

## Appendix B2-1

### Florida Consortium MOA

#### ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

This Memorandum of Agreement (“MOA”) is entered into by and between the following States: Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Virginia (collectively the “Participating States” or “Assessment Consortium”).

**1. Purpose.** The purpose of this MOA is to form a coalition of states with a shared vision for common assessments that are internationally-benchmarked; build toward college and career readiness by the time of high school graduation; measure a common core of standards for K-12 pursuant to the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices Memorandum of Understanding (“Common Core Standards”); utilize technology for efficiency of delivery and scoring; and are cost effective. An outcome of this shared vision will be a proposal for the federal Race to the Top Assessment Competition in 2010 to develop and implement common, high-quality assessments aligned with the Common Core Standards.

**2. Lead State.** The Participating States agree that Florida shall be designated as the Lead State, and Florida accepts the designation. The Lead State shall manage the work process under this MOA and competitively bid, when determined by the Assessment Consortium, for all services and commodities required to achieve the objectives of this MOA.. In particular, the Lead State shall:

a. Direct and oversee meetings of the Assessment Consortium and set the agendas.

b. Pursuant to the laws of the Lead State, procure any necessary goods and services needed to carry out the intent of this MOA, using the most reasonable form of competitive solicitation and by quotes if no competitive solicitation is required.

c. Although the Lead State shall manage and administer the primary contracts, each Participating State shall be a party to any multi-state agreement, by direct execution or by addendum,. However, each Participating State shall be responsible for enforcing their portion of the work on any multi-state contract. In addition, the Lead State shall not be responsible for any of the contractual obligations of a Participating State.

d. Coordinate, assist, and task the Management Entity as may be reasonably necessary.

e. Serve as liaison with the U.S. Department of Education, and all other third parties on behalf of the Assessment Consortium.

f. The Lead State may resign by notifying the Participating States at least 30 days in advance by written notice. A majority of the Participating States will then appoint a new Lead State.

g. The Participating States may remove the Lead State and appoint a new Lead State by vote of a majority of the Participating States. Upon the resignation or removal of the Lead State, all contracts and other rights and obligations of the Lead State shall be assigned to the new Lead State.

**3. Management Entity.** Services of a Management Entity will be procured and utilized to assist the Consortium in conducting its work. A majority vote of the Assessment Consortium is required to award a contract to the Management Entity.

The Management Entity shall perform the following services:

a. Assist the Lead State in coordinating and running the Assessment Consortium meetings, including acting as a facilitator at the meetings.

b. Perform research and draft reports necessary for developing Requests for Proposals for goods and services.

c. Assist the Lead State in procuring goods and services as agreed upon by Participating States.

d. Provide advice and grant-writing services to the Assessment Consortium to assist them in developing the proposal for the Race to the Top Assessment Competition.

e. Perform any other activities and services that are reasonably requested by the Lead State or any Participating State in order to achieve the purposes of this MOA.

**4. Scope of Work and Responsibilities of the Participating States.** Each Participating State in the Assessment Consortium shall adopt the Common Core Standards which were developed to be internationally benchmarked and to build toward college and career readiness by the time of high school graduation. The Assessment Consortium shall, if funded by Race to the Top Assessment Competition funds, develop common, high-quality assessments which are aligned with the Common Core Standards, utilize technology for efficiency of delivery and scoring, result in a common definition of proficiency, and are cost effective. In order to achieve these deliverables, the Assessment Consortium and the individual Participating States shall perform the following activities.

a. Each Participating State will adopt the Common Core Standards using their state-approved standards-adoption process.

b. The Assessment Consortium will meet to define the process for procuring the services of a Management Entity by April 30, 2010

c. The Assessment Consortium will develop and submit a proposal for funding through the Race to the Top Assessment Competition by June 2010 or the due date established by the U.S. Department of Education.

d. The Assessment Consortium will meet, with the assistance of a Management Entity, to review the status of each Participating State's Common Core Standards adoption by August 2, 2010.

e. The Assessment Consortium will develop a plan by December 10, 2010, for sharing of test items and tasks aligned with the Common Core Standards for use in Participating States' LEAs for formative and interim assessment purposes.

**5. Meetings and Quorum.** Meetings may be called by the Lead State or a majority of the Participating States. Meetings may either be in person or by conference call. Written notice of the meeting shall be sent to all Participating States at least 48 hours in advance, by email, facsimile, or certified mail.

a. A Quorum for any meeting shall consist of designated representatives from at least two-thirds of the Participating States. An individual state may appear by phone and be counted as part of the Quorum. Each Participating State shall have one vote.

b. All actions or decisions of the Assessment Consortium shall, unless otherwise designated elsewhere in this MOA, require a majority vote to pass.

c. Actions and decisions of the Assessment Consortium may also be taken by written directive executed by a majority of the Participating States without a formal meeting.

d. Notwithstanding the above, any amendment to this MOA shall require a unanimous vote of the Participating States.

**6. Exam Results.** Each Participating State shall own their respective assessment results and any other documentation which are developed as a result of any particular state assessment. All Participating States shall jointly own all deliverables produced as a result of this MOA, and shall have the right to utilize all deliverables and documents produced under this MOA for the benefit of their respective state, subject to all state and federal confidentiality laws and regulations.

#### **7. Termination and Withdrawal of Parties.**

a. This MOA may be terminated by agreement of all the Participating States.

b. Any Participating State may withdraw from this MOA upon thirty days written notice to all Participating States. In addition, any Participating State may immediately withdraw from this MOA upon notice of a loss of state funding to support the assessment work. A notice specifying the reasons for immediate termination shall be sent as soon as possible after the termination to the Participating States.

c. A withdrawn Participating State may only participate in a contract or agreement it executed prior to its withdrawal from the Assessment Consortium and this MOA.

d. A Participating State may have their rights hereunder terminated in the event it fails to perform or comply with any of its material covenants or obligations contained in this MOA, and such failure is not remedied and cured in all material respects within fifteen (15) days after the date written notice of such failure is delivered to the Participating State by the Lead State. A termination for default under this provision shall effectively terminate all contracts and agreements entered into by the terminated Participating State which have been procured through this MOA. Upon demand by the Lead State, the terminated Participating State shall provide written proof that such agreements have been terminated. However, the determination of default must be made by a majority of the Participating States before the Lead State is authorized to take any action against a defaulting Participating State.

**8. Confidential Information.** The Participating States warrant they shall not disclose to any third party any personally identifiable information about any student, without the written consent of the Participating State that owns the data. This applies to information which came from any record or report used by the Assessment Consortium or from any education record which is subject to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, 20 U.S.C. Section 1232g. The term “educational record” shall have the meaning prescribed in 20 U.S.C. Section 1232g(a)(4).

**9. Expenses.** It is the intent of the Participating States to seek funding from various third parties for the development of the common, high quality assessments and other shared deliverables under this MOA, and for the cost of a Management Entity. However, prior to obtaining such funds, the Participating States agree that they shall equally share these expenses. Decisions on whether to incur a shared expense and the amount to incur shall be decided by a majority vote of the Assessment Consortium. Notwithstanding the above, the Participating States also agree that they shall individually pay for any state specific expenses, including travel and the costs related to any state’s use of an assessment.

#### **10. Miscellaneous Provisions.**

**a. Rules of Interpretation.** The Participating States waive application of the principle of contract construction that ambiguities are to be construed against a contract’s drafter, and agree that this MOA is a joint product of all Participating States.

**b. Assignment.** No Participating State may assign any of its rights or obligations hereunder without the prior written consent of the Assessment Consortium.

**c. Additional Documentation.** Each Participating State agrees to take such action and to execute and deliver all documents necessary to carry out the terms and conditions of this MOA.

**d. Invalidity and Severability.** In the event that any provision of this Contract shall be held to be invalid, such provision shall be null and void. The validity of the remaining provisions of the MOA shall not in any way be affected thereby.

**e. Counterparts.** This Contract maybe executed in multiple counterparts, each of which shall be deemed to be an original and all of which shall constitute one contract, notwithstanding that all parties are not signatories to the original or the same counterpart, or that signature pages from different counterparts are combined, and the signature of any party to any counterpart shall be deemed to be a signature too and may be appended to any other counterpart.

**f. Authority to Execute.** Each Participating State warrants that it has the authority to enter into this MOA, and the party executing hereunder has the full authority to bind that state.

**IN WITNESS WHEREOF**, the Participating States have, through their duly authorized representative, executed this Memorandum of Agreement, which shall be effective, as of the last signature date below.

**STATE OF ARKANSAS**

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**STATE OF FLORIDA**

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**STATE OF INDIANA**

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**STATE OF COLORADO**

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**STATE OF ILLINOIS**

By: Christopher Koch  
Name: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D.  
Title: State Superintendent of Education  
Date: January 11, 2010

**STATE OF LOUISIANA**

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS**

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**STATE OF MINNESOTA**

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA**

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**STATE OF OHIO**

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA**

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA**

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Appendix B2-2**

**Florida Consortium Participants**

Arizona  
District of Columbia  
Florida  
Georgia  
Illinois  
Indiana  
Kentucky  
Louisiana  
Maryland  
Massachusetts  
Mississippi  
New Jersey  
New York  
North Carolina  
Pennsylvania  
South Carolina  
Tennessee

Total: 17 states

Appendix B2-3  
MOSAIC MOU

**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 Illinois (“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 career-ready 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)**

Christopher Koch  
Signature

January 8, 2010  
Date

Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D.  
Print Name

State Superintendent of Education  
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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Print Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title

**Please email this signed page  
by January 5, 2010 to**

lynette.russell@dpi.wi.gov      and      pat.roschewski@nebraska.gov  
or fax to

(Fax) 608.266.8770      and      (Fax) 402.471.4311

**\*\*PLEASE email this signed page only by January 5, 2010\*\***

**Appendix B2-4**

**MOSAIC Consortium Participants**

Delaware  
Hawaii  
Idaho  
Illinois  
Iowa  
Kansas  
Kentucky  
Maryland  
Michigan  
Minnesota  
Mississippi  
Missouri  
Montana  
Nebraska  
New Jersey  
North Dakota  
Ohio  
Oklahoma  
Oregon  
Pennsylvania  
South Carolina  
South Dakota  
Tennessee  
Utah  
Washington  
Wisconsin  
Wyoming

Total: 27 States

## Appendix B2-5

### Balanced Consortium MOU

#### 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 Illinois (“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 integrated system 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 evidence of actual student performance on challenging tasks that prepare students for the demands of college and career in the 21<sup>st</sup> 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) Teachers are involved 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.

1

4) **Assessments are structured to continuously improve teaching and learning.** 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 improve the quality of learning 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 use multiple measures 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 on-demand, 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) **New technologies enable greater assessment quality 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 open-ended 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 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 curriculum-embedded 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 Baccalaureate, 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.

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 computer-based 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.

6

**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 Balanced Assessment 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)**

Christopher Koch  
Signature

January 8, 2010  
Date

Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D.  
Print Name

State Superintendent of Education  
Title

**Please email this signed page to**

**Tammy Morrill  
Tammy.Morrill@maine.gov**

**\*\*PLEASE email this signed page only by January 7, 2010\*\***

**Appendix B2-6**

**Balanced Consortium Participants**

Alabama	Montana
Arizona	Nebraska
Arkansas	New Hampshire
California	New Jersey
Connecticut	North Carolina
Delaware	North Dakota
Illinois	Ohio
Indiana	Oklahoma
Iowa	Pennsylvania
Georgia	Rhode Island
Kansas	South Carolina
Kentucky	South Dakota
Maine	Tennessee
Maryland	Utah
Massachusetts	Washington DC
Michigan	West Virginia
Mississippi	Wisconsin
Missouri	Wyoming

Total: 36 states

**Appendix B2-7**  
**SMARTER Consortium MOU**

## 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, Illinois, Minnesota, 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 2/15/2010.
  - 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.

- 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.
- l. 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)**

Christopher Koch  
Signature

January 8, 2010  
Date

Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D.  
Print Name

State Superintendent of Education  
Title

Please sign and date this agreement by no later than January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2010.  
FAX signed copy to Tony Alpert at: (503) 378-5156 or email scanned copy to [Tony.Alpert@state.or.us](mailto:Tony.Alpert@state.or.us)

**Appendix B2-8**  
**SMARTER Consortium Participants**

California  
Colorado  
Delaware  
District of Columbia  
Hawaii  
Idaho  
Illinois  
Kansas  
Kentucky  
Michigan  
Minnesota  
Mississippi  
Montana  
Nebraska  
New York  
Ohio  
Oregon  
South Carolina  
Tennessee  
Utah  
Washington  
Wisconsin  
Wyoming

Total: 23 States

[Note: New Mexico has submitted a formal statement of intent to participate in the SMARTER consortium, but has not yet submitted an MOU.]

## Appendix B2-9

### Achieve Consortium Letter of Intent



January 15, 2010

Dr. Christopher Koch  
State Superintendent of Education  
Illinois State Board of Education  
100 North 1st Street  
Springfield, IL 62777

#### **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. Gner  
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 Sayre  
Controller  
Prudential Financial, Inc.

Dear Superintendent Koch:

Achieve is pleased to confirm Illinois'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.

Illinois's participation in this partnership is critical to its success. We look forward to continuing our important work together in the coming months.

Sincerely,

Michael Cohen  
President

*States Committed to Assessment Partnership  
(As of 10:00 EST on January 15, 2010)*

- |                         |                   |                    |
|-------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Alabama              | 10. Illinois      | 19. New Mexico     |
| 2. Arizona              | 11. Indiana       | 20. North Carolina |
| 3. Arkansas             | 12. Kentucky      | 21. Ohio           |
| 4. California           | 13. Louisiana     | 22. Oklahoma       |
| 5. Delaware             | 14. Maryland      | 23. Pennsylvania   |
| 6. District of Columbia | 15. Massachusetts | 24. Rhode Island   |
| 7. Florida              | 16. Michigan      | 25. Tennessee      |
| 8. Georgia              | 17. Minnesota     | 26. Utah           |
| 9. Hawaii               | 18. New Hampshire | 27. Wisconsin      |





## 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 21<sup>st</sup> 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 decision-making
- 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 B2-10**

**Achieve Consortium Participants**

Alabama	Massachusetts
Arizona	Michigan
Arkansas	Minnesota
California	New Hampshire
Delaware	New Mexico
District of Columbia	North Carolina
Florida	Ohio
Georgia	Oklahoma
Hawaii	Pennsylvania
Illinois	Rhode Island
Indiana	Tennessee
Kentucky	Utah
Louisiana	Wisconsin
Maryland	

Total: 27 states

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.