efforts in the state. They also align with the requirements as stated in the Request for Applications (RFA)—that Wisconsin work to develop a system that includes postsecondary data, information about educators, and early childhood education data, all while leveraging partnerships to accelerate progress towards a meaningful and useful LDS.

1.1 <u>Advancing Postsecondary Data Infrastructure:</u> Leverage momentum to accelerate data sharing and interoperability among state education agencies

"And here is what we know: Over the course of a lifetime, those with a college degree -and I want the young people here especially to listen to this -- over the course of a lifetime, those with a college degree earn over 60 percent more than those with only a high school diploma -- 60 percent more. Most of the fastest growing jobs require a bachelor's degree or more. This is what we were talking about earlier in the classroom. Four out of every 10 new jobs will require at least some advanced education or training within the next decade. So put simply, the right education is a prerequisite for success. There was a time when if you just got a high school education and you were willing to work hard, you could get a job in a trade or in the factory that paid a middle-class wage. And those days are declining. The currency of today's economy is knowledge."

> -- President Barack Obama, Speech to Wright Middle School Madison, WI, Nov. 4, 2009

Current Capacities

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction began its first major effort to create an integrated, student level data system in 2004. At that time, Wisconsin already had a public reporting web portal, the Wisconsin Information Network for Successful Schools (WINSS). Thus, early initiatives focused on streamlining data collection and integrating existing data systems into our LDS.

DPI's first step in developing our LDS was to assign a unique student number to every public school student in the state. This was accomplished using the Wisconsin Student Locator System (WSLS)—a web application that 1) assigns the unique Wisconsin Student Number (WSN) to each student entering a Wisconsin Public School, 2) ensures that WSNs follow students from school to school within the state, 3) updates our database with any changes in student status, and 4) automatically corrects errors in information such as birthdays or spellings. This application enabled DPI to launch the Individual Student Enrollment System (ISES), our first statewide student-level collection, in 2005. More specifically, ISES is a web-based system that includes state defined data standards, which enabled Wisconsin to begin collecting longitudinal studentlevel data. In 2006, Wisconsin received its first SLDS grant and proceeded to build a studentlevel data warehouse using data from WSLS, ISES, and other external sources, such as ACT results. When combined, these operational and decision support systems enabled Wisconsin to begin eliminating data silos, greatly enhancing the quality and accuracy of our public and federal reporting, as well as our analytic program evaluation. Additionally, the LDS system reduced DPI's internal cost of meeting federally mandated reporting, while greatly improving the accuracy of data publicly available through WINSS.

Throughout this process, DPI has collaborated with postsecondary institutions, research organizations, state agencies and public officials to conduct timely and relevant research. In particular, key policy questions have focused on the PK-20 pipeline, examining student preparedness for higher education and the workforce, college access and affordability, and teacher preparation programs. As a result, DPI has developed three postsecondary partnerships: the Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCS), the University of Wisconsin System (UW System), and the Wisconsin Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (WAICU). Together these organizations form the backbone of the state's PK-16 education efforts.

The challenges Wisconsin faces in sharing data across the PK-16 spectrum are not unique. While the state has the capacity to share data among education and other agencies, varying data standards and elements, as well as the absence of a common PK-16 student identifier, requires the use of matching software and workaround strategies to link student data across agencies. Unfortunately, while the acquisition of advanced matching software has generated an impressive match rate for individual projects, it is a time consuming process that must be conducted each time a data request is made. Consequently, Wisconsin has the capacity to exchange PK-16 data, but seeks to establish an interoperable data system that can seamlessly and reliably exchange data among partners.

However, the older and often incompatible data systems maintained by different agencies present implementation challenges that require the same kind of data alignment and systems upgrades DPI has undergone with local education agencies (LEAs) in order to enhance interoperability and data exchange. Notably, the numerous data systems within our postsecondary education systems and among the various college and university campuses were developed thirty to forty years ago. The various upgrades, patches, and redevelopments have left a patchwork information technology (IT) infrastructure across the state, and it is not surprising that the cutting edge technology developed almost four decades ago has created legacy challenges for statewide interoperability. Since these systems were constructed independently, they will require substantial programming and infrastructure upgrades to align standards and create efficient and reliable interoperability.

Finally, while postsecondary campuses and LEAs maintain full student records, the postsecondary systems and DPI only collect certain student data elements, which are not consistent among postsecondary education systems and DPI. Consequently, DPI and our partners are currently working to establish a common set of core data elements and formats that can be aligned across systems to ensure the accuracy of student records matching and exchange. These elements may include, among others, a statewide student identifier, name, and birth date.

Each partner in our PK-16 data system faces different challenges in achieving interoperability. In particular, each partner maintains different data elements and verifies data at different points in time. This diversity of practice and capacity guarantees a complicated, slow exchange of data with limited usefulness, unless system upgrades and data alignments are done.

As part of our current SLDS grant, DPI has convened a stakeholder group to gather information and build consensus around integrating postsecondary agencies and data into the LDS. Along with our primary postsecondary partners, we have established the following challenges in building an interoperable link that bridges the data collection among DPI and our postsecondary partners:

Department of Public Instruction (DPI): DPI has a K-12 unique student identifier (the Wisconsin Student Number) and currently uses matching software to link data collected from postsecondary institutions and state agencies. This process is staff intensive, time consuming, and does not support ongoing, seamless data exchange.

In order for DPI's K-12 statewide student identifier to be integrated with our postsecondary partners, certain data elements will have to be standardized. Additionally, DPI is prohibited from collecting social security numbers, a sensitive data element used for matching records among some state agencies.

DPI has a variety of student, teacher, and school finance data collections that take place throughout the year. However, the student data from a given school year is not fully audited until December of the following school year. This may generate some lag or additional data errors within the PK-16 system.

<u>University of Wisconsin System (UW System)</u>: UW System has had a student-level database for over thirty years, and can track students among UW campuses. While UW System has a powerful data system and the capability to exchange data, its data elements and standards do not currently align with other data systems.

Currently, campuses submit student records to UW System on a semester basis. In general, records do not include first and last name, instead utilizing a campus student identifier along with assorted other data elements for internal tracking. Names are included only for financial aid recipients in order to meet federal reporting requirements. However, the absence of student names from many records will present a record matching challenge. Additionally, the UW System data standard for date of birth contains month and year only, which will likely have to be aligned or bridged to facilitate seamless data exchange among partners.

Finally, UW System is already engaged in a massive IT project to redevelop its personnel management system. Consequently, allocating staff and financial resources to implement PK-16 alignment upgrades will be challenging without additional funding.

Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCS): WTCS may have the most extensive data collection of any education system. However, while it amasses a wealth of information from all of its more than fifty institutions, the data system architecture is very old, not easily queried, and maintained by a solo programmer. Due to system architecture and limited staff resources, WTCS has a limited ability to add new data elements, or manipulate current elements, at present.

WTCS colleges submit data throughout the academic year. These student demographic records include student name, date of birth, sex, ethnicity, and district student ID, when available. The data system also collects course information by student. This collection includes course enrollment, completion and grade; and grant activity data which includes a record for every student who was served by a state or federal grant administered by WTCS.

While its existing data sets are sufficient to establish a common set of data elements, the primary challenge for WTCS in implementing the PK-16 upgrades will be the limited staff and technological capacity to incorporate the statewide unique student identifier and align data standards.

<u>Wisconsin Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (WAICU)</u>: WAICU is currently piloting a centralized data system to collect information from three of its members. Following the pilot phase, the scope and scale could be expanded to incorporate data from additional WAICU members.

In the WAICU system, students will be tracked by an individual identifier combined with the campus's Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) unit identifier (UnitID). The data to be collected are largely de-identified. For example, a record may contain the student identifier, date of birth, or age, but not the student's name.

The challenges WAICU faces in participating in an interoperable PK-16 system are (1) staff resources, and (2) incorporating the common data elements and data standards necessary for seamless data exchange.

In November, Governor Jim Doyle signed 2009 Wisconsin Act 59 into law. This Act authorized DPI, UW System, WTCS, and WAICU to study each other's education programs, required a written agreement concerning such studies and data sharing, and required the establishment of a PK-16 LDS of student data.

Staff from each of the four partner education systems immediately began developing an overarching PK-16 compact to implement the system. Additionally, staff members are negotiating a series of subsequent memoranda of understanding to delineate and define data governance, security requirements, research protocols, and any relevant costs. We expect the compact will be signed by the end of the year, and that subsequent agreements will be reached by the end of the first quarter of 2010.

Additionally, DPI's ongoing efforts to bring together a wide array of postsecondary and state agency partners around creating a more robust PK-20 longitudinal data system—one that includes information about students before and after their time in the K-12 system—have been well received. Our current SLDS grant has funded development and consensus building work around integrating postsecondary student data into our LDS, both through Wisconsin's postsecondary education systems as well as through the National Student Clearinghouse.

Capacities to be Developed

The more robust system envisioned by Wisconsin's PK-16 stakeholders would enable a seamless exchange of data among institutions, authorized under state law and governed by an interagency data compact. It would include:

- 1. A set of common, aligned data elements, including:
 - a common student identifier,
 - other agreed upon common data elements, and
 - aligned data standards
- 2. An interoperable data exchange for research and reporting, which may include:
 - a system for secure file exchange,
 - protocols for authentication, user authorization. and FERPA compliance, and
 - capacity for ad hoc research requests and reporting capabilities
- 3. Sub grants for implementation of systems upgrades and data alignments necessary for interoperability across the PK-16 data exchange to our postsecondary partners:
 - the University of Wisconsin System (UW System)
 - the Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCS), and
 - the Wisconsin Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (WAICU)
- 1. Establish a set of common, aligned data elements. Efficient, seamless data exchange will require the three postsecondary partners and DPI to adopt and implement a common statewide student identifier, a set of common data elements, and a set of aligned data standards. The proposed common student identifier will be utilized in addition to other existing identifiers, and will be made available to other state agencies in order to facilitate broader data exchange when appropriate under federal and state law.

As noted previously, the three postsecondary partners and DPI currently collect different data elements used to identify and match student unit record information. Since Wisconsin proposes to establish a data exchange, rather than a single data warehouse, a set of common elements will have to be established in order to validate record matches among systems as well as maintain data integrity and accuracy. Additionally, each education system currently maintains different data standards, which will have to be aligned or bridged for the key common data elements established by the partners.

2. Create an interoperable data exchange for research and reporting. Once common data elements and standards have been established, a system for data requests, approval, and secure file exchange will be established in accordance with the governance policies and

3. Provide sub grants to our three postsecondary partners to upgrade their data infrastructure. While our PK-16 data system efforts are underway, consensus building and planning will result in little institutional change without proper resources to enable our postsecondary partners to follow through on measures to create seamless interoperability and data exchange. In order to accelerate progress towards interoperability, DPI proposes to award sub grants to UW System, WTCS, and WAICU (postsecondary partners) for the development of structural capacity that will allow for interagency data sharing. DPI's current SLDS grant will support the systems upgrades or implementation work necessary to achieve seamless interoperability within our agency and the LDS.

Using Data to Support Improvement Efforts

Currently, Wisconsin uses data to support improvement, both in LEAs and statewide, through educational research, policy analysis, and program evaluation.

<u>LEAs and student improvement</u>: The capacity and quality of LEA data systems varies greatly across the state. While our districts meet federal and state reporting requirements, many smaller districts lack the technical infrastructure or staff expertise for sophisticated data analysis and collection.

To that end, DPI created the Wisconsin Information Network for Successful Schools (WINSS). This online reporting site provides publicly reported data on areas such as student achievement, school demographics, and attendance. However, this is an aggregate-level analysis tool, and therefore lacks the capacity for teachers and administrators to retrieve student-level performance data and analysis. Consequently, DPI plans to migrate all WINSS data into the LDS. Additionally, DPI has developed the Multi-Dimensional Analytic Tool (MDAT), which enables authorized users to examine individual student performance over time. Currently, data primarily travels from LEAs to DPI for reporting and analysis, though LEAs have some ability to download DPI data into their systems. Ultimately, DPI wants to develop more substantial two-way data sharing with LEAs; at present, local capacity varies too greatly for this to be effective.

<u>Statewide education improvement</u>: Wisconsin engages in a wide array of research partnerships on student improvement and educational strategies. For example, DPI has recently worked with the Value-Added Research Center at UW-Madison to study growth models, has facilitated a charter school study with La Follette School of Public Policy Professor John Witte, conducted research on the SAGE small class size program in K-3, and annually produces supply and demand reports on teacher employment.

Additionally, Wisconsin has a rich array of two-year community and technical colleges and is a national leader in awarding associates degrees. Furthermore, secondary, career, and technical

education programs are transforming courses to implement programs of study in high skill, high wage, and high demand career areas as well as career and technical education. To improve the transition to technical training and the workforce, DPI and Wisconsin school districts have worked with postsecondary partners on curricular alignment, credit transfer, and data exchange across the PK-16 system. The data collected through DPI's student level Vocational Education Enrollment Reporting System (VEERS), which will be integrated into the LDS under our current grant, is a rich complement to data on post-secondary readiness and course data—greatly informing student success in higher education and the workforce.

However, non-aligned data systems and complicated research agreements have often slowed down the study and improvement processes. As Wisconsin moves toward a more data-informed approach to education policy and school improvement, the state's recently enacted PK-16 data system legislation and proposed interoperability will greatly facilitate and expedite our research and analysis process.

1.2 <u>Great Teachers & Leaders</u>: Transition to a web-based, integrated teacher licensing system, greatly improving data quality and accessibility

DPI recognizes the need for readily available and reliable information about the educators in our state—where they received their degree and subsequent training, what type and category of license(s) they have, and for how long they have been teaching and where. We intend to create an online teacher licensure program which will result in greater data integrity, a more cohesive and reliable structure within current data collections, easier-to-access data, and valuable connections between DPI, institutions of higher education, our Cooperative Educational Service Agencies (CESAs, which serve as a service unit between the school district and the State Superintendent), and the 425 school districts in Wisconsin.

A comprehensive on-line licensure system will

- ✓ link agencies in the state, including LEAs, institutions of higher education, other state departments, and CESAs;
- ✓ expedite initial license application and renewal processes; and,
- ✓ store for more accurate and timely reporting—in our longitudinal data system—important data about educators, educator preparation programs, and licensure trends in the state.

Current Capacities

Wisconsin is proud of its educators, and strives to make certain that those educators are welltrained and receive appropriate support in the classroom. Driven by the beliefs that standards should guide what students know, and that greater accountability in a results-driven system improves student learning, the state has also taken steps to ensure that educators participate in career-long professional development. To address the needs to support educators—especially those new to the field—while requiring greater accountability, the State Superintendent appointed an Education Task Force in 1994. This task force was given a mission to study, develop, and propose a new system for preparing and licensing educators.

The result of the task force's work and recommendations was Wisconsin Administrative Code PI-34, or the Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative. The Initiative, which was adopted in 2000, is built on the foundation of Wisconsin's Educator Standards. Simply put, the Quality Educator

Initiative put into place career-long professional development that includes a Professional Development Plan requirement for licensed initial educators. This Plan involves convening a team of trained educators to review, approve, provide support for, and verify completion of a new educator's professional development goals.

Charged with managing the requirements of PI-34, DPI's Teacher Education, Professional Development, and Licensing (TEPDL) Office is notably located in the Department's Division for Academic Excellence. The mission of this Office is:

- to serve and support the Wisconsin education community in meeting Wisconsin statutory and code requirements; and
- to ensure high quality educators and strong leadership in every school.

The Office does this by:

- aligning teacher education, professional development programs, and program approval and licensing to all components of Wisconsin's Quality Educator Initiative (PI-34);
- working to ensure that all Wisconsin educators are highly qualified licensed staff who have demonstrated the knowledge, skills, dispositions, and performances that substantiate competence in Wisconsin's standards;
- coordinating and providing leadership in the program approval process for all institutions of higher education in the state offering programs that prepare educators; and
- ensuring continued professional growth for educators using the licensing process for Initial, Professional, and Master Educators.

TEPDL serves an important function for the educators—teachers and administrators—of the state, as well as for LEAs, CESAs, and institutions of higher education.

As the primary regulator of PK-12 licensing in Wisconsin, TEPDL receives applications for over 35,000 license issuances or renewals each year, and currently manages licenses for over 225,000 educators. However, the state of TEPDL's licensure system is, by many standards, antiquated. DPI currently stores licensure data in a multitude of formats (including scanned documents), and data structures that are difficult to access, and even more difficult to manage. As a result, important analyses about teacher supply and demand, preparation programs, and quality remain beyond our reach. While current capabilities require a focus on process, our new system will allow for greater focus on information. The changes we propose will dramatically shift the methodology of TEPDL—and indeed, DPI—from a document-driven to a data-driven decision-making organization.

As it stands, the licensure process operates as efficiently as possible, given current capacity. Still, the system includes a labyrinth of steps. (TEPDL's Current Educator License Application Processing Flow is attached in Appendix A.) Staff must manually scan and input data into a variety of databases and image documents. A majority of the licensing staff's time is consumed with this data entry and paper handling. Time not consumed with data entry is often spent answering inquiries about either the current process or a specific application. Though TEPDL employees navigate the process well, many questions arise for educators attempting to apply for their initial license or renew existing licenses. Without doubt, the current process is confusing,

unwieldy, and slow. Additionally, DPI anticipates that the licensure workload will soon exceed staff resources, and budgetary concerns in the state portend challenges in hiring new positions.

TEPDL has already invested significant personnel time and fiscal resources in researching and initial planning of a potential online program. The team and its leadership are intensely dedicated to improving the system with which they work on a daily basis. They know that a better system, though convenient for staff in DPI, and certainly helpful for educators, will also input valuable information into our LDS that will allow DPI to better understand teacher training, supply, demand, and effectiveness, thereby enabling us to provide more focused support for our educators and the institutions that train them. They know that a better licensure system will ultimately improve education in Wisconsin.

Though the need for a new system to collect, store, and manage data about educators in Wisconsin is widely recognized within DPI and among key stakeholders in the State, previous efforts to update the system have repeatedly come to a formidable dead-end: lack of funds. In many ways, important pursuits such as improvements to our teacher licensure program have been sacrificed on the altar of equally vital efforts to develop the foundations of our LDS and accompanying reporting methods. Race to the Top has quickly focused and improved understanding of the value and importance of thoughtfully gathering information about our educators and the institutions in which they were trained. Given this greater collective awareness, and DPI's substantial work to develop our LDS, DPI is perfectly poised to utilize Federal funds to 1) improve an important service we provide for educators; 2) collect and better manage data about educators; and, 3) develop useful, innovative, and sustainable ways to use those data to better understand and address our successes and struggles in educating the youth of our state.

Using Data to Support Improvement Efforts

Reporting

In addition to responsibilities for educator licensure, TEPDL is a representative for the state superintendent regarding educator licensure standards for initial licensure and license renewal; regularly prepares reports for the education committees of the legislature; conducts approval reviews of Wisconsin educator preparation programs every five years; and prepares an annual report on the supply and demand of educational personnel. These efforts serve to inform the public and fulfill reporting requirements of the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

We are certain that the data collection and assessment necessary for this work will be well served by an online licensure system with higher quality and more easily accessed data. Important policy questions about teacher distribution, the impact of teaching preparation initiatives such as PI-34, and the ability to identify quality educators are currently addressed through the above methods. However, better quality and more diverse data will surely provide a richer and more complete picture of education in Wisconsin. Specifically, a data system that can track students, link those students to their teachers, and link educators to their preparation programs will undoubtedly provide invaluable information to guide reform. Though we currently collect information about teachers, the complicated nature of the data collection, structures, and management processes makes taking full advantage of our data to create a robust picture of education in our state difficult.

Capacities to be Developed

Interoperability

Though the vision for TEPDL's integrated online licensure system is one of interoperability, the current outdated licensure process lacks the capacity to communicate efficiently with other state or district institutions, or even with other offices within DPI. We consider interoperable data sharing between the various institutions involved in the licensing process to be an integral part of our streamlined new system. This system will:

- Create web-based, customer-friendly license application and renewal processes for educators, including:
 - Paperless application/renewal procedures and status tracking
 - An online forum to track PI-34 requirements
 - Automated, electronic fee payment, transcripts, background checks, fingerprint results tracking, and professional development data submission
 - Reduced license application turnaround time
- Offer an automated platform for institutions of higher education to provide program participation and completion data to our LDS, resulting in:
 - Automated initial educator licensing
 - Automated educator supply data for DPI's annual report on Supply and Demand of Wisconsin Education Personnel
- Provide automated data exchanges and electronic communication with employing school districts and providers of professional development plan resources, including:
 - Emergency license requests
 - Auditing of school personnel
 - On-request reports from the educator license database
 - Searchable index of approved educator preparation programs
 - Automated educator demand data for DPI's annual Supply and Demand of Wisconsin Education Personnel Report

Ultimately, this system will be interoperable with LEAs, CESAs, Wisconsin institutions of higher education, and a variety of agencies in the state, including the Departments of Revenue (DOR), Justice (DOJ), Regulation and Licensing (DRL), Transportation (DOT), and Children and Families (DCF).

<u>Data Quality</u>

We propose to greatly improve the data quality of DPI collections managed by TEPDL. Under the current system, educator data—collected on paper—are manually entered in discrete collections and spreadsheets that, in addition to being difficult to access and manage, are also challenging to verify for data quality. Consolidating and cleansing these data sets, and ultimately storing them in our LDS, are important steps for our overall vision.

1.3 <u>Early Childhood Data Strategy:</u> Assessing early childhood data collection and capacity and developing a strategy for integration into the LDS.

A true longitudinal view of student progress must not only extend beyond high school; it must also include early childhood education programs. Stakeholders, including child advocates, Head Start staff, the Department of Children and Families and the Governor's Council on Early Childhood Education and Care, recognize the tremendous value in creating a data-driven view of student achievement that starts before kindergarten. Important policy questions about program participation, longitudinal outcomes for early childhood education program participants, and program characteristics remain unanswered as long as DPI is unable to identify, capture, and incorporate early childhood data elements into our LDS.

In an effort to carry forward the momentum created in our PK-20 stakeholder meetings, DPI proposes to conduct a feasibility study of early childhood education data sharing throughout the state. This important first step will include an internal inventory and assessment of paths to creating a continuous data flow starting with education programs before kindergarten.

This necessary expansion of our LDS to include early childhood data must begin with a careful evaluation of current data collections; it must consider data collection possibilities; and, it must evaluate and determine a best method to improve interoperability between early childhood education providers and the K-12 education system.

Current Capacities

Currently, DPI only collects early childhood data for a few specific program areas and interventions, including early childhood special education services. Both DPI and the Department of Children and Families coordinate and provide grants for early childhood programs and are deeply interested in expanding the LDS into the early childhood arena. However, there is little inter-agency understanding of the data collected relating to pre-K programs and less knowledge of data collected throughout the state by early childhood education providers.

Capacities to be Developed

Many important policy and research questions will get richer and more comprehensive answers with the addition of early childhood education data into our LDS. To that end, we must carefully assess not only our internal data collections, but also external data collections and sharing feasibility. We expect to evaluate current data collections from a variety of sources, including:

1. Wisconsin Head Start state supplement: Wisconsin provides federal Head Start grantees with supplemental funding through the Wisconsin Head Start State Supplement. This program provides state funded slots to service additional children on the federal Head Start waiting lists. Currently, no data is collected at the state level for the children served by this program. As DPI explores the collection and alignment of this data, the first priority would be data from Head Start in schools or cooperative educational service agencies that receive

supplemental state funding. The second priority would be expanding to all additional Head Start grantees.

- 2. Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C: Through a federal general supervision grant from the US Department of Education, Wisconsin's Department of Health Services (DHS) and DPI have just completed the implementation of a new data collection system that allow county programs to make electronic referrals for children transitioning into school district IDEA services. As DPI explores data alignment, one goal would be the extension of the DPI portion of this data system to allow alignment with the DPI individual student data.
- **3. Child care food program:** DPI currently has a shared data collection system with the Department of Children and Families related to the child care food program. While this system is primarily program data, it does involve specific child data related to monitor the weekly attendance of subsidized children versus the number of enrolled children claimed for CACFP reimbursement.

1.4 Need for Project: Summary

State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) Requirements

The State Fiscal Stabilization Fund requires Wisconsin to comply with the seven capabilities and 12 elements outlined in the America COMPETES Act. Wisconsin currently has, at a minimum, a rudimentary capacity to meet all these requirements. However, our current State LDS (SLDS) grant, this new proposal, and our Race to the Top application seek to create a powerful LDS capable of efficiently and seamlessly exchanging data to support student improvement. To that end, this grant proposal addresses almost every capability and element. For more information, please see our Proposed Objectives in Section 2.4 and the chart of our current LDS status in Appendix C.

Data Security and Accessibility

Confidential student data is the core of any LDS. Such data must be protected. Wisconsin's laws and citizenry are unequivocal: pupil data privacy must be protected with utmost vigilance. DPI has instituted state-of-the-art security systems and continues to implement strict security rules regarding use of and access to confidential data in accordance with state and federal privacy laws. To that end, DPI's legal counsel and pupil data policy advisor are integral parts of the overall LDS team, and additional security measures are being negotiated as part of our PK-20 data exchange agreements.

2. Proposed Objectives: Three Overarching Agendas

Wisconsin is confident in our ability to report by September of 2011 that we have, at a basic level, the data elements and capabilities of the America COMPETES Act. However, this basic level of competency is not enough to address the educational priorities and concerns in Wisconsin. We seek to do more to provide educators, families, education agencies, and policymakers better resources to attend with focus to the educational needs of our state: addressing the overwhelming achievement gap between black and white students, ensuring our

students are educated by the highest quality teachers, and developing the next generation of assessments that engage students and accurately measure achievement of content standards.

Current work to enhance our longitudinal data system focuses primarily on changes within DPI. The following objectives answer the unavoidable call to substantially expand our LDS to include additional data and foster partnerships outside the PK-12 arena. Below, we have listed each outcome and its accompanying components for each of our three agendas. These outcomes were determined through a needs assessment, keeping under consideration the required elements and capabilities of the America COMPETES Act. We thus end the section by summarizing the elements and capabilities each of our outcomes will help DPI fulfill.

2.1 Advancing Postsecondary Data Infrastructure

Tremendous energy and effort in Wisconsin is centered on developing a robust PK-16 data system that supports high quality research as well as the secure, reliable transmission of pupil data among education institutions. This momentum is reflected both in our efforts to date, which have created the ground work for us to move quickly in establishing higher level interoperability.

Current Efforts:

- ✓ Enacted state legislation authorizing a PK-16 data system in November 2009
- ✓ All four education systems (DPI, UW System, WAICU, and WTCS) will sign an interagency compact to govern PK-16 data exchanges and ad hoc research requests by December 2009.
- ✓ All four members of the compact will sign memoranda of understanding governing data sharing, research protocols, security and any relevant costs by March, 2010.

Outcome #1: A set of common, aligned data elements, including:

- a common student identifier,
- other agreed upon data elements, and
- aligned data standards

<u>Outcome #2</u>: An interoperable data exchange for research and reporting, which may include:

- a system for secure file exchange,
- protocols for authentication, user authorization and FERPA compliance, and
- capacity for ad hoc research requests

<u>Outcome #3</u>: Sub grants provided to postsecondary partners to implement systems upgrades and data alignments necessary for interoperability across the PK-16 data system, including:

- the University of Wisconsin System (UW System),
- the Wisconsin Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (WAICU), and
- the Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCS).

2.2 Great Teachers & Leaders

Much thought has been given to realistic, measurable, and useful outcomes within Educator Licensure. An approach that incorporates our goals of 1) having a strong planning and analysis
foundation, 2) an integrated online teacher licensure application and data management tool, and 3) high-quality educator data integrated into our LDS, into three outcomes provides an excellent blueprint for implementation.

<u>Outcome #1</u>: A Strong Foundation: Analysis, Requirements Gathering, and Workflow Development

In order to create an integrated system of data collection and processing, we must first address issues of data quality and accessibility within DPI. While an integrated online teacher licensure data system is appealing, and the temptation to hasten work on this part of the project is strong, TEPDL currently suffers under a system that is the result of ad hoc data collection and maintenance architecture; the result is dysfunctional. Consequently, the team is deeply dedicated to fulfilling the following components of this first outcome—seen as necessary first steps towards a highly efficient system:

- An inventory of TEPDL data collections, including an assessment of additional data to collect.
- Requirements gathering and plan development to fully functionalize a unique teacher identifier.
- Workflows and accompanying business rules for the upcoming new system.
- A plan of project implementation phases, timeline, final staff allocation, and hardware and software acquisition and integration.

<u>Outcomes #2 and #3</u>: A Comprehensive Online Data Management and Educator Licensing Portal

An integrated, online, licensure management system and database is at the heart of this effort. Such a program will create valuable data-sharing connections between DPI and LEAs, institutions of higher education, and other state departments. Additionally, this system will reap an abundant harvest of useful data for the LDS: data that will be used to answer important policy and educational questions; data that will be used to understand what it means to be a high-quality teacher, to understand the distribution of high quality educators in our public schools, and the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs.

The implementation of such an application involves two developmental phases, the outcomes of which are online modules that will together form a comprehensive system. The modules begin with an internal web application that will ensure a timely move towards cleaner and more manageable data. This application will improve data capture, facilitate exchange of data within DPI, and include a secure login capacity for agencies integral to the licensure process. The module, or outcome, created in the second phase, will provide online functionality for educators in the state to apply for initial or master licensure, or to renew or change an existing license.

Following are the descriptions of each module, as well as the components associated with development.

Outcome #2: An Internal Web-based Data Management Module with Connections for External Partners

Development of a DPI web application will allow for internal workflow and document management, an integral first step to improve data quality within the agency. This module will include role-based security authentication that ensures the privacy of data and authorizes access only to legitimate users of the system. It will allow for increased data capture, data validation, and a data-driven workflow, thereby improving educator and licensure data quality and integrity within the agency. This internal system will also provide TEPDL staff with sufficient opportunity to fully learn the components of the application, thereby improving the technical and implementation support they can provide future system customers. Thus, the components of the internal aspect of this outcome are twofold:

- A security administration feature
- Training documentation to accompany all Module One components

The external partner component of this module will include secure logins, reporting tools, and data submission tools for education program providers, LEAs, and CESAs. It will allow institutions of higher education to report education preparation program participants and completers and complete follow-up research on graduates of their programs. It will also provide LEAs and CESAs access to tools and reports related to education staff licensure: to verify enrollment status in a higher education program, to verify license status and type, and to complete reporting requirements for DPI. The outcomes for this module relate to the need to provide efficient and expedient connections and communications between DPI and our external partners.

In creating the application connections to our external partners, we expect to produce the following components:

- An online application module to serve education program providers
- An online application module to serve LEAs, CESAs

Outcome #3: A Web Module with Initial License and Renewal Application Programs

This outcome completes the circle of our integrated online licensing system by providing an online portal for initial and renewing applicants to manage their licensure process. Such a process will incorporate the enhanced data collection and validation determined in Outcome One: A Strong Foundation. More specifically, this online module will include the following components:

- Web-based license application intake—for initial licenses
- Web-based license renewal component
- Training documentation to accompany all Module Two components

Outcome #4: Migration of Educator Licensure and Training Data into LDS

Our final goal for the comprehensive educator licensure portal project is one of integration. Starting with our foundation building stage, we intend to plan for and incorporate data elements about educators into our LDS. The addition of this educator data will culminate our efforts to collect and maintain clean and manageable data that 1) is of high quality, 2) is more accessible, and 3) improves reporting capacity within the department. As mentioned above, TEPDL is

responsible for annual reports at a state and federal level. Having higher quality and more accessible data will not only improve the accuracy of these reports; it will also make the process of reporting more efficient and timely. Further, integrating our educator data into the LDS will provide for richer and more complete information that we as a state agency can provide the people, agencies, and education institutions of Wisconsin.

In an effort to ensure transparency and build positive anticipation for these outcomes, DPI intends to continue building support for this project throughout from the start of the process: informing and involving all parties—LEAs, CESAs, institutions of higher education, educators, and other state departments—throughout the progress.

2.3 Early Childhood Data Strategy

Outcomes for the Early Childhood Data Strategy first address the need to identify the multitude of programs within the State which provide educational value to the pre-kindergarten student. Once these programs are recognized, analysis will be completed to determine what data is currently collected, available, and transportable. This analysis will help determine the feasibility of adding data from the different programs to the LDS. The three outcomes of our Early Childhood component are:

Outcome #1: Analyze the current early childhood data environment

Identify early childhood programs with the following information: data elements collected, method of collection, availability of the data collected, data standards used, and the capacity available for data sharing.

Outcome #2: Establish data sharing methodologies

Build consensus around common data elements, other data elements needed, and common data standards between DPI and early childhood education partners.

Outcome #3: A work plan to realize data sharing process

Create a work plan to indicate how, what, and when the identified data elements can be added to the LDS on a per program schedule.

2.4 Outcomes: Summary

With this grant, Wisconsin has a singular opportunity to unite under the banner of LDS the many valuable, but currently disparate, efforts throughout the state to collect and report education data in meaningful ways. Ultimately, the outcomes associated with Advancing Postsecondary Data Infrastructures, Great Teachers & Leaders, and our Early Childhood Data Strategy agendas will enhance data integrity, accessibility, reporting, and the quality of connections and communications with all of the people and agencies with whom we work. Though DPI will achieve these improvements only through partnerships with other state agencies, LEAs, program providers, and educators, we are confident the outcomes will benefit all parties.

SFSF Required Element	Outcomes that enhance current progress towards SFSF requirements throughout DPI	
Element #1	Advancing Postsecondary Data Infrastructure: Agreement upon and development of a statewide unique student identifier that allows for the exchange of data between DPI and postsecondary institutions, but that does not permit a student to be individually identified by users of the system (except where allowed by Federal and State law).	
Element #2	Advancing Postsecondary Data Infrastructure: Inclusion of student-level enrollment, demographic, and program participation information that extends beyond K-12.	
	Great Teachers & Leaders: Capture of enrollment, certification, and completion information for teachers and administrators in Wisconsin.	
Element #3	Advancing Postsecondary Data Infrastructure: Improved interoperability, combined with recent state legislation, and the development of memoranda of understanding with postsecondary partners will allow for the exchange of student-level information about the points at which students exit, transfer in or out, drop out, or complete postsecondary education programs.	
Element #4	Advancing Postsecondary Data Infrastructure: Realization of interoperability framework between DPI and postsecondary partner institutions <i>Great Teachers & Leaders:</i> Comprehensive educator licensure web- portal will allow two-way communication between DPI and education program providers	
Elements #5-7	Wisconsin currently meets these elements (see chart in Appendix C).	
Element #8	<i>Great Teachers & Leaders:</i> Assessment of current teacher identifier and implementation of plan to ensure identifier meets new requirements for matching and confidentiality.	
Elements #9-10	Wisconsin currently meets these elements (see chart in Appendix C).	
Element #11	Advancing Postsecondary Data Infrastructure: Interoperability with postsecondary partners will allow for the exchange of data that provide information regarding the extent to which students transition successfully, including whether students enroll in remedial coursework.	
Element #12	Advancing Postsecondary Data Infrastructure: Agreed upon data elements expected to include data that provide other information necessary to address alignment and adequate preparation for success in postsecondary education. Great Teachers & Leaders: Improvement of manageability and quality of educator data, and migration of that data into LDS, will provide information to address questions of transitions and success in postsecondary education.	

SFSF Required Outcomes that meets or enhance current progress towards SFSF
--

Capability	requirements throughout DPI	
	Advancing Postsecondary Data Infrastructure: Student-level data will be captured from institutions of higher education, expanding our LDS to include postsecondary data.	
Capability #1	<i>Great Teachers & Leaders:</i> The myriad of connections created with an online teacher licensure and data capture system will allow Wisconsin to examine student progress over time, including connections for public school graduates who pursue higher education degrees in education and enter the workforce as a teacher or administrator.	
Capability #2	Advancing Postsecondary Data Infrastructure: Our proposal accelerates interoperability by using standard data structures, data formats, and data definitions to ensure linkage and connectivity among the various levels and types of data.	
1 7	<i>Great Teachers & Leaders:</i> Comprehensive educator licensure web- portal will facilitate and enable exchange of data among agencies and institutions within the state.	
Capability #3	Great Teachers & Leaders: Implementation of plan to ensure unique teacher identifier meets new requirement to match student and teacher data.	
Capability #4	<i>Great Teachers & Leaders:</i> Improved manageability and integrity of educator data will enable seamless matching of teachers with information about their certification and teacher preparation programs.	
Capability #5	Advancing Postsecondary Data Infrastructure: The interoperable system we propose to facilitate will allow for a seamless exchange of data that will greatly improve our ability to easily access data for continuous improvement and decision-making.	
	<i>Great Teachers & Leaders:</i> Improved manageability and integrity of educator data will allow for more timely and accurate reporting to parents, students, teachers, and school leaders.	
Capability #6	ility #6 <i>Great Teachers & Leaders:</i> Development of an integrated, online educator license tool will decrease chances of data entry error, improve the manageability of data, and ensure quality and integrity of data in the system.	
Capability #7	<i>Great Teachers & Leaders:</i> Improved manageability and integrity of educator data will provide State with ability to more accurately and efficiently meet reporting requirements of the Department of Education.	

3. Timeline for Project Outcomes

3.1 Advancing Postsecondary Data Infrastructure

Under our current SLDS grant, DPI is leading a process to expedite the development of the postsecondary component of our PK-16 data system. DPI and our postsecondary partners have worked with the Governor's office and State Legislature to create the legal authority and governance agreements necessary to transition from patchwork data sharing among PK-16 education organizations into an interoperable, efficient, and reliable PK-16 data system.

Additionally, we have brought together key stakeholders from across the PK-20 spectrum, including various educational institutions and state departments, to engage in a consensus building process around both a list of the crucial questions we want our LDS to answer as well as a strategic framework for growing and integrating our LDS.

This is no small task. Consensus building made possible by our current grant is no match for reality: each postsecondary system represents a myriad of unique complications on the path to interoperability, not the least of which is a basic structural deficiency that would inherently restrict the efficient exchange of data between systems.

Consequently, the proposed grant focuses on the implementation of specific common data elements, standards, and a unique student identifier shared by DPI and Wisconsin's three postsecondary education systems. Rather than focusing on broad, general agreements, the work of this grant will concentrate on the specific technical capacities necessary, and legal agreements required, under FERPA for Wisconsin to maintain a truly interoperable, secure PK-16 data system.

Fortunately, Wisconsin's Race to the Top efforts, coupled with concurrent work from our current grant, have positioned us to quickly disburse sub grant funds, resolve major planning and alignment issues, and focus most of the grant work on technical implementation and system development. However, because the technical infrastructure in each partner institution has different assets and liabilities, the specific implementation timeline will vary among partners. A timeline by outcome is included below:

<i>Outcome:</i> Sub grants to postsecondary partners to implement systems upgrades and data alignments necessary for interoperability across the PK-16 data system		
<u>TIMELINE</u>	<u>Task</u>	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
Year 1 Q1	Finalize common data standards and elements.	DPI, UW System, WTCS, and WAICU
	Sign grant agreement and provide sub grant to UW System for implementation of PK-16 data system functionalities.	DPI and UW System
	Sign grant agreement and provide sub grant to WTCS for implementation of PK-16 data system functionalities.	DPI and WTCS
	Sign grant agreement and provide sub grant to WAICU for implementation of PK-16 data system functionalities.	DPI and WAICU

Outcome: A set of common, aligned data elements including: a common student identifier, other agreed upon common data elements, and aligned data standards.

TIMELINE	TASK	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
Year 1 Q1 – Q2	 Hold a series of meetings to: Review existing memoranda of understanding and governance agreements signed by the partners 	DPI, UW System, WTCS, and WAICU
	• Develop a core list of data elements necessary for useful and expedient matching of pupil records	
	• Individually assess the necessity and feasibility of adding any new, relevant data elements	
	• Identify current data standards for each data element under consideration for each partner organization.	
	 Resolve final list of common data elements and standards 	
	• Agree on a data standard for the LDS student key (common identifier).	
	• Develop an implementation timeline for all common elements and standards based on each partner's unique needs and existing capacity.	
	• Sign an interagency agreement establishing the common data elements, standards and student identifier.	

Outcome: An interoperable data exchange for research and reporting, which may include: a system of secure file exchange; protocols for authentication, user authorization and FERPA compliance; and the capacity for ad hoc research requests.

TIMELINE	TASK	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
Years $1-2$	Commence initial development of the common LDS	DPI, UW System,
Q3 – Q6 (Support:	student key	wics, and walcu
Q7 – Q12)	Align data element around standards	
	Implement LDS student key	
Years 2 –	Develop a system for secure file exchange	DPI, UW System,
3 Q5 – Q12	Create protocols that may include: authentication, user authorization and FERPA compliance	wics, and wricu
	Develop ad hoc extract and reporting capabilities	

3.2 Great Teachers & Leaders

As described in Need for Project, Section 1.2, the Office of TEPDL has given much thought to the development of a highly functional integrated online licensing system. DPI proposes to complete a thorough data inventory of TEPDL's collections, including an assessment of unnecessary elements and additional elements needed. During this phase, TEPDL—with input from throughout the agency, and guidance from the LDS Project Manager and staff—will evaluate current teacher identifier methods and determine the necessary steps to upgrade our system to include a unique teacher identifier appropriate to meet new requirements. Additionally, careful planning of new system workflows and business rules must occur before application development. The TEPDL team will plan the project implementation phases, timeline, and final staff allocation. Final hardware and software needs, acquisition and integration methods will also be determined during the foundation building period.

Having developed a clear plan for implementation during the first stage of the overall project, the second stage will be application development. DPI expects this project to be implemented in two phases, represented by modules that fit together to form the overall application.

Data collected through the online program will be incorporated (according to plans developed in the foundation building process), into DPI's longitudinal data system when it is most appropriate. This process will be coordinated by the LDS Project Manager, and implemented by staff in the IT Team.

As mentioned above, the LDS Project Manager and team will work directly with TEPDL and the Teacher Licensure Project Lead throughout all phases of the project to ensure that 1) meaningful data are collected, and 2) that the data are collected in a way conducive to storage and management in our LDS. Additionally, the TEPDL and LDS teams will work to provide transparency about the project, building support and positive anticipation for the upcoming system changes.

Outcome: A strong foundation: analysis, requirements gathering, and workflow development		
TIMELINE	TASK	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
Year 1 Q1 – Q2	An inventory of TEPDL data collections and architecture, including an assessment of additional data to collect.	Leadership: Assistant State Superintendent for Academic Excellence
	Requirements gathering and plan development to functionalize a unique teacher identifier that will meet new requirements.	<u>Planning & daily</u> <u>oversight</u> : Project Lead <u>Implementation</u> : TEPDL, developers/analysts to be hired
		<u>Additional Support</u> : LDS Project Manager and Education Consultant
Year 1 Q2 – Q3	Workflows and accompanying business rules for the upcoming new system.	Same as above
	A plan of project implementation phases, timeline, final staff allocation, and hardware and software acquisition and integration.	

Outcome: An Internal Web-based Data Management Module with Connections for E	External
Partners	

TIMELINE	TASK	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
Years 1 – 2 Q4 – Q8	Development of online application module to serve education program providers	Leadership: Assistant State Superintendent for Academic Excellence
	Development of online application module to serve LEAs, CESAs	<u>Internal Accountability:</u> Licensure project Steering Committee
	Development of online application module for security administration	<u>Planning & daily</u> <u>oversight</u> : Project Lead <u>Implementation</u> : TEPDL, developers/analysts to be hired Additional Support:
		LDS Project Manager

		and Education Consultant
Year 2 Q8	Training documentation to accompany all Module One components	Same as above

Outcome: A Web Module with Initial License and Renewal Application Programs		
TIMELINE	TASK	PARTY RESPONSIBLE
Years 2 – 3 Q5 – Q9	Web-based application intake—for initial licenses Training documentation to accompany all initial license component	Leadership: Assistant State Superintendent for Academic Excellence <u>Planning & daily</u> <u>oversight</u> : Project Lead <u>Implementation</u> : TEPDL, developers/analysts to be hired <u>Additional Support</u> : LDS Project Manager and Education Consultant
Years 2 – 3 Q5 – Q12	Web-based application intake—for license renewals Training documentation to accompany license renewal component	Same as above
Years 3 Q9 - Q11	Integration of initial license and license renewals module with the data management module	Same as above

<i>Outcome:</i> M	igration of Educator Licensure and Training Data into LDS	
<u>Timeline</u>	TASK	PARTY RESPONSIBLE

	-		
Year 1 Q1 – Q2	Development of LDS Educator Data Plan: determine data to be integrated into the LDS and when	Leadership: Assistant State Superintendent for Academic Excellence	
Years 2 – 3	Migration of educator data into LDS	<u>Planning & daily</u> <u>oversight</u> : Project Lead <u>Implementation</u> : TEPDL, developers (analysts to	
Q5 – Q12		be hired	
Years 1 – 3 Q1 – Q12	Communications and support-building with education community: LEAs, CESAs, institutions of higher education, teachers, and administrators	LDS Project Manager and Education Consultant	

These timelines are a best estimate upon submission of this application. We anticipate changes in the process as a result of the research and analysis accomplished during the first phase of the Great Teachers and Leaders Agenda. For a more specific timeline, please see our work plan in Appendix A.

3.3 Early Childhood Data Strategy

The important questions to be answered with early childhood data are well recognized within DPI and among our PK-20 partners. It is apparent that a true longitudinal view of student achievement must include early childhood data as well. While the capacity to add this data to the LDS is unknown at this time, we need to analyze all early childhood programs according to the timeline and tasks below to determine the overall workplan necessary to link early childhood data within the LDS to increase the longitudinal view of a student.

Outcome: Analyze the current early childhood data environment			
TIMELINE	TASK	PARTY RESPONSIBLE	
Year 2 Q5 – Q6	Identify early childhood programs with the following information: data elements collected, method of collection, availability of the data collected, data standards used, and the capacity available for data sharing.	DPI and the Department of Children and Families	

Outcome: Establish data sharing methodologies			
<u>TIMELINE</u>	TASK	PARTY RESPONSIBLE	
Years 2 – 3 Q7 – Q10	Build consensus around common data elements, other data elements needed, and common data standards between DPI and early childhood education partners.	DPI and the Department of Children and Families	

Outcome: Develop work plan to realize data sharing process			
<u>TIMELINE</u>	<u>Task</u>	PARTY RESPONSIBLE	
Year 3 Q9 – Q12	Create a work plan to indicate how, what, and when the identified data elements can be added to the LDS on a per program schedule.	DPI and the Department of Children and Families	

4. Project Management and Governance

This proposal is submitted with full support and approval of all levels of DPI leadership. At the highest level, the project is the responsibility of State Superintendent Tony Evers. The LDS Project sponsor remains, by appointment of the Superintendent, Rick Grobschmidt, Assistant State Superintendent for Libraries, Technology, and Community Learning. (His résumé is attached in Appendix B.) He is ultimately responsible for the successful implementation of all aspects of Wisconsin's LDS, and participates regularly in collaborative LDS efforts within the agency while also facilitating partnerships with other institutions and organizations in the state.

The basic structure of the LDS Project involves three structural components:

- Grant oversight and plan approval by the Executive Steering Committee
 - Established under the original LDS governance structure, and will remain in place through subsequent phases of LDS development.
 - Membership includes the Deputy State Superintendent (Please see résumé of Michael Thompson.).
 - Led by the project sponsor, Assistant State Superintendent of Libraries, Technology, and Community Learning.
 - Comprised of management from across DPI and legal counsel.
 - The primary responsibility: to ensure the project remains aligned with the needs and priorities, and compatible with other initiatives, of the agency, thus serving educators and students in Wisconsin.
- <u>Project planning</u> managed by LDS Project leadership
 - This component involves 1) development of a detailed internal plan—with specific workflows, timelines, and expectations—for completion of goals aligned with the Executive Steering Committee's vision, and 2) facilitation of communication between all

LDS staff; distribution of clear plans to all teams involved in the project; and provision of regular updates to the Executive Steering Committee.

• <u>Plan implementation</u> by cross-agency teams with content area and data expertise integral to the project

The LDS is a collaborative effort throughout DPI, one that involves the expertise of various program area staff serving to guide the applications development work of the Information Technology Bureau. Thus, all committees and teams associated with the LDS Project include staff from throughout DPI. In particular, the DPI offices of Content and Learning and Educational Accountability are integral to the development of the LDS. Both are represented on the Executive Steering Committee and throughout the other teams of the LDS project. These content experts are familiar with the aims of the longitudinal data system, and come vested with a solid understanding of project objectives, history, and stakeholder needs.

Work that started in DPI over four years ago—and continues with our current SLDS grant—has created an agency infrastructure that will not only support additional LDS efforts; it will also provide for the sustainability of the LDS as a high-priority component of DPI's work. Two full-time LDS project staff positions have recently been filled, ensuring the project has staff focused and specialized for LDS work. Additionally, with input and recommendations from LDS team members, the Steering Committee regularly evaluates the LDS framework and process flow plan to ensure efficient work towards project goals.

In addition to LDS Steering Committee oversight and guidance, DPI's Data Management Steering Committee handles data governance for DPI. This group includes cabinet-level leadership and data management experts from throughout DPI. In addition to setting data governance policy for DPI, this group may serve as a resource for LDS initiatives working to ensure compliance with federal, state, and DPI policies.

Daily project oversight will be the responsibility of the LDS Project Manager. (Please see the attached résumé of Melissa Straw.) The Project Manager reports directly to the Chief Information Officer (see résumé of Rod Packard). Additionally, the Project Manager, with assistance from the Education Consultant (see résumé of Laura Pinsonneault), will provide regular updates to members of the Implementation teams and the Executive Steering Committee.

A general note on the oversight of our proposed activities: a project of this magnitude is considered "high profile" as defined by the Wisconsin Legislature, and therefore subject to additional monitoring by the state legislature. One of the criteria defining "high profile" is any project with a budget over one million dollars. In such instances, DPI is required to submit monthly Dashboard Reports to the Secretary of the Department of Administration. These reports contain status updates for Schedule, Scope, Budget, and Other Issues, and are signed by the Director of Information Technology, the Executive Sponsor, Finance Authority, Business Authority, and Contract Administrator.

Below, we address specific oversight and management plans for our three agendas. We realize that an LDS is a comprehensive project that will find greatest success when it incorporates a true crossagency approach. Thus, regular communication between teams and updates to the executive steering committee will be included in all plans.

4.1 Advancing Postsecondary Data Infrastructure

General oversight and responsibility for the postsecondary team within DPI lay with the Assistant Superintendent for Libraries, Technology, and Community Education. Oversight of the IT Team lay with the IT Director, Rod Packard. In addition to daily project oversight, the LDS Project Manager will be responsible for providing direction for this initiative. Each postsecondary partner will provide a project lead to manage efforts within their organization. Please see the résumés for each partner. The Education Consultant, Laura Pinsonneault, will provide assistance as needed to the postsecondary partners during their analysis.

4.2 Great Teachers & Leaders

Ultimately, the responsibility for all aspects of the Great Teachers & Leaders Agenda lay with TEPDL. This office, under the leadership and management of the Assistant Superintendent for Academic Excellence (Please see the attached résumé for Deborah Mahaffey), will develop work groups and implementation teams fitting the different tasks for each major goal of the project. (Please see the attached proposed organization chart in Appendix A.)

As this agenda represents a significant effort by DPI not only to create internal change, but also to enhance communication, connections, and partnerships with departments, LEAs, institutions of higher education, and educators throughout the state, the Integrated Educator Licensure System effort will have a specialized steering committee. The Teacher Licensure Steering Committee will have ultimate oversight of this project. To facilitate communication between the groups, and overall compatibility with our LDS goals, this group will include members from the LDS Executive Steering Committee. The group will also include representatives from our partner agencies and institutions to ensure greater communication and eventual interoperability between all parties

The majority of organization and detailed planning will be handled by the Teacher Licensure Project Lead (position to be filled), who will work with a business analyst, technical lead, writer, and several developers to create and implement the online modules. The Project Lead will provide important planning and oversight of day-to-day activities, and maintain regular communication with the LDS Project Manager to ensure alignment of the work in TEPDL with overall LDS goals. It is expected that the Teacher Licensure Implementation Team report regularly to the LDS Executive Steering Committee. Additionally, the current LDS Project Manager and education consultant will regularly monitor progress and provide support for TEPDL activities.

4.3 Early Childhood Data Strategy

General oversight and responsibility for the early childhood team also lay with the Assistant Superintendent for Libraries, Technology, and Community Education. Oversight of the IT Team lay with the IT Director, Rod Packard. In addition to daily project oversight, the LDS Project Manager will be responsible for providing direction for this initiative. The Education Consultant, Laura Pinsonneault, will provide assistance as needed to internal staff and our Early Childhood partners during their analysis.

5. Staffing

Efforts to build, sustain, and support an LDS must be comprehensive and long-term. They must also include considerations of implementation and customer support. In addition to the individuals listed above currently supporting the project management efforts of each overarching agenda, DPI has reviewed the possible scope of work to determine the resources that will be needed above and beyond what we currently have today. Staffing needed to support the shared tasks of the three agendas include a Project Lead, Educator's Liaison, and a Help Desk Analyst. Given our dedication to further develop our LDS and design accompanying applications that are useful and sustainable, it is necessary to incorporate into our current Help Desk Team a Help Desk position specifically for the LDS. The effort needed to support our partners will continue to grow as we add to our LDS. As a team, we hope to continue to provide this service at the same level of quality we do today. Current positions within DPI, funded by a myriad of sources, will also support efforts to complete the grant objectives.

5.1 Advancing Postsecondary Data Infrastructure

An Analyst and Policy Analyst will be needed to support the outcomes within this agenda. For each of the individual outcomes, a separate Developer is needed to complete the scope of work. As the proposed efforts are in combination with current work in progress on our LDS, we feel the addition of these positions will provide DPI with necessary support for the supplemental efforts associated with this proposal.

5.2 Great Teachers & Leaders

A Project Lead is necessary to manage the significant outcomes associated with our Great Teachers & Leaders agenda. Along with a Technical Lead and a Technical Writer, the Project Lead will support TEPDL staff efforts aligned with development of the comprehensive educator licensure and data management application. Completion of the specific outcomes associated with development of the online program will be facilitated by addition of an analyst and six developers.

5.3 Early Childhood Data Strategy

An additional analyst will be added to the LDS Project Team to support the research and collaboration efforts associated with the feasibility study.

Professional Development

An integral part of any LDS is often left out of specific plans: professional development and training. Yet, without support for new and existing data customers, our ultimate goal of creating a culture of educated data use throughout our state, one that in turn improves the education we provide our students, will flounder. Misused or misunderstood data may cause just as much harm as lack of information. Thus, we intend to incorporate thoughtful implementation and comprehensive trainings around all components of our LDS. We anticipate the dedication of staff with project area expertise to facilitate user support functions and assist with professional development and application implementation.

Our proposed work plan is attached in Appendix A.

SANCTIONS FOR

TITLE I DISTRICTS

NOT MAKING ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS (AYP)

DISTRICTS IDENTIFIED FOR IMPROVEMENT (DIFI) STATUS- *Must make AYP for two consecutive years to be removed from DIFI status

Timeline	What districts must do	What the state will do		
Miss AYP for <i>one</i> year	No sanctions			
DIFI Level 1 Miss AYP for two consecutive years	 Within 3 months, identified district must develop new or revised district improvement plan. The plan must: Incorporate scientifically-based research strategies Identify actions that have the greatest likelihood of improving the achievement of participating children in meeting Address the professional development needs of instruction staff by committing to spend not less than 10% of district Title I funds for this purpose Include specific measurable achievement goals and targets Address the fundamental teaching and learning needs in the schools Incorporate appropriate activities, before school, after school, and during the summer Specify responsibilities of the state educational agency and local educational agency 	 Upon request, DPI will provide or arrange technical assistance to assist the LEA to: Develop and implement an improvement plan Work with schools needing improvement Technical assistance will be supported by effective methods and instructional strategies grounded in scientifically based research. Technical assistance will address problems, if any, in implementing parent involvement and professional development activities. DPI must establish a system of corrective action. DPI will take corrective action if a district does not make adequate progress by the end of the second full school year it has been identified for improvement (see DIFI level 3). (Note: state must provide notice of the corrective action to the parents and public). Prior to that status, DPI will closely monitor progress of school districts and may require the following: Title I reservice action district to will be priority for 		
	 The LEA must implement the plan no later than the beginning of this school year. 	Intell-receiving school districts will be priority for being selected for monitoring for compliance of their ESEA consolidated application.		
	 Ensure that parents of each student enrolled in a school served by a local educational agency identified for improvement are notified. 			

Timeline	What districts must do	What the state will do
DIFI Level 2 Miss AYP for three years	 Continue the implementation of the improvement plan. Comply with any monitoring procedures imposed by the state. 	 Continue to provide technical assistance as described under DIFI level 1. Closely monitor the progress of districts that may consist of the following: Title I-receiving school districts will continue to be a priority for being selected for monitoring for compliance of their ESEA consolidated application. Districts may be required to submit for review their district improvement plans.
	 Continue the implementation of the improvement plan. Comply with any monitoring procedures imposed by the state. 	 Continue to provide technical assistance as described under DIFI level 1. Closely monitor the progress of districts that may consist
DIFI Level 3 Miss AYP for four years	3. Implement state-required corrective action.	 2. Closely monitor the progress of districts that may consist of the following: Title I-receiving school districts will continue to be a priority for being selected for monitoring for compliance of their ESEA consolidated application. Districts may be required to submit for review their district improvement plans. Title I-receiving school districts' ESEA consolidated application for funding will be reviewed to ensure funds are targeted toward improvement areas, and school districts may be required to redirect ESEA funds to improvement areas. 3. Districts will be required to submit to DPI their district improvement plans and after conferring with school district officials, DPI will implement corrective action for Title I-receiving districts per NCLB requirements noted below. Corrective action must include at least one of the following: Deferring programmatic funds or reducing administrative funds
		 Instituting and fully implementing a new curriculum Replacing the LEA personnel who are relevant to the failure to make adequate yearly progress

Timeline	What districts must do	What the state will do
		Removing particular schools from the jurisdiction of the LEA and establishing alternate arrangement for public governance and supervision of such schools
		Appointing or receiving a trustee to administer the affairs of the LEA in place of the superintendent and school board
		Abolishing or restructuring the LEA
		Authorizing students to transfer to another LEA
	 Comply with any monitoring procedures imposed by the state. Continue the implementation of state-required corrective action. 	1. Continue to provide technical assistance as described
		under DIFT level 1.
DIFI Level 4 Miss AYP for five years		 Closely monitor the progress of districts that may consist of the following:
		Title I-receiving school districts will continue to be a priority for being selected for monitoring for compliance of their ESEA consolidated application.
		Title I-receiving school districts' ESEA consolidated application for funding will be reviewed to ensure funds are targeted toward improvement areas, and school districts may be required to redirect ESEA funds to improvement areas.
		 Ensure that Title I-receiving school districts are implementing state-required corrective action.

Resources:

- More information on Wisconsin's School Accountability System can be found at: <u>http://www.dpi.wi.gov/oea/acct/index.html</u>
- Wisconsin Information Network for Successful Schools School Improvement Planning Tool can be found at: <u>http://www.dpi.wi.gov/sig/improvement/tools.html</u>
- Sample letter/statement to parents regarding districts identified for improvement: <u>http://www.dpi.wi.gov/esea/doc/sample-difiparentnotif.doc</u>
- Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction's No Child Left Behind Web site: http://www.dpi.wi.gov/esea/index.html

H:\LONGTERM\ESEA\sanctions for districts.doc 01/12/10 9:50 PM

Corrective Action Requirements for Milwaukee Public Schools District in Need of Improvement Background December 8, 2009

The people of Milwaukee and throughout Wisconsin are coming together around the shared responsibility and sustained effort to ensure a quality education for every child in Milwaukee.

In the past years, the community has stepped forward to support Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS). Numerous groups have convened and multiple studies were conducted on the school district's programs, practices, and student achievement. All have had the primary goal to support academic success for the children of Milwaukee. Nationally-recognized organizations, community-organized councils, and district-convened committees have produced a series of reports that have identified areas of concern. "Raising Achievement in the Milwaukee Public Schools: Report of the Strategic Support Team of the Council of Great City Schools," "African American Education Report 2007," "Working Together, Achieving More: District Strategic Plan," and "Toward a Stronger Milwaukee Public Schools," by McKinsey & Company, outline the steps to ensure that all MPS students have access to a comprehensive, quality education provided by an efficient and effective school district.

The above reports are strong calls for transformation of MPS from peers and from the community; however, those calls are now underscored by the required federal sanctions in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and the *Jamie S*. settlement approved by the federal district court. In short, the calls for transformation have now become requirements to transform.

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI) is required by ESEA to annually identify schools and districts that did not make adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward meeting the state's established objectives in four areas. These objectives include:

- Testing 95 percent of their enrolled students in the statewide reading and mathematics assessment;
- Meeting state established proficiency targets in reading based on Wisconsin's statewide test;
- Meeting state established proficiency targets in mathematics based on Wisconsin's statewide standardized test; and
- Maintaining a high school graduation rate of at least 80 percent of the statewide average and elementary and middle school attendance rates of at least 85 percent of the statewide average, or show growth.

Milwaukee Public Schools has not made adequate yearly progress for five consecutive years in reading and mathematics at the elementary, middle, and high school grade spans. MPS once again did not meet AYP in reading and mathematics for the 2008-09 school year and is now a DIFI-Level 4.

APPENDIX 29 - (E)(2)(ii) 2009-10 Corrective Action Plan for MPS

Under ESEA, DPI has required MPS to take corrective action designed to meet the goal of having all students achieve at the proficient and advanced student academic achievement levels. Previous corrective action requirements have created a strong foundation and progress has been made; however, a more aggressive approach is needed to address the urgency, magnitude, and complexity surrounding the district's performance.

In 2007, DPI directed the district to restructure its organization through the MPS District and School Accountability Model. This directive was based upon information from multiple sources including the Council of Great City Schools which described MPS as "a system of schools, not a school system." A system of central accountability, too long absent from MPS, is essential to ensure that strategies to improve student achievement are consistently implemented in every MPS building. Under the District and School Accountability Model, MPS grouped its 207 schools into nine clusters to ensure communities of learning, quality of instruction, and accountability in every building. While the district has made progress in implementing these "System of Support" clusters, the district must strengthen this effort. The district must define more specifically who reports to whom in each of the nine clusters and how supervisors within the clusters are assigned duties. Further, the district must make clear that responsibility for oversight of each of the nine clusters rests directly with the MPS superintendent.

This accountability model is also essential to implement the court-approved *Jamie S*. settlement. The federal district court found that MPS systemically violated student rights in its use of suspension. The district's use of suspension was also identified as a serious concern by the Council of Great City Schools. Suspension exacerbates the district's student attendance problem and leads to lower student achievement and graduation rates. Research tells us that an effective educational system must provide a system of early intervening services PK-12 to address the academic and behavioral needs of all students before students fail. The *Jamie S*. settlement is based on this research. Under the settlement and as corrective action to address its DIFI status under ESEA, MPS must develop and implement a system of coordinated early intervening services PK-12 in every MPS school.

In 2008-09, MPS received \$121.7 million of federal entitlement funds through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), and the Carl Perkins Act. MPS also received an additional \$25 million of federal discretionary grants through DPI.

For 2009-10, MPS is expected to receive at least \$126 million in federal entitlement funds plus at least \$95.6 million in federal funds through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). In addition, MPS will be eligible for a large share of the \$42 million Title I School Improvement money coming to Wisconsin through ARRA.

Beginning in 2009-10, the State Superintendent will appoint a federal funds trustee who will serve as an inspector general for use of federal funds by MPS and provide increased fiscal oversight for the numerous federal grants the district receives. The trustee will also meet at least quarterly with the Milwaukee Innovation and Improvement Advisory Council to provide council members, the State Superintendent, MPS officials, and the public with greater understanding of MPS' use of federal funds. The federal funds trustee will also work in concert with other DPI

APPENDIX 29 - (E)(2)(ii) 2009-10 Corrective Action Plan for MPS

staff to assure that the district fulfills benchmarks with the 2009-10 corrective action requirements.

To raise achievement, close achievement gaps, and ensure that every MPS student graduates from high school, specific corrective actions are required to:

- I. Increase Student Attendance through Collaborative Community-wide Solutions.
 - A. Form school and district parent action teams that build upon current efforts by using the nine cluster infrastructure to focus on regular attendance for all students in all MPS schools.
 - 1. Coordinate with the DPI VISTA project to use resources, including VISTA members assigned to the Milwaukee-based Parents Plus of Wisconsin, to support each cluster.
 - 2. Coordinate support for parent engagement with the Milwaukee Innovation and Improvement Advisory Council.
 - B. Collaborate and partner with the Milwaukee Innovation and Improvement Advisory Council to involve community organizations and non-profits in efforts to raise regular school attendance.
 - C. Coordinate the work of City Year mentors with other efforts to improve attendance.
 - D. Sustain and improve current Community Learning Centers, employing highly qualified teachers to provide academic tutoring in reading and mathematics to students with greatest needs.
 - E. Implement before- and/or after-school tutoring in English/language arts and mathematics in all Title I SIFI schools.
 - F. Implement a 9th grade support program in all high schools to ensure successful transition to high school.
 - G. Implement a credit recovery program in all high schools for all students who are credit-deficient.

II. Ensure a System of Quality and Consistency in Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Using a System of Early Intervening Services (EIS) PK-12 for All Students. The system must be approved by the independent expert appointed by the federal district court to carry out the *Jamie S*. settlement and must include the following:

- A. Instruction in reading, mathematics, and positive behaviors for all students based on state standards, maximizing instructional time, using scientific research-based curricula provided by effective teachers, and monitored for implementation integrity.
 - 1. Implement 90-minute reading block and 60-minute mathematics block for grades K-3, 60 minute blocks in reading and mathematics in grades 4-8, and reading intervention courses for grades 9-12 in all schools.
 - 2. Implement the comprehensive district-wide plan for literacy that is standards-based, articulated across levels, and uses a limited number of programs which was part of the 2008-09 Corrective Action Requirements.

- 3. Continue implementation of a district-wide plan for mathematics instruction that uses a limited number of programs.
- 4. Develop a district-wide assessment policy and system which includes standards-based formative, benchmark, and summative assessment that allows analysis and reporting at the student, classroom, and school levels.
- B. Universal screening of <u>all</u> students on reading, mathematics, and behavior, conducted at least three times a year, to determine levels of need, and progress in performance in core instruction.
- C. Scientific research-based interventions (small group and customized) for reading, mathematics, and positive behavior provided to students based on measured relative need and implemented with integrity.
 - 1. Summer school with mathematics and reading focus in all Title I schools identified for improvement (SIFI).
 - 2. Extended calendars of a minimum of 30 additional days of instruction in one or two Title I SIFI schools must be implemented by the beginning of the 2010-11 school year.
- D. Progress monitoring (two measures performance and implementation integrity) for interventions that yield reliable and valid measures used by the school to determine the needed level of intensity of service, degree of implementation, and effectiveness of each specific intervention.
- E. Parent/family/community involvement efforts of school personnel that inform about specific services being provided, solicits input for continuous improvement, actively involves the community in the operation of EIS, and measures the involvement of families over time.
- F. Professional development for educators based on National Staff Development Council Standards including measured needs of the school that ensure improvement in student performance.
- G. Educational leadership that effectively manages all components of a system of early intervening services, maximizes instructional time, uses problem-solving approaches, and periodically involves all stakeholders in evaluating the results of EIS using current data.

III. Ensure a Consistent, Transparent, and High Quality System of Accountability in Milwaukee Public Schools for School Improvement, Teacher Quality, and Financial and Operational Management.

- A. Meet, in accordance with federal law, all agreed-upon timelines and ESEA requirements for DIFI, SIFI, and the ESEA Consolidated Application.
- B. Continue the restructuring of the district and coordination of services through the MPS District and School Accountability Model, using the system of nine support clusters of MPS schools to ensure consistent implementation of the corrective action requirements.
- C. Use the nine support clusters to ensure accountability for school improvement through development, monitoring, and technical assistance related to implementation of school improvement plans in all MPS schools.

- D. Ensure all educators are appropriately licensed for their assignments, are highly qualified under ESEA, and are receiving professional development as specified by the Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative (PI 34), state statute, and ESEA.
- E. Require induction support, including mentors, for all initial educators and educators with emergency permits or licenses beginning on the first day of school.
- F. Provide highly skilled and experienced teachers in schools categorized as high need and with low student achievement.
- G. Provide individually tailored support for principals in all Title I SIFI schools.
- H. Coordinate the use of federal funds with the DPI federal funds trustee.
- I. Design, implement, and use a data warehouse that meets the business, human resource, and education accountability needs of the school district.
- J. Transfer student records in a timely manner, between and among all MPS (including charter and partnership) schools and from all MPS schools to other schools, including parental choice schools, and aggressively pursue the receipt of student records from schools outside MPS.

Corrective Action Requirements for Milwaukee Public Schools District in Need of Improvement – Level 4 (2009-10) Implementation Benchmarks

I. Increase Student Attendance through Collaborative Community-wide Solutions.

- A. Form school and district parent action teams that build upon current efforts by using the nine-cluster infrastructure to focus on regular attendance for all students in all MPS schools.
 - 1. Coordinate with the DPI VISTA project to use resources, including VISTA members assigned to the Milwaukee-based Parents Plus of Wisconsin, to support each cluster.
- 5 Corrective Action Requirements December 8, 2009

2. Coordinate support for parent engagement with the Milwaukee Innovation and Improvement Advisory Council.

Benchmarks:

- Maintain a Central Services Title I parent liaison representative and parent information specialists for each cluster. Strengthen the parent involvement staffing for each cluster.
- Utilize the DPI VISTA project to help ensure that each MPS school has a functioning School Governance Council. The work of the councils will include a focus on increasing student attendance.
- Provide documentation to DPI that all School Governance Councils have been established by October 1, 2009.
- Establish a District Parent Action Team made up of representatives from each of the system of support clusters by November 1, 2009. The work of the District Parent Action Team should be coordinated with the Milwaukee Innovation and Improvement Advisory Council.
- Train School Governance Council members, including parents and staff by December 1, 2009.
- Each School Governance Council must identify school level strategies to increase student attendance by January 15, 2010. The strategies identified must be based on the city-wide attendance, drop-out prevention and recovery plan and incorporate comments from MPS stakeholders including the Milwaukee PTA Council and the Milwaukee Parent Congress. Implementation of school level strategies must begin second semester.
- By June 30, 2010, MPS will submit a report to DPI summarizing the efforts of each School Governance Council and results for improving attendance in the clusters.
- B. Collaborate and partner with the Milwaukee Innovation and Improvement Advisory Council to involve community organizations and non-profits in efforts to raise regular school attendance.
- C. Coordinate the work of City Year mentors with other efforts to improve attendance.

Benchmarks (items B and C):

- Develop a city-wide attendance, dropout prevention and recovery plan that is integrated with previous alliance for attendance efforts and submit it to DPI by December 1, 2009. The plan must include timelines for implementation beginning second semester as well as strategies to incorporate the work of the City Year Mentors in 2010-11.
- Submit a report summarizing actions to meet this requirement and results, including student attendance and graduation rates for the district and each school by June 30, 2010.

- D. Sustain and improve current Community Learning Centers, employing highly qualified teachers to provide academic tutoring in reading and mathematics to students with greatest needs.
- E. Implement before- and/or after-school tutoring in English/language arts and mathematics in all Title I SIFI schools.
- F. Implement a 9th grade support program in all high schools to ensure successful transition to high school.
- G. Implement a credit recovery program in all high schools for all students who are credit deficient.

Benchmarks (items D, E, F, and G):

- In schools with a CLC or Title I SIFI, implement strategies to recruit and retain students with the greatest needs for tutoring services by the beginning of second semester.
- Recruit highly qualified teachers to provide *academic tutoring* that is aligned with the day school program in all Community Learning Centers (CLC) by November 1, 2009.
- Provide academic tutoring in each CLC for at least 20 regularly attending students, for at least three hours a week by November 30, 2009.
- Offer Supplemental Educational Services in all Title I SIFI, with priority given to Level 2 SIFI and above, by November 30, 2009.
- Submit to DPI by November 1, 2009, a description of the specific, coordinated, cross-district strategies that will be implemented in all high schools to achieve successful 9th grade transition. Submit to DPI by November 1, 2009, a description of the specific, coordinated, cross-district strategies that will be implemented in all high schools to ensure credit recovery for students who are credit-deficient.
- Monitor the implementation of tutoring programs and student progress using district tools and student attendance to measure student gains.
- Provide regular updates to DPI via monthly meetings as to the challenges and successes the district is experiencing concerning tutoring, high school transition and credit recovery efforts.
- **II.** Ensure a System of Quality and Consistency in Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Using a System of Early Intervening Services (EIS) PK-12 for All Students. The system must be approved by the independent expert appointed by the federal district court to carry out the *Jamie S*. settlement and must include the following:
 - A. Instruction in reading, mathematics, and positive behaviors for all students based on state standards, maximizing instructional time, using scientific research-based curricula provided by effective teachers, and monitored for implementation integrity.
 - 1. Implement 90-minute reading block and 60-minute mathematics block for grades K-3, 60 minute blocks in reading and mathematics in grades 4-8, and reading intervention courses for grades 9-12 in all schools.

- 2. Implement the comprehensive district-wide plan for literacy that is standards-based, articulated across levels, and uses a limited number of programs which was part of the 2008-09 Corrective Action Requirements.
- 3. Continue implementation of a district-wide plan for mathematics instruction that uses a limited number of programs.
- 4. Develop a district-wide assessment policy and system which includes standards-based formative, benchmark, and summative assessment that allows analysis and reporting at the student, classroom, and school levels.

Benchmark:

- Ensure that 50% of all MPS schools, including all Title I SIFI, are meeting the instructional time requirements specified above for the 2009-10 school year. Provide a list of the schools meeting the requirement to DPI at the September 9, 2009 MPS/DPI DIFI meeting.
- Submit a list of the specific programs used in mathematics for all students by November 1, 2009.
- Provide school schedules documenting required math and reading instruction time and reading intervention courses for the 50% of schools by October 30. DPI will verify school schedules during the 2009-10 school year.
- Submit a revised district-wide Comprehensive Literacy plan by October 30, 2009. The revised plan must address the clarifications, additions and edits requested in the August 27, 2009 letter from Dr. Thayer.
- For the 30 schools implementing PBIS, provide the following data reports by December 15, 2009 and May 14, 2010:
 - Data equivalent to the SWIS and from EBS measures
 - Copies of all Benchmarks of Quality (BoQ) or similar measures
 - Copies of all School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET) or similar measures
 - For the 30 schools implementing PBIS, provide the following documentation by May 14, 2010:
 - Number of minutes of instruction in positive behaviors
 - Copies of the curricula used and documentation that the curricula is certified by a nationally recognized PBIS consultant and that the curricula meets the national PBIS standards
 - Schedules of PBIS coaches or similar personnel providing support to teachers and leaders
 - Schedules, content, and participant ratings of formal professional development supporting PBIS
- B. Universal screening of <u>all</u> students on reading, mathematics, and behavior, conducted at least three times a year, to determine levels of need and progress in performance in core instruction.
 Benchmarks:
 - Review attendance and office referral data by teacher by grade 3 times annually for all MPS students in all MPS schools (K-12) beginning September, 2009.

- Establish a district-wide policy and system to ensure universal screening data are collected, analyzed and used to modify Tier 1 instruction and identify students in need of additional support. Present the district-wide implementation plan at the November, 2009 MPS/DIFI meeting.
- For the 2009-10 school year, conduct universal screening in literacy and numeracy for 95% of MPS students K-8 in January and May, 2010. Screening tools must meet the standards established by the National RtI Center.
- In subsequent school years, conduct universal screening 3 times annually in literacy and numeracy for 95% of MPS students K-8.
- Establish one consistent district-wide universal screening tool for each core academic course required for graduation for all students in grades 9-12 in all MPS schools by June 30, 2010. Screening tools must meet the standard of convincing evidence established by the National RtI Center.
- Submit documentation of a school-based procedure to be used by all schools three times a year beginning October 2009 that determines the names and numbers of students at-risk and in need of intervention by December 15, 2009, and May 14, 2010.
- Provide the following data reports by December 15, 2009 and May 14, 2010:
 - By grade and by school the number and percent of students enrolled that were screened in reading, math, and behavior (attendance and referrals to the office)
 - The performance in reading and math by teacher, by grade, by school of all students screened
 - Documentation by teacher, by grade, by school of all students screened for behavior. For purpose of these screenings, data on referrals to the office and actions taken will include, by individual student, suspensions, calls to the police, and calls to parents to pick up their child from school before the end of the school day
- Provide a description of the process by which data will be derived on students retained in grade from previous school year annually by December 15, 2009.
- Provide a report for the current school year of students retained in grade from previous school year by student name, by grade, and by school by February 15, 2010.
- C. Scientific research-based interventions (small group and customized) for reading, mathematics, and positive behavior provided to students based on measured relative need and implemented with integrity.
 - 1. Summer school with mathematics and reading focus in all Title I schools identified for improvement (SIFI).
 - 2. Extended calendars of a minimum of 30 additional days of instruction in one or two Title I SIFI schools must be implemented by the beginning of the 2010-11 school year.

Benchmarks:

• Title I grants include expenditures and plans for summer school for all Title I SIFI.

- Provide the schedule and staffing of each summer school session with a mathematics and/or reading focus for each school by June 14, 2010.
- Submit a plan for the implementation of extended calendars in 2010-11 by February 1, 2010. The plan should describe the role of School Governance Councils in identifying the schools to implement extended calendar.
- Provide a list describing the specific interventions, the specific area of student need these interventions in reading, math and behavior address, the evidence supporting its use, the implementation integrity measure, and the professional development needed to support its use by May 14, 2010.
- In consultation with the independent expert, identify the required data elements of a district-wide system to collect intervention data, including student performance data and implementation integrity by June 30, 2010.
- D. Progress monitoring (two measures performance and implementation integrity) for interventions that yield reliable and valid measures used by the school to determine the needed level of intensity of service, degree of implementation, and effectiveness of each specific intervention. Benchmark:
 - Provide documentation that describes the specific progress monitoring practices in reading, math and behavior and how these practices address "level of need," the evidence supporting its use, the performance measure, and the professional development needed to support its use in 2010-2011 school year by June 30, 2010
- E. Parent/Family/Community involvement efforts of school personnel that inform about specific services being provided, solicits input for continuous improvement, actively involves the community in the operation of EIS, and measures the involvement of families over time in every MPS school. Benchmark:
 - Establish a dissemination plan to help families understand the system of early intervening services including an understanding of their child's universal screening data by January 2010. The plan must be implemented second semester.
 - By May 14, 2010, provide documentation by school of:
 - The efforts by school personnel to solicit parent/family input for continuous improvement of a school's SEIS
 - The efforts by school personnel to increase the measured involvement of parents/families based on the six Family Involvement Standards
- F. Professional development for educators based on National Staff Development Council Standards including measured needs of the school that ensure improvement in student performance. Benchmarks:

- Designate a single Central Services staff person to direct professional development activities for staff in all MPS schools related to a system of early intervening services by October 1, 2009. Provide documentation of appointment.
- Develop a district-wide professional development plan to ensure that staff in all MPS schools have the capacity to consistently collect and report attendance and office disciplinary referral data using a standard district definition, analyze universal screening data and use the data to effectively modify instruction. The plan must be given to DPI by January 4, 2010 with implementation to begin second semester.
- Provide DPI with a schedule of data workshops to be implemented in 2009-10 school year by January 4, 2010. Content and implementation of the data workshops must be consistent with the recommendations of the independent expert.
- By December 15, 2009 and May 14, 2010, provide documentation of professional development including coaching offered and participation rates disaggregated by teacher and by school relative to:
 - Consistent collection and reporting of student attendance and office disciplinary referral data using a standard district definition
 - Collecting universal screening data
 - Analyzing universal screening data and using the data to modify instruction
 - Reading and mathematics instruction
- G. Educational leadership that effectively manages all components of a system of early intervening services, maximizes instructional time, uses problem-solving approaches, and periodically involves all stakeholders in evaluating the results of SEIS using current data.
 - Develop and submit a comprehensive, district-wide policy directing all schools to implement universal screening in literacy, numeracy and behavior for all students by January 4, 2010.
 - Establish and submit procedures by January 4, 2010 to supervise all MPS principals and school leaders to ensure universal screening in literacy, numeracy and behavior is implemented according to the schedule in Appendix A.
 - Establish and submit Central Services procedures by April 10, 2010 to ensure that schools failing to meet universal screening expectations implement a Plan of Rapid Compliance. The Plan of Rapid Compliance must ensure that the school is in compliance within 6 months.
 - Submit a copy of the form to be used to document the Plan of Rapid Compliance by April 10, 2010.
 - Develop and submit a district-wide plan by May 1, 2010 to consistently implement a system of early intervening services for all MPS students in all MPS schools that incorporates the 14 essential components and the Phases of

Implementation as described by the independent expert according to the schedule in Appendix A.

- By December 15, 2009 and May 14, 2010, provide documentation of meetings with the Independent Expert to develop:
 - a district-wide plan for SEIS
 - implementation integrity measures for reading and math K-8 and procedures for data collection to begin 2010-11
 - a district-wide assessment system and policy for assessing standardsbased universal screening, formative benchmarks, and summative assessments that allow analyses and reporting at the student, classroom, and school levels for literacy and numeracy at K-8 schools and behavior K-12 to be implemented at the beginning of the 2010-11 school year
 - at least one district-wide universal screening measure for each core course required for graduation that allows analysis and reporting at the student, classroom, and school levels to be used beginning the 2010-11 school year
 - interventions (Tier 2 and 3) in reading, math and behavior to be used by all schools following the schedule noted in Appendix A
 - progress monitoring practices (Tiers 2 and 3) in reading, math, and behavior to determine the needed level of intensity of service to students
 - a dissemination plan to help families understand the system of early intervening services including an understanding of their child's universal screening data.
- III. Ensure a Consistent, Transparent and High Quality System of Accountability in Milwaukee Public Schools for School Improvement, Teacher Quality, and Financial and Operational Management.
 - A. Meet, in accordance with federal law, all agreed upon timelines and ESEA requirements for DIFI, SIFI, and the ESEA Consolidated Application. Benchmarks:
 - Submit the 2008-09 ESEA Consolidated End-of-Year Report by August 31, 2009.
 - Submit required corrective action resulting from 2008-09 ESEA monitoring by the deadline indicated in the monitoring report.
 - Submit the district ESEA Consolidated Application, including Title I ARRA funds, by August 31, 2009.
 - Submit the district IDEA application, including IDEA ARRA funds, by August 31, 2009.
 - Meet with DPI staff regarding required revisions to the ESEA Consolidated Application by October 30, 2009.
 - Update the district DIFI Plan for 2009-10 by October 15, 2009.
 - Submit evidence to DPI of parent notification of DIFI status by

¹² Corrective Action Requirements December 8, 2009

October 15, 2009.

- Demonstrate compliance with all federal requirements for Title I during 2009-10 ESEA monitoring.
- B. Continue the restructuring of the district and coordination of service through the MPS District and School Accountability Model, using the system of nine support clusters of MPS schools to ensure consistent implementation of the corrective action requirements.
- C. Use the nine support clusters to ensure accountability for school improvement through development, monitoring, and technical assistance related to implementation of school improvement plans for all MPS schools. Benchmarks (items B and C):
 - Maintain an MPS DIFI Director, and designate Central Office leads for each section of the Corrective Action Requirements by July 1, 2009.
 - The MPS DIFI Director, key MPS administrators, MPS School Improvement Supervisors, and the Board President or designee will meet monthly with the DPI Director of DIFI and key DPI administrators to monitor implementation of the Corrective Action Requirements.
 - Each August the MPS Superintendent, MPS DIFI Director, and other key administrators shall meet with the State Superintendent and Cabinet to review implementation of the Corrective Action Requirements.
- D. Ensure all educators are appropriately licensed for their assignments, are highly qualified under ESEA, and are receiving professional development as specified by the Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative (PI 34), state statute, and ESEA. Benchmarks:
 - Submit PI-1202 Fall Staff Report, which includes the position/assignment of all MPS staff between December 15, 2009 and January 15, 2010.
 - Submit PI-9550-IIC Highly Qualified Teacher Plan, which includes a listing of all core subject area teachers who are not highly qualified by December 15, 2009.
 - Submit a list of educators who were hired after data was provided on the PI-1202 and supply evidence of whether each is appropriately licensed or has applied for a DPI license by February 1, 2010.
 - Submit evidence that ESEA parental notification requirements regarding highly qualified teachers have been fulfilled by February 15, 2010.
 - Correct any coding errors to the PI-1202 Fall Staff Report by Report between March 1 and March 15, 2010.
 - Submit final PI-9550-IIC Highly Qualified Teacher Plan by June 1, 2010.
- E. Require induction support, including mentors, for all initial educators and educators with emergency permits or licenses beginning on the first day of school. Benchmarks:
 - Provide an electronic list of all first year educator assignments, school and/or building site(s) by October 9, 2009.
 - Provide a description of the MPS induction support system for all initial educators (teachers, pupil services, administrators) by September 1, 2009 (or the first day of school). Include:

- A description of the services that will occur at the school/building level for all initial educators.
- A description of the mentor training programs (content and timelines) for teachers, pupil services, and administrators.
- A description of the support seminars that is required for all initial educators.
- A description of the ongoing orientation programs provided for all initial educators.
- A description of how the induction support will be administered and implemented.
- A description of how development of a professional development plan is integrated in the induction system.
- A description of how the induction program will be evaluated both through formative and summative assessment and how the findings will be used to improve the program.
- Provide a description of the MPS induction support system for emergency permit and licensed teachers.
 - Provide an electronic list of all teachers hired on an emergency license or permit by October 9, 2009.
 - Provide an electronic list of assignments, school and/or building site(s) and the induction support provided for all teachers hired on an emergency license or permit by October 9, 2009.
- Provide an electronic list of all new (hired after October 9) first year initial educators (teachers, pupil services, administrators) and their mentors by December 15, 2009. Include their names, assignments, school and/or building site(s).
- Provide an electronic list of all new (hired after October 9) teachers hired on an emergency license or permit by December 15, 2009. Include their names, assignments, school and/or building site(s), and the induction support provided for each.
- Provide an electronic list of all new (hired after December 15) first year initial educators (teachers, pupil services, administrators) and their mentors by February 1, 2010. Include their names, assignments, school and/or building site(s).
- By February 1, 2010, provide an electronic list of all teachers hired on an emergency license or permit after December 15, 2009. Include their names, assignments, school and/or building site(s) and the induction support provided for each.
- Provide update reports on the implementation of induction activities to support first year initial educators and emergency permit and licensed teachers by November 16, 2009, March 15, 2010, and June 15, 2010.
- F. Provide highly skilled and experienced teachers in schools categorized as high need and with low student achievement.
 Benchmarks:

- Analyze data to determine distribution patterns of highly skilled and experienced MPS teachers by November 2, 2009. (*Note: highly skilled and experienced for 2009-10 will include licensure for assignment and years of experience.*)
- Use the data to identify schools with high needs and low student achievement in need of highly skilled and experienced teachers by December 1, 2009. Priority must be given to Title I SIFI.
- Recruit Master teachers as defined by MPS for service in schools categorized as high need and with low student achievement by February 1, 2010.
- G. Provide individually tailored support for principals in all Title I SIFI schools. Benchmarks:
 - All Title I SIFI principals attend the New Wisconsin Promise Conference in January 2010.
 - Select principals of Title I SIFI to attend the DPI Principals' Leadership Retreat in June 2010.
 - Report on the assessment of Title I SIFI principal professional development needs and the system established to meet those needs at the December and June DPI/MPS DIFI meetings.
- H. Coordinate the use of federal funds with the DPI federal funds trustee. Benchmarks:
 - Participate in federal entitlement grant writing meetings with key DPI staff by August 17, 2009.
 - The DPI federal funds trustee must review MPS federal entitlement grant applications, particularly ESEA and IDEA, to ensure funds are utilized to implement the corrective action requirements.
 - MPS financial and program staff provide jointly developed quarterly reports to the DPI federal fund trustee on the progress made in implementation of each federal entitlement program and the Title I School Improvement grants to ensure program objectives are met and funds are utilized in a timely and appropriate manner.
- I. Design, implement, and use a data warehouse that meets the business, human resource, and education accountability needs of the school district. Benchmarks:
 - Develop a plan by September 1, 2009 to ensure that teacher licensing, assignment, and mentoring data are entered correctly into the human resources database. Implementation of the plan must begin no later than October 9, 2009.
 - Extend the process of developing data dashboards beyond administrators to classroom teachers. The teacher dashboards shall include timely data about the students in their classes.
 - Continue to integrate data elements into the data warehouse, including district and school financial data.
 - Continue to offer data retreats and professional development for school staff and key central services staff about using new and existing data tools.

- Include a demonstration of the data warehouse as part of the December 2009 and May 2010 DPI/MPS DIFI meetings.
- J. Transfer student records in a timely manner, between and among all MPS (including charter and partnership) schools and from all MPS schools to other schools, including parental choice schools, and aggressively pursue the receipt of student records from schools outside MPS. Benchmark:
 - Establish an internal workgroup to monitor the implementation of related districts policies and procedures by September 1, 2009.

APPENDIX 29 - (E)(2)(ii) 2009-10 Corrective Action Plan for MPS

		Grades K-8	Grades 9-12	
	Academics	Behavior	Academics	Behavior
2009-10	Universal	Universal		Universal
	Screening	Screening		Screening
2010-11	Tier 1	Tier 1	Universal	Tier 1
			Screening	
2011-12	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 1	Tier 2
2012-13	Tier 3	Tier 3	Tier 2	Tier 3
2013-14			Tier 3	

Appendix A Phases of Implementation for a System of Early Intervening Services In the Milwaukee Public Schools
APPENDIX 30 - (E)(2) - MPS District School Improvement Accountability Model Under NCLB

MPS District & School Improvement Accountability Model Under NCLB



APPENDIX 31 - (E)(2) Turnaround & Transformation Models Criteria for Interventions: Turnaround Model

Strategy	Essential Components in a District	Essential Components in a School
I. Replace the	Required	Required
principal and at least 50% of the staff	 A. Place principals in turnaround schools who have demonstrated success in low performing schools. B. Identify incentives for staff and principal to ensure that the most effective staff and leader(s) work at the lowest performing schools and ensure a level of sustainability and stability. C. Collaborate with the union to implement practices to reassign teaching staff to other schools whose skills are not matched to the turnaround model school including creating memoranda of 	A. Redeploy teaching staff who offer valuable skills but are not effective in current role and bring in new staff with specialized skills and competencies.
	understanding (MOU.)	
II. Build effective	Required	Required
principal leadership	 A. Provide on-going, systematic professional development for leaders in turnaround schools to ensure their continued growth as highly effective principals. B. Provide on-going opportunities for principals from different schools to come together to learn about successful practices that are impacting their schools. C. Create on-going opportunities for principals to communicate their needs and perspectives to leaders responsible for planning their professional development. 	 A. Signal the need and urgency for dramatic changes from the status quo. B. Articulate expectations of highly effective staff. C. Build commitment and consensus with staff, parents, and community partners around a clearly defined mission and school improvement goals. D. Demonstrate a clear need and focus on professional development, where learning and problem solving occur throughout the school every day. E. Design a schedule to create learning blocks that allow teachers to meet in teams for instructional planning, development of assessments, addressing student learning needs, and professional development work. F. Ensure a high degree of accountability for team/committee work and school performance through public reporting and results.

APPENDIX 31 - (E)(2) Turnaround & Transformation Models Criteria for Interventions: Turnaround Model

III. Adopt a new	Required	Required		
governance structure	 A. Provide schools with defined autonomy and support, i.e., clearly define the expectations and anticipated results, but give the school the opportunity to research and develop practices and models that have demonstrated success in impacting student learning. B. Provide support for implementation of a Response to Intervention model. Desired C. Place a school improvement facilitator/ turnaround coach in the school. D. Create partnerships with external organizations, universities, and community groups to build capacity and to support efforts of turnaround schools. 	 A. Establish a leadership team that has responsibility for oversight of data analysis, the school improvement plan, and school policies and practices that promote student learning. B. Consciously build and distribute teacher leadership throughout the school. C. Clearly define roles and responsibilities for staff responsible for school improvement, e.g., school improvement facilitator, instructional coach, principal, leadership team, etc. D. Build community and parent/family ownership and support for school reform and involve these stakeholder groups as true partners in site-based decisions. 		
IV. Implement a new	Required	Required		
or revised	Framework:	Framework:		
instructional	A. Articulate an instructional vision for the district.	A. Conduct a School Self-Assessment to determine		
program	B. Define core curricular content for grades K-12.	areas of strength and high priority areas for		
program	C. Establish grade-level benchmarks.	improvement.		
	D. Define a balanced assessment system and	B. Build an academic press for achievement with the		
	provide necessary support for school	expectation that all students will achieve at high		
	implementation that is aligned with the DPI			
	recommendations, "Crafting a Balanced System	C. Align all curriculum and instruction to the standards,		
	of Assessment in Wisconsin.	Denchmarks, and assessments at each grade level.		
	E. Conduct a District Self-Assessment to determine	D. Ensure that the school climate is ordenly, respectivel,		
	improvement in low performing schools and	and supports student learning through clear and enforced expectations for student behavior		
	develop a plan to support these schools	F Build in strategies that promote a warm climate where		
4	F. Assess the strengths and needs of each	all students feel connected to the school and know		
	turnaround school and collaboratively develop and	that there are adults who care about their success.		
	design a revised instructional model that will result	F. Examine current systems and practices that are		
	in student success.	barriers to all students achieving at high levels.		
	G. Ensure that staff have the knowledge and skills to	G. Promote a culture of innovation and risk-taking that		
	align their curriculum and instruction to the	creates opportunities for students to be successful in		
	standards, benchmarks and assessments at each	exciting and authentic learning environments.		
	grade level.			
	H. Align federal and school improvement plans to	Support and Interventions:		
	ensure that they are coordinated and provide	H. Establish a clearly articulated plan for identifying		
12/15/2009 12:32 PM	Wisconsin Department	of Public Instruction		

2

	coherence for school improvement at the	students for interventions, tracking interventions for
	turnaround school.	students, and monitoring progress.
		 Establish roles and expectations for classroom
	Support and Interventions:	teachers, Title I teachers, curriculum specialists,
	I. Provide support for extended learning	interventionists, etc. in meeting the needs of all
	opportunities.	students.
	I Reallocate resources to align with goals and	I Evaluate intervention plans core curriculum and
	programs of turnaround school to ensure the	ongoing student needs to adapt core instruction as
	aroatest potential for success	well as supplemental instruction
	V Drouido ophaolo flovibility to implement practicas	K Ensure that funds are directed to students with
	K. Provide schools nexibility to implement practices	K. Ensure that funds are directed to students with
	that enhance the ability of staff to collaborate,	greatest needs.
	extend learning time, or implement other research-	
	based strategies designed by the staff/principal.	Assessment:
	L. Ensure that staff has the time and the skills to	L. Analyze student achievement data and continually
	evaluate intervention plans, curriculum, and	monitor progress to identify key areas of focus for
	individual student needs to adapt core and	improvement.
	supplemental instruction.	
	Assessment:	
	M. Design a plan and monitoring strategies to assess	
	the progress of the instructional program at the	
	turnaround school and make adjustments to	
	ensure success of students.	
	N. Using a variety of strategies, communicate the	
	work of the turnaround school as a model of	
	innovation, both within and outside the district	
V Boorwit roplace	Required	Required
	Recruit:	Recruit:
and retain effective	A Identify teachers within the district who have been	A Publiciza critoria for candidatos for staff reassignment
staff	A. Identity teachers within the district who have been	A. Fublicize chiefla for candidates for star reassignment.
	succession in low performing schools and	D. Demonstrate alignment of school goals with new
4		staning patierns (i.e., ninng instructional coaches,
	turnaround school.	curriculum specialists, etc.)
	B. Implement plans to recruit teachers from outside	
	the district who have demonstrated success in low	
	performing schools.	Replace:
	C. Identify barriers to teaching in low performing	C. Redeploy staff who offer valuable skills but are not
	schools and design strategies to address those	effective in current role, and bring in new staff with
	issues.	specialized skills and competencies.
	D. Design incentives to attract teachers to work in	 D. Ensure that teacher evaluation system is aligned to
	turnaround schools.	progress toward school goals.
	Replace:	Retain:

12/15/2009 12:32 PM

	E. F.	Collaborate with the teachers' union to implement practices that allow administrators to reassign staff whose skills are not matched with needs of the turnaround school. Collaborate with the teachers' union to allow for transfer of highly effective teachers to the turnaround school.	E. <u>Desirec</u> <i>Recruit.</i>	Provide on-going support, assistance, and professional development to teachers to ensure that they continue to build the necessary skills to be successful in the turnaround school.
		4	F.	Provide feedback to district about recruitment needs,
	Retain:			successes, and challenges.
	G.	Provide financial and/or other incentives to	Retain:	
		recognize teacher commitment to improved	G.	Provide multiple opportunities for teachers to be
		student achievement.		recognized for how they have improved student
	Н.	Implement a teacher mentoring program		achievement.
		specifically designed to support teachers in		
	-	turnaround schools.		
	D.	Provide on-going opportunities for teachers from		
		different schools to come together to learn about		
		successful practices that are impacting their		
	Е	Schools.		
	∟.	create on-going opportunities for teachers to		
		loadors responsible for planning their professional		
		development		
	Desired	<u>i</u>		
	I	Use technologies and networks to recruit teachers		
		who want to work in the district's most challenging		
		schools.		
	J.	Design a rubric describing the skills and		
		competencies of highly effective staff that is used		
40		to identify strengths and gaps.		
	Retain:			
	Κ.	Engage teachers in discussions and decisions		
		around district goals and planning for turnaround		
		schools.		
	L.	Provide on-going opportunities for teachers from		
		different schools to come together to learn		
		together and collaborate.		
	М.	Publicize the successes of the turnaround school		

12/15/2009 12:32 PM

APPENDIX 31 - (E)(2) Turnaround & Transformation Models Criteria for Interventions: Turnaround Model

	to the community.			
VI. Provide on-going,	<u>Required</u>	<u>Required</u>		
high quality, job-	A. Establish standards that link professional	A. Provide targeted and differentiated professional		
embedded	development to student achievement. (See	development to address the needs of teachers based		
nrofessional	National Staff Development Council standards)	on their content and pedagogical knowledge.		
development	http://www.nsdc.org/standards/index.cfm	B. Continually document the effectiveness of the		
development	B. Analyze student achievement data across low	professional development initiatives and modify		
	performing schools to determine areas that need	practices as necessary.		
	to be targeted for professional development in	Desired		
	turnaround schools.	Desired		
	C. Align resources and differentiate support to low	C. Hire an on-site school improvement facilitator/coach to		
	performance areas in turnaround schools.	focus on the professional development needs of staff.		
	A. Design a comprehensive professional	D. Share leadership responsibilities among staff for		
	development plan to support staff's use of a	providing high quality learning opportunities.		
	variety of data and assessment strategies.			
	D. Create principal learning communities that bring			
	principals together to learn and support each			
	other's restructuring efforts.			
	E. Provide learning opportunities for school-based			
	teams to work more effectively.			
	Desired			
	E Provide on going opportunities for teachers from			
	different schools to come tegether to learn			
	together and collaborate around common student			
VII Promoto the	Required	Required		
vii. Fromote the	B Implement a comprehensive system for collecting	A Use data to determine high priority instructional areas		
continuous use of	and using a variety of data that can be	and set goals for school improvement		
student data	disaggregated by student groups and can inform	B Make student performance goals assessments and		
	the instruction of individual students in	b. Make student performance goals, assessments and measures clear, widely understood and available		
4	classrooms	C Improve the data literacy of all staff is learn how to		
	C Differentiate resources to turnaround schools	design assessments implement a broad range of		
	hased on analysis of student data	assessments and discuss results		
	D Implement a data system that monitors	D Use data to make instructional decisions about		
	interventions of individuals and droups of	support to individual students		
	students	F Monitor and report progress toward goals		
	F Provide support to schools in the development of	systematically and frequently		
	formative and henchmark assessments that help	systematically and nequently.		
	define what students are learning and identify			
	ans that must be addressed	Desired		
	gaps that must be addressed.	200104		

12/15/2009 12:32 PM

	 F. Provide support to schools to continually monitor their data in order to make timely adjustments to improve instruction. <u>Desired</u> G. Design a data system that measures individual atudant academic growth over time. 	F. Report performance measures in different languages and using different media.
	Student academic growth over time.	Pequired
instructional time for students and time for staff collaboration	 A. Increase instructional time in turnaround schools by extending the school day and/or the school year. B. Assist schools in developing schedules and 	A. Design a comprehensive instructional program for students with extended learning for the school day and/or the year.
development	structures that provide for increased student learning time and time for staff collaboration and professional development.	 Desired B. Provide learning opportunities for staff to function at a high level as professional learning communities that are accountable for student learning and results.
	C. Partner with community organizations to provide programs and extended learning opportunities for students.	
IX. Provide social- emotional and community-oriented services for students	 <u>Required</u> A. Establish key partnerships with community health and social agencies to meet the needs of all students. B. Differentiate services and resources (social workers, nurses, community partnerships) to low-performing schools based on school needs. 	 Required A. Create mechanisms for students and families to link to health and social agencies to address student and family needs. B. Determine needs of individual students that interfere with their being successful at school, and target specific interventions (i.e., substance abuse prevention, anti-bullving, etc.) to them.
	Desired C. Develop partnerships between turnaround schools and a specific business, agency, state department, non-profit, etc. for on-going support and resources.	 C. Engage families as positive and productive partners to support the learning and growth of their students. D. Include assessment of social and emotional issues in school improvement planning and targeting of resources. <u>Desired</u>
		E. Develop programs and support to families that provide resources and learning opportunities that go beyond the school day and build the school as a center/hub for the community.

Strategy	Essential Components in a District	Essential Components in a School		
I. Staff the	Required	Required		
transformation model	A. Replace the principal who led the school prior	A. Redeploy teaching staff who offer valuable		
school with highly	to commencement of the implementation of	skills but are not effective in current role and		
effective teachers and	the transformation model, unless the principal	bring in new staff with specialized skills and		
school leaders	B Place a principal in the transformation model	B Identify and remove teachers and other staff		
Serie of reducts	school who has demonstrated success in low	who do not improve student achievement		
	performing schools.	outcomes.		
	C. Collaborate with teachers' union to allow for	C. Use a variety of evaluations to improve		
	transfer of highly effective teachers to the	teachers' performance, including measures of		
	transformation model school.	student growth and progress.		
	D. Implement strategies to recruit, replace and	D. Demonstrate alignment of school goals with		
	retain effective staff, including: identifying	new staffing patterns (i.e., hiring instructional		
	teachers within the district who have been	coaches, curriculum specialists, etc.)		
	effective in low performing schools; and			
	who have been effective in low performing			
	schools			
	Desired			
	E. Collaborate with the teachers' to design			
	practices to reassign staff to other schools			
	whose skills are not matched to the needs of			
	the transformation model school, including			
	(MOLL)"			
	F Provide additional compensation to attract			
	and retain high-guality educators to the			
	school.			
II. Build effective	Required	Required		
principal leadership	A. Provide on-going, systematic professional	A. Signal the need and urgency for dramatic		
	development for leaders in transformation	changes from the status quo.		
	model schools to ensure their continued	B. Articulate expectations of highly effective staff.		
	growth as highly effective principals.	C. Build commitment and consensus with staff,		
	from different schools to come together to	clearly defined mission and school		
	learn about successful practices that are	improvement goals		
	impacting their schools.	D. Demonstrate a clear need and focus on		
	C. Create on-going opportunities for principals to	professional development where learning and		
	communicate their needs and perspectives to	problem solving occur throughout the school		

12/17/2009 7:42 AM

	leaders responsible for planning the	r every day.	
	professional development.	E. Design a schedule	o create learning blocks
		that allow teachers	to meet in teams for
		instructional plannir	ig, development of
		assessments, addre	essing student learning
		needs, and profess	onal development work.
		F. Ensure a high degree	e of accountability for
		team/committee wo	rk and school performance
		through public repo	rting and results.
		G. Provide opportunitie	es for teachers to be
		recognized for how	they have improved
		student achievemer	nt.
III. Implement	Required	Required	
comprehensive	Framework:	Framework:	
instructional reform	 A. Articulate an instructional vision for t 	he A. Conduct a School S	Self-Assessment to
stratagios	district.	determine areas of	strength and high priority
sualeyies	 B. Define core curricular content for gra 	des K-12. areas for improvem	ent.
	C. Establish grade-level benchmarks.	B. Build an academic	press for achievement with
	D. Define a balanced assessment systematic systemate systematic systematic systematic	m and the expectation that	all students will achieve
	provide necessary support for schoo	at high levels.	
	implementation that is aligned with the	ne DPI C. Align all curriculum	and instruction to the
	recommendations, "Crafting a Balan	ced standards, benchm	arks, and assessments at
	System of Assessment in Wisconsin	." each grade level.	
	E. Conduct a District Self-Assessment	D. Ensure that the sch	ool climate is orderly,
	determine areas of strength and high	priority respectful, and sup	ports student learning
	areas for improvement in low perform	ning through clear and e	nforced expectations for
	schools.	student behavior, w	here bullying and
	F. Assess the strengths and needs of e	ach harassment are not	tolerated. Build in
	transformation model school and	strategies that pron	ote a warm climate where
	collaboratively develop and design a	revised all students feel cor	nected to the school and
	instructional model that will result in	student know that there are	adults who care about
	success.	their success.	
	G. Ensure that staff have the knowledg	e and E. Examine current sy	stems and practices that
	skills to align their curriculum and ins	struction are barriers to all st	udents achieving at high
	to the standards, benchmarks and	levels.	
	assessments at each grade level.	F. Promote a culture of	if innovation and risk-
	H. Use data to identify and implement	taking that creates	opportunities for students
	comprehensive, research-based, ins	tructional to be successful in	exciting and authentic
	reform strategies that are vertically a	ligned learning environme	nts.
	from one grade to the next.	G. Design a schedule	to create learning blocks
	I. Align federal and school improveme	that allow teachers	to meet in teams for

12/17/2009 7:42 AM

 ensure that they are coordinated and provide coherence for school improvement at the transformation model school. J. Provide more time for students to learn core academic content by expanding the school day, the school week, or the school year, and/or increase instructional time for core academic subjects during the school day. 	 instructional planning, development of assessments, addressing student learning needs, and professional development work. Support and Interventions: H. Establish a clearly articulated plan for identifying students for interventions, tracking interventions for students, and monitoring progress.
 Support and Interventions: K. Establish a clearly articulated district plan for supports and interventions for struggling students. L. Reallocate resources to align with goals and programs of transformation model school to ensure the greatest potential for success 	 I. Evaluate intervention plans, core curriculum, and ongoing student needs to adapt core instruction, as well as supplemental instruction. J. Ensure that funds are directed to students with greatest needs.
 M. Provide schools flexibility to implement practices that enhance the ability of staff to collaborate, extend learning time, or implement other research-based strategies designed by the staff/principal. 	Assessment: K. Analyze student achievement data and continually monitor progress to identify key areas of focus for improvement. Desired
N. Ensure that staff has the time and the skills to evaluate intervention plans, curriculum, and individual student needs to adapt core and supplemental instruction.	 Framework: L. Increase rigor at high schools by offering opportunities for all students to enroll in advanced coursework, such as Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate,
Assessment: O. Continually monitor the progress of the instructional program at the transformation	early college high schools, dual enrollment programs, or thematic learning academies that prepare students for college and careers.
 model school and make adjustments to ensure success of students. P. Institute a system for assessing impact of changes in instructional practices resulting from professional development. 	 M. Improve student transition from middle to high school through summer programs, freshmen academies, or other programs. N. Restructure the school day to add time for strategies such as advisory periods that huild
 D. Use a variety of assessments to evaluate teachers that are based in significant measure on student growth to improve school leaders' 	relationships between students and staff.
Desired Support and Intervention:	 O. Increase graduation rates through, for example, credit-recovery programs, smaller learning communities, and opportunities to accelerate beyond basic reading and

	Q. Publicize the successes of the transformation mathematics skills.
	model school to the community.
IV. Provide on-going,	Required Required
high guality, job-	A. Establish standards that link professional A. Design a comprehensive professional
embedded professional	development to student achievement. development plan for the school with subject-
embedded professional	B. Analyze student achievement data across low specific pedagogy and instruction that reflects
development	performing schools to determine areas thata deeper understanding of the community
	need to be targeted for professional served by the school.
	development in transformation model schools. B. Provide targeted and differentiated
	C. Align resources and differentiate support to professional development to address the
	low performance areas in transformation needs of teachers based on their content and
	model schools. pedagogical knowledge.
	D. Create principal learning communities that C. Continually document the effectiveness of the
	bring principals together to learn and support professional development initiatives.
	each other's restructuring efforts. D. Provide learning opportunities in differentiated
	E. Provide learning opportunities for school- instruction to ensure that staff are equipped to
	based teams to work more effectively. facilitate effective teaching with a wide
	continuum of learners.
	Desired
	F. Provide on-going opportunities for teachers Desired
	from different schools to come together to E. Hire an on-site school improvement
	learn together and collaborate around facilitator/coach to focus on the professional
	common student learning challenges. development needs of staff.
	F. Share leadership responsibilities among staff
	for providing high quality learning
	opportunities.
	G. Provide learning opportunities for staff to
	function at a high level as professional
	learning communities.
V. School governance,	Required Required
operations and	A. Implement a comprehensive self-assessment A. Create specific positions and opportunities for
comprehensive support	of the school to determine the highest priority teachers to serve in leadership roles in
	needs of the school. curriculum development, instruction, and
	B. Provide schools with defined autonomy and professional development.
	support, i.e., clearly define the expectations B. Establish a leadership team that has
	and anticipated results, but give the school the responsibility for oversight of data analysis,
	opportunity to research and develop practices the school improvement plan, and school
	to implement a comprehensive approach to policies and practices that promote student
	substantially improve student achievement, learning.
	including operating flexibility (staffing, C. Clearly define roles and expectations for staff

12/17/2009 7:42 AM

 C. Assist schools in developing schedules and structures that provide for increased student learning time and time for staff collaboration and professional development. D. Provide support for implementation of a Response to Intervention model. E. Recruit, screen, and select external partners in collaboration with school staff. F. Identify incentives, and then reward staff and principal who improve student achievement outcomes. 	e.g., ictional al, :. wnership volve thers in
Desired G. Implement a weighted per pupil school based	
 VI. Promote the continuous use of student data A. Implement a comprehensive system for collecting, disaggregating, and using a variety of individual student data, through the use of formative, benchmark, and summative assessments that inform teacher and school instructional practices. B. Differentiate resources to transformation model schools based on analysis of student data. C. Implement a data system that monitors interventions of individuals and groups of students. D. Design a comprehensive professional development plan to support staff's use of a variety of data and assessment strategies. E. Provide support to schools in the development of formative and benchmark assessment strate help define what students are learning and identify gaps that must be addressed. F. Provide support to schools to continually monitor their data in order to make timely adjustments to improve instruction. 	school widely i.e. learn cuss ions goals ferent
VII. Provide social- Required Required	

12/17/2009 7:42 AM

APPENDIX 31 - (E)(2) Turnaround & Transformation Models Criteria for Interventions: Transformation Model

emotional and community-oriented services for students	A. B. C. D. <u>Desire</u> E.	Partner with community organizations, including health and social service agencies, to provide programs and extended learning opportunities for students. Differentiate services and resources (social workers, nurses, community partnerships) to low-performing schools based on school needs. Seek out additional funds to support low performing schools. Design strategies for all low performing schools to better engage and serve the families and the community. ed Develop partnerships between transformation model schools and a specific business, agency, state department, non-profit, etc. for	A. B. C. D.	Partner with parents, community and faith- based organizations, health clinics, the police department, and others to create safe school environments that meet students' social, emotional, and health needs. Determine needs of individual students that interfere with their being successful at school and target specific interventions (i.e., substance abuse prevention, anti-bullying, etc.) to them. Provide more time or opportunities for enrichment activities for students, e.g., instruction in financial literacy, internships, apprenticeships, service learning opportunities, by partnering, as appropriate, with other organizations, such as universities, non-profits, businesses, museums, etc. Engage families as positive and productive
		on-going support and resources.	<u>Desire</u> E. F.	 partners to support the learning and growth of their students. Include assessment of social and emotional issues in school improvement planning and targeting of resources. Develop programs and support to families that provide resources and learning opportunities that go beyond the school day and build the school as a center/hub for the community.

State Revenues Used to Support K-12 and Public Higher Education as a Percentage of Total Revenues Available to the State

	FY 2008	FY 2009
Total K-12 and Higher Ed	7,058,821,335	6,811,714,921
Total Net Appropriations	19,666,902,500	19,870,867,800
%	35.9%	34.3%

Elementary and Secondary Education Appropriated Amounts

	FY 2008	FY 2009
General aids	4,722,745,900	4,247,223,900
Categorical aids	617,531,900	662,903,600
School levy credits	672,400,000	822,400,000
Residential Schools	11,478,400	11,485,900
Total	6,024,156,200	5,744,013,400

Public Institutions of Higher Education Appropriated Amounts

Total K-12 and Higher Ed	7,058,821,335	6,811,714,921
Total	1,034,665,135	1,067,701,521
Wisconsin Technical College System	142,152,500	143,152,500
University of Wisconsin	892,512,635	924,549,021
	<u>FY 2008</u>	FY 2009

All Appropriations- GPR, PR, and SEG Appropriated Amounts

GPR	FY 2008	FY 2009
Gross Appropriations	13,799,410,400	14,035,965,300
Compensation Reserves	62,759,600	132,617,900
Less Lapses	-268,286,500	-1,274,768,000
Net Appropriations	13,593,883,500	12,893,815,200
PR	FY 2008	<u>FY 2009</u>
Gross Appropriations	3,237,832,000	3,346,091,600
Compensation Reserves	18,516,700	46,425,100
Net Appropriations	3,256,348,700	3,392,516,700
SEG	FY 2008	<u>FY 2009</u>
Gross Appropriations	2,799,946,800	3,542,560,200
Compensation Reserves	16,723,500	41,975,700
Net Appropriations	2,816,670,300	3,584,535,900
GPR + PR + SEG		
Total Gross Appropriations	19,837,189,200	20,924,617,100
Total Net Appns (+ comp. reserves		
- lapses)	19,666,902,500	19,870,867,800



CESA: Cooperative Educational Service Agencies

Appendix (F)(2) 2:



2009-2010 Charter Schools by Type

Note: Figure shows focus of all operating charter schools in Wisconsin during the 2009-2010 school year. Total schools= **206**