

State of Illinois



**Race to the Top
Application for Phase 3 Funding
CFDA Number: 84.395A**

December 16, 2011

**The State of Illinois Race to the Top
Application for Phase 3 Funding**

Table of Contents

I.	State Plan Overview	3
	A. Executive Summary.....	3
	B. Student Outcome Goals	7
II.	Summary Table for Phase 3 Plan	9
III.	Narrative	11
	(A)(2) Building Strong Statewide Capacity to Implement, Scale-Up, and Sustain Proposed Plans.....	11
	(B)(3) Supporting the Transition to Enhanced Standards and High-Quality Assessments	18
	(C)(3) Using Data to Improve Instruction	29
	(D)(2) Improving Teacher and Principal Effectiveness Based on Performance	35
	(D)(3) Ensuring Equitable Distribution of Effective Teachers and Principals	44
	(D)(5) Providing Effective Support to Teachers and Principals	47
IV.	Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) Summary	52
V.	Race to the Top Phase 3 Budget	53

SECTION III. PART II APPLICATION

Following the notice of Department approval of a State's Part I application, a Governor must submit to the Department a Part II application including the information described below.

- I. State Plan Overview: In this section of Part II of the application, the State must provide an executive summary of its Phase 3 plan, including an explanation of why the State believes the activities selected from Phase 2 Race to the Top submission in its Phase 3 plan will have the greatest impact on advancing its overall statewide reform plan.
- II. Summary Table for Phase 3 Plan: In this table, the State must indicate which sub-criteria are addressed in the State's Phase 3 application.
- III. Narrative and Performance Measures: For each selection sub-criterion the State addresses, the State must write its narrative response in the text box below the selection sub-criterion. In this space, the State must describe how it has taken action or will take action to address that sub-criterion. While the Department recognizes that the limited funding available under Race to the Top Phase 3 will likely require adjustments to the scope, budget, timeline, and performance targets for activities selected for funding under Phase 3, eligible States must select activities from its Phase 2 application for funding under Race to the Top Phase 3, including activities that are most likely to improve STEM education. In addition to describing the activities selected from its Phase 2 plan, a State must also provide an explanation of why it has selected each of those activities.

For sub-criteria addressed in a State's Part II application, the State must provide goals and annual targets, baseline data, and other information for performance measures as indicated in the State's Phase 2 application. For each of those criteria, the State must complete the performance measure tables or provide an attachment with the required performance measure information. The limited scope of Race to the Top Phase 3 means that funded activities might not be covered by performance measures in the Race to the Top Phase 2 application, thus potentially preventing the meaningful evaluation of grantee performance. Consequently, applicants must develop and propose for the Department's approval performance measures for sub-criteria that do not have performance measures in the Race to the Top Phase 2 application. The State may provide additional performance measures, baseline data, and targets for a criterion if it chooses. If a State does not have baseline data for a performance measure, the State should indicate that the data are not available and explain why.

There will be selection sub-criteria in a State's Phase 2 application that the State does not address in its Phase 3 application. The State need not complete or include anything about those sub-criteria, including the performance measure, in its Phase 3 Part II application. In addition, since a State's Phase 2 application included specific evidence with respect to some selection criteria, a State need not resubmit this evidence unless it chooses to provide updated evidence in support of Phase 3 activities.

- IV. STEM Summary: An applicant must describe how it will allocate a meaningful share of its Phase 3 award to advance STEM education in the State. The State may meet this requirement by including in its plan and budget: (1) Activities proposed by the State to meet the competitive preference priority for STEM education, if applicable; or (2) Activities within one or more of the four core education reform areas that are most likely to improve STEM education. A State should address this requirement throughout the Part II application. In addition, the State provides a summary of how it is meeting this requirement in part V.
- V. Budget: The State must link its proposed reform plans to projects that the State believes are necessary in order to implement its Phase 3 plans. The State must also include how it plans to direct a meaningful share of its Phase 3 award to advance STEM education in the State. Providing additional budget detail through a project-level table and narrative allows the State to specifically describe how its budget aligns with its reform plans and how its budget supports the achievement of the State's goals. The total State budget should not exceed the budget amount provided to the State upon the approval of Part I.
- VI. Application Signature Page: The State must assure that all of the information and data in the Part II application and the certified assurances in the Part I application are true and correct. The State must further certify that the signatories have read the application, are fully committed to it, and will support its implementation.

I. STATE PLAN OVERVIEW

- A. Provide an executive summary of the State’s Phase 3 plan. Please include an explanation of why the State believes the activities in its Phase 3 plan will have the greatest impact on advancing its overall statewide reform plan.

Executive Summary of the Illinois RTTT3 Plan

On the day the awards were announced for the second phase of Race to the Top funding, the State Superintendent of Education was clear in his message to Illinois school districts and education stakeholders, stating:

- “I am proud of the effort that our state has made to put together such an ambitious plan, which I believe should serve as our blueprint for where we need to take education through the next decade.”

The Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE), Office of the Governor, and education leadership throughout the State have held true to this commitment to the objectives and strategies in the Phase 2 plan, advancing far-reaching reforms across all of the Race to the Top reform areas. For example:


- Illinois has maintained its leadership role in the PARCC consortium, serving as a governing state;
- ISBE has hired 15 content specialists to assist with Common Core State Standards implementation, with expertise in Math, English language arts, and data and assessment;
- The Office of the Governor, various State agencies, and the P-20 Council have forged ahead with the State's STEM education agenda, developing Program of Study models in key STEM career cluster areas and establishing an interagency governance structure to manage statewide STEM initiatives;
- Illinois has been selected to be one of the first states to implement the Shared Learning Infrastructure, a multi-state collaborative to develop a next-generation technology system that will enable teachers to easily find high-quality and highly-customizable curriculum and classroom resources aligned to the Common Core State Standards;
- Illinois has developed the regulatory framework and model templates to implement the State's sweeping reforms of its teacher and principal performance evaluation systems; and
- Illinois has enacted bold education reform legislation through a consensus-based process that ties performance evaluations to critical human capital decisions, streamlines the teacher dismissal process, and reforms collective bargaining and strike provisions.

The Race to the Top Application for Phase 3 Funding (RTTT3) provides the State of Illinois with an opportunity to further accelerate the implementation of the reform blueprint laid out in the State's Phase 2 application and continue to build on the State's "reform momentum." The State has established the following three goals for its RTTT3 plan:

1. Attract a group of Participating LEAs that can serve as "reform exemplars" for the entire State. These districts will agree to meet a high bar for participation across a comprehensive set of reforms.
2. Within the Participating LEAs, build systems and processes to accelerate and sustain improved student outcomes.
3. While the Participating LEAs will blaze the path for a comprehensive approach to key reforms, RTTT3 will also build State capacity to extend these reforms statewide.

The below diagram depicts the general structure for the State's RTTT3 Participating LEA expectations and State supports:

RTTT3 Strategy Areas: Learners at the Center



Learners are at the center of the State's RTTT3 strategies, with integrated expectations and supports for:

- Implementing standards-aligned instructional systems that address (i) curriculum, grading, and reporting; (ii) instructional practices; and

(iii) high quality assessments (*see B(3) of this Plan*); and

- Improving educator quality and effectiveness through (i) the establishment of redesigned performance evaluation systems; (ii) programs to attract effective educators to High Poverty High Minority schools; and (iii) induction and mentoring programs (*see D(2), D(3), and D(5) of this Plan*).


These strategy areas are supported by three foundational elements:

1. A common data and technology platform -- the Illinois Shared Learning Environment, which incorporates the Shared Learning Infrastructure and state-level enhancements and extensions to support personalized learning and access to high quality resources (*see C(3) of this Plan*).
2. A common comprehensive continuous improvement process -- the "Rising Star" system, which will guide districts and schools through the procedures and practices for systemic change and instructional improvement (*see A(2) of this Plan*).
3. Integrated State supports, with increased capacity at ISBE and a new Center for School Improvement as the nexus of the Statewide System of Support (*see A(2) of this Plan*).

The State expects that the common foundational elements of the Plan will support ISBE's ability to ensure consistent implementation across the Participating LEAs, as well as provide opportunities for inter-district networking and collaboration.

The Participating LEA expectations and State supports aligned to the State's RTTT3 strategy areas are described in each Section of this Plan, and collectively summarized in Appendix 1. As shown in the timeline in Appendix 2, this Plan will result in full implementation of a comprehensive set of reforms in the 2014-15 school year. At that time, the different RTTT3 strategy areas are intended to be linked within each Participating LEA as part of a comprehensive instructional system, with instructional practices, standards & curriculum, assessments, learner profiles, and educator systems linked in a real-time cycle that drives personalized learning and improved student outcomes.

A Real-Time Instructional Improvement Cycle Across the RTTT Strategy Areas



This graphic is used with permission from the Center for Educational Leadership and Technology, to demonstrate how the Shared Learning Infrastructure can connect and support various components of the instructional improvement cycle.

Through this Plan, the State will support Participating LEAs to establish the elements of this system, and monitor and evaluate the Participating LEAs so that the State can adjust its support strategies to prepare for broader statewide implementation. This Plan will also have a substantial impact on STEM education in the State by (i) funding the establishment of a new, innovative public-private infrastructure to advance STEM Programs of Study; (ii) focusing standards implementation supports on math and science integration into the curriculum; (iii) establishing a technology platform for the delivery of STEM resources; and (iv) providing induction and mentoring supports targeted to STEM educators.

Ultimately, the State's objective for this Plan is to impact student achievement and close the achievement gap. With the intensive work performed by the Participating LEAs and the Statewide systems established under this Plan, Illinois believes it can continue to raise proficiency levels for all students, significantly cut the achievement gap from current levels, and improve high school performance and college enrollment.

B. Provide student outcome goals, overall and by student subgroup, for—

- (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; and
- (d) Increasing college enrollment 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.

RTTT3 Student Outcome Goals

The systems and supports necessary to implement the Common Core State Standards, advance teacher and principal effectiveness, and provide educators with actionable data cannot be built in a single school year. Illinois will aggressively pursue their implementation through the 2013-14 School Year, and strive toward student achievement gains during this period that outpace current trends, with an expectation of an accelerated performance trajectory in the third school year of the grant period and beyond. The systems and resources developed by this Plan are particularly critical to closing the achievement gap and dramatically improving performance in Illinois' lowest performing schools. As a result, for the Black, Hispanic, and Low-Income subgroups, the State's goals are more aggressive, both in the timing and trajectory of student outcomes.

Appendix 3 contains a table identifying the State's overall and subgroup-specific goals over the life of the RTTT3 grant period and beyond for increasing student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics on the NAEP, ISAT, and PSAE, as well as for increasing high school graduation and college enrollment rates. These goals were informed by trend data across the State and its districts that have demonstrated significant improvement, external benchmarking based on performance among the nation's top performing states, and expectations for growth resulting from the continuation of the State's current reform agenda and the implementation of this Plan.

As detailed in Appendix 3, the State's achievement goals are:

- **Increasing proficiency levels in reading and math on the ISAT and PSAE:** As State assessments are modified to align with the Common Core, Illinois expects steady gains throughout the RTTT grant period.
- **Increasing proficiency levels in reading and math on NAEP:** The State's goals are to increase overall NAEP proficiency rates by 10% over the RTTT grant period to align with gains that have been demonstrated by some of the top performing states over the prior decade.

Consistent with the State's overall achievement gap objectives, the State has established the goal of a 15% increase in black, Hispanic, and low-income subgroup performance on NAEP.

- **Decreasing achievement gaps between subgroups in reading and mathematics on State assessments and NAEP:** As detailed in Appendix 3, the State's goals for decreasing achievement gaps include accelerated improvements over the course of the next six years (the RTTT grant period and beyond) that reduce the achievement gaps by 1/2 of current levels. Based on the State's success to date closing the achievement gap, the State believes this goal is attainable and must remain a top priority for the State's education system.
- **Increasing high school graduation rates:** With the State's comprehensive focus on high schools, the State's goal is to achieve a 90% overall graduation rate in the next six years. For particular student subgroups, the State, over the next six years, plans to reduce by 1/2 the difference from 90% for each student subgroup's graduation rate.
- **Increasing college enrollment and increasing the number of students who complete at least a year's worth of college credit applicable to a degree within two years of enrollment:** Since Illinois incorporated the ACT in its State assessment system in 2001, many more Illinois students, particularly underrepresented minorities, are in the college pipeline. However, as analyzed by the Illinois Board of Higher Education in its report, the Illinois Public Agenda for College and Career Success, many of these students do not continue to a degree. Approximately 42% of Illinois students enter college directly after graduating from high school, but only 28.4% enroll in a second year. In Illinois, 20.9% of adults aged 25 to 64 attended some college but never received a degree. According to data analyzed in the Illinois Public Agenda Report, in the best-performing states 57.3% of ninth grade students directly entered college upon graduation, and 42% enrolled in a second year. The State's goals for both initial college enrollment and continuation of higher education is to close the gap between Illinois and the best performing state in each of these areas by the end of the RTTT3 grant period. To achieve these goals, college enrollment will increase to 52%, and the number of students who complete at least a year's worth of college credit applicable to a degree will climb to 40%.

II. SUMMARY TABLE FOR PHASE 3 PLAN

Please indicate which sub-criteria are addressed in the State’s Phase 3 application.

Elements of State Reform Plans	Performance Measure	Check the appropriate box
A. State Success Factors¹		
(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	<i>Must be proposed by Applicant</i>	X
(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	<i>Must be proposed by Applicant</i>	
B. Standards and Assessments		
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	<i>Must be proposed by Applicant</i>	
(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	<i>Must be proposed by Applicant</i>	
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	<i>Must be proposed by Applicant</i>	X
C. Data Systems to Support Instruction		
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	<i>Must be proposed by Applicant</i>	
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	<i>Must be proposed by Applicant</i>	
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction:	<i>Must be proposed by Applicant</i>	X
D. Great Teachers and Leaders		
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	<i>Must be proposed by Applicant</i>	
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	From Phase 2 application	X
(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	From Phase 2 application	X
(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	From Phase 2 application	

¹ We do not expect States to write to sub-criterion (A)(1) since States will be working with LEAs regarding their participation during the scope of work process.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	<i>Must be proposed by Applicant</i>	X
E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools		
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	<i>Must be proposed by Applicant</i>	
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	From Phase 2 application	
F. General Section Criteria		
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	<i>Must be proposed by Applicant</i>	
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charters and other innovative schools	<i>Must be proposed by Applicant</i>	
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	<i>Must be proposed by Applicant</i>	
Emphasis on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM)	<i>Must be proposed by Applicant</i>	X

III. NARRATIVE

In the text box below, the State must list the selection sub-criterion from its Phase 2 application the State is proposing to address in Phase 3 (e.g., (D2)), the page reference from the Phase 2 application where the original plan for addressing the sub-criterion can be found, and a narrative description of the Phase 3 plan to address that sub-criterion.

The Phase 3 plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties for each proposed activity. A Phase 3 applicant need not resubmit evidence from its Phase 2 application. If it chooses, a Phase 3 applicant may provide updated evidence if it supports the Phase 3 activities. Any new supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful must be described and, where relevant, included an Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

For a full description of the selection criteria, please see Section VII.

Selection sub-criterion	(A)(2)	Page references from State’s Phase 2 application	24-44
--------------------------------	---------------	---	--------------

Building Strong Statewide Capacity to Implement, Scale-Up, and Sustain Proposed Plans

(A)(2) Goal I: Build strong leadership & dedicated teams to implement statewide reform

The State's Phase 2 application included a plan for realigning and strengthening ISBE capacity around the State's reform agenda through a revamped internal structure that focused on supporting policy and program coordination and implementation in each of the Plan areas -- Standards and Assessments; Data Systems and Use; Teacher and Leader Effectiveness; and Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools. As the foundation for the reforms set forth in this Application, ISBE, under RTTT3, will increase its capacity and re-align its resources to effectively manage the State's Plan through: (1) the establishment of the RTTT Leadership and Implementation Team and (2) the creation of the Center for School Improvement (CSI).

Key Activity 1: Establish the RTTT Leadership and Implementation Team

The RTTT Leadership and Implementation Team, as detailed in the State's Phase 2 Application, will consist of the State Superintendent of Education, two deputy superintendents, Assistant Superintendents with oversight of the various reform areas, and four new staff hires described below. The RTTT Leadership and Implementation Team will spearhead all aspects of Plan implementation and ensure accountability at the State and LEA levels. This Team will meet regularly to review the status of RTTT policy and program implementation and to identify and address issues as they arise (utilizing external advisors and partners, as necessary). This Team will use information provided through this Plan's various

data, evaluation, and monitoring systems to lead a process of continuous improvement in the implementation of the State's reform agenda. In addition, this Team will share periodic reports on implementation efforts with the State Board of Education, the Governor, the P-20 Council, legislative leadership, and make decisions about which Participating LEAs, if any, are not meeting requirements under the MOU and State law and determine the appropriate course of action/intervention.

As part of the RTTT Leadership and Implementation Team, ISBE will use RTTT3 funds to support four new staff members. The new positions, as detailed below, are: a Director of Performance Management, a Director of Policy and Program Implementation, a Statewide Professional Development Coordinator, and a RTTT Implementation Counsel. The key responsibilities of each new position are as follows:

- The **Director of Performance Management** will be charged with gathering, analyzing and making available, as appropriate, all of the data sources identified in the State's Plan that will be utilized to gauge State and Participating LEA progress toward Plan implementation, including gains in student achievement. Working with agency staff, the Director of Performance Management will oversee the development and implementation of key instructional technology initiatives including the Illinois Shared Learning Environment (ISLE). This Director will also work closely with the Illinois Collaborative for Education Policy Research (ICEPR) to integrate research and evaluation data into the State's performance management processes.
- The **Director of Policy and Program Implementation** will be charged with managing and monitoring the intersecting work of the State's plan as described in this Application in order to ensure there is coherence and coordination across all reform activities. This Director will serve as the "glue" that will bind the State's multiple reform efforts into a comprehensive and effective whole. The Director will work with the Center for School Improvement (described below) to coordinate and leverage all aspects of the Center's work while also managing a process of stakeholder and partner engagement to sustain strong support for this Plan. The Director will be responsible for raising any implementation issues to the RTTT Leadership and Implementation Team for resolution.
- The **Statewide Professional Development Coordinator** will help ensure that existing and new professional development and technical assistance programs outlined in this Plan are implemented in a strategic and coordinated manner, taking into consideration the needs and capacity of Participating LEAs and timelines for implementation of the Plan's reforms. This coordinator will work closely with the Center for School Improvement Director to strengthen the quality and impact of professional development offerings.
- The **RTTT Implementation Counsel** will be tasked with handling the legal components of the State's RTTT3 plan including, but not limited to, the preparation of procurement requests, data share processes and agreements in support of, among others, ISBE, ISLE and the ICEPR, inter-agency and intergovernmental agreements and the review of Participating LEA Memoranda of Understanding and related agreements. The RTTT Implementation Counsel will also serve as the liaison to the Department of Education for reporting and compliance-related matters.

Key Activity 2: Establish the Center for School Improvement

ISBE, with both RTTT3 and Title I, Part A 1003(a) funds, will establish the Center for School Improvement (CSI) as the nexus of its Statewide System of Support (SSOS) to provide high-quality, coordinated and consistent support to districts and schools across the State. 1003(a) funds will be used to support CSI's activities in low-performing schools and districts eligible for such services under federal law. RTTT3 will be

used to extend CSI's services to Participating LEAs, and to build capacity within CSI to support key reforms that are central to this Plan. The CSI provides ISBE with greater flexibility to quickly scale up capacity to work across the State's reform agenda and move ahead with intensive work in the Participating LEAs while expanding its scope in key areas such as standards implementation and continuous improvement processes. The CSI will be operated as a partnership between: (1) ISBE; (2) one or more university or nonprofit partners with a proven track record of effectively and efficiently providing high-quality support in the RTTT focus areas; and (3) the Illinois Association of Regional Superintendents of Schools (IARSS), serving as the representative of the regional delivery system. ISBE will issue a procurement for the CSI in the first quarter of 2012 and will be supported by guidance and direction from the RTTT Leadership and Implementation Team. The CSI Director will report directly to an ISBE Deputy Superintendent.

(A)(2) Goal II: Build the Capacity of LEAs for Successful Implementation of Reforms

Key Activity 1: Use Integrated Plans and a Comprehensive Continuous improvement Process as Tools for Building LEA Capacity

The State's Phase 2 application described the use of School and District Integrated Plans as a tool for RTTT oversight and building LEA capacity. Since submission of the Phase 2 Application, the "Rising Star" system, a comprehensive continuous improvement process, has been fully embedded in the State's web-based school and district "Integrated Plans" that serve as the required template for a variety of plans required by both State and federal funding sources (e.g., Title I, Title III, and technology implementation plans).

Rising Star uses indicators of effective practice, at both the district and school level, to provide the structure for improving teaching and learning as part of a continuous cycle of assessment, planning, implementation, and progress monitoring. At the district level, Rising Star uses indicators of effective practice organized into the following three overarching areas: district context and support; district change process; and district-school expectations. At the school and classroom level, there are additional indicators of effective practice, organized into the following four categories and eight essential elements:

Rising Star Categories and Elements

Category	Essential Element
Continuous Improvement	Comprehensive Planning
Learning Environment	Climate and Culture Community and Family Engagement
Educator Quality	Professional Development Leadership
Teaching and Learning	Curriculum Instruction Assessment

As ISBE has shifted its improvement planning process to align with the Rising Star framework, ISBE believes it is critical for its

expectations for RTTT3 Participating LEAs to also align with Rising Star. As described in Appendix 1, the Participating LEA expectations are structured around the RTTT3 strategy areas described in the Executive Summary of this Plan, which place learners at the center of the State's RTTT3 strategies, and build around them structures for supporting personalized learning and instructional improvement that tie to the Rising Star indicators of effective practice. The CSI, through RTTT3 funding, will support Participating LEAs in working with the Rising Star indicators and corresponding categories in order to help drive, accelerate and sustain continued improvements that cut across all of the RTTT3 strategy areas. In addition, the CSI will also be responsible for overseeing and providing intensive supports to Participating LEAs for:

- Standards implementation, curriculum alignment, and improvement of instructional practices (see Section B(3)); and
- Professional development and training to effectively utilize the Illinois Shared Learning Environment (ISLE) to impact teaching and learning (see Section C(3)).

In order to support the State's commitments to dramatic instructional improvement set forth above, the Participating LEAs, in turn, will be required to make the following general commitments that cut across all elements of the State's RTTT3 Plan:

- Participate in the second phase of ISLE implementation, as further discussed in Section C(3), integrating with ISLE to support each of the RTTT3 strategy areas;
- Use Rising Star or an approved equivalent as the basis for a comprehensive continuous improvement process at the district and school levels;
- Provide sufficient autonomy in the use of time and re-allocate professional development resources necessary for implementation of RTTT3 activities;
- Participate in all State-led efforts to undertake Participating LEA networking activities, disseminate implementation models, and evaluate program results;
- If the district has any "Tier I" or "Tier II" schools as defined under the School Improvement Grant program, the Participating LEA must seek to leverage SIG funds to support its RTTT3 implementation plan; and
- Use the Participating LEA funding allocation only for implementation of the Participating LEA requirements under this Plan.

Key Activity 2: Measure Progress and Intervene When Necessary

The State's Phase 2 application described the establishment of an RTTT Outcomes Measurement Plan that would use data submitted through Integrated Plans and data collected by the State through its longitudinal data system to monitor and track RTTT implementation and publicly report on outcomes. Since the Phase 2 application submission date, the State's P-20 Council has led a comprehensive process to redesign the State Report Card to achieve many of the stakeholder engagement and public reporting objectives envisioned for the RTTT Outcomes Measurement Plan in the Phase 2 application. Legislation enacted in November 2011 will lead to a report card redesign to roll out by October 2013. For the first time, the State will report information such as how many college-level Advanced Placement courses each high school offers, how many eighth-graders passed algebra, and how many teachers received top ratings on their performance evaluations. Elementary School Report Cards will indicate how many students attended preschool, while the high schools' will highlight how many freshmen were academically

on track and how many graduates completed their first year of college without requiring remedial courses. All the Report Cards will compare test results to other Illinois public schools with similar student compositions. Dozens of educators, parents and students offered their views during the redesign process, and more than 60 focus groups were convened to provide input.

ISBE's RTTT Leadership and Implementation Team will use outcome indicators included within the redesigned State Report Card to track the impact of RTTT3 reforms on teaching and learning. In addition, Participating LEAs must agree to use information in the redesigned State Report Cards to support parental and community engagement.

In addition to the outcome indicators in the redesigned State Report Card, the State will define supplemental process and outcome indicators needed to effectively assess the progress of the State, LEAs, and schools in meeting key goals, addressing objectives, and undertaking activities outlined in this Plan. The scope of work for the Illinois Collaborative for Education Policy Research (ICEPR), described in Section C(3), will include working with ISBE's Director of Performance Management to:

- Define the supplemental process and outcome indicators;
- Establish mechanisms for gathering data to support these supplemental indicators; and
- Incorporate the redesigned State report card indicators and supplemental indicators into a coherent outcomes measurement system for Participating LEAs, and this Plan as a whole.

This outcomes measurement system will provide the State, Participating LEAs, and other stakeholders with the information needed to closely monitor performance and progress and adjust implementation when necessary to achieve this Plan's objectives.

In addition to addressing this sub-criterion, please explain why your State has selected to address the activities in this sub-criterion in its Race to the Top Phase 3 application.

State capacity, both within ISBE and external to the agency, is critical to the successful implementation of this Plan. The RTTT Leadership and Implementation Team and the expansion in scope of the Center for School Improvement will help coordinate and align State support systems and provide comprehensive assistance to Participating LEAs. The State must also establish processes and systems to measure outcomes associated with this Plan to ensure the reforms are being successfully implemented and are ultimately improving student performance and closing the achievement gap.

Performance Measures	Actual Data: Baseline (Current)	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014	End of SY 2014-2015
General goals to be provided at time of application:	Baseline data and annual targets				
Percentage of Participating LEAs achieving 4-star or 5-star status within the State's accountability designation system.*	NA	NA*	30%	35%	40%
Of those Participating LEAs not achieving 4-star or 5-star status, % on track to achieve 4-star or 5-star status by the end of SY 2016-17.**	NA	NA*	40%	50%	66%
Percentage of Participating LEAs that have assessed, prioritized, and established plans for the full implementation of the mandatory indicators within Rising Star or an approved equivalent continuous improvement system.	NA	25%	100%	100%	100%
Percentage of Participating LEAs utilizing Rising Star that have assessed, prioritized, and established plans for the full implementation of at least 75% of the non-mandatory district indicators within the district continuous improvement plan.	NA	0	40%	60%	80%
Percentage of Participating LEAs that have had a peer review of the LEA's implementation of the Rising Star continuous improvement process.		0%	0%	50%	100%
<p>[Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data]</p> <p>Baseline data is not available because the State does not yet know which districts will be Participating LEAs. Baseline data will be provided and any necessary updates to the annual targets will be made within two weeks of finalizing the list of Participating LEAs.</p> <p>*This performance measure is tied to the State of Illinois' proposed ESEA waiver application to be submitted to ED on February 21, 2012. The application will establish a "5-star" accountability system for schools and districts derived from indices for achievement on State assessments, student growth, and graduation outcomes. The State is proposing for the new system to take effect in SY 2012-13. This measure will be revised and updated as necessary to reflect the State's final approved waiver application.</p> <p>** "On track" status will be determined by ISBE's Director of Performance Management based on performance on the indices included in the State accountability system.</p>					

Sub-criteria (A)(2): Building Strong Statewide Capacity to Implement, Scale-Up, and Sustain Proposed Plans*		
IMPLEMENTATION STEPS	TIMELINE	RESPONSIBILITY
(1) Develop and issue Request for Proposals (RFP) for the	Jan. - Apr. 2012	ISBE

Center for School Improvement (CSI)		
(2) Select CSI entity	July 2012	ISBE
(3) CSI planning and development of support mechanisms	July - Dec. 2012	ISBE, selected CSI entity
(4) CSI commences supports to Participating LEAs	January 2013	ISBE, selected CSI entity
(5) Hiring of four (4) positions aligned with the State's reform strategies	Jan. - July 2012	ISBE
(6) Support for the redesign of the State Report Card	Jan. 2012 - May 2013	ISBE, P-20 Council

***The Participating LEA implementation timeline for this plan is located in Appendix 2.**

Selection sub-criterion	(B)(3)	Page references from State’s Phase 2 application	72-88
--------------------------------	---------------	---	--------------

Supporting the Transition to Enhanced Standards and High-Quality Assessments

The Phase 2 Application described the State's plan to support an accelerated transition by Participating LEAs to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and high quality assessments by focusing on two central strategies:

- Establishing an action framework so that Participating LEAs can effectively implement the CCSS in every classroom, and for every student, by the end of the second year of the grant period. The core elements of this framework included (i) aligning curriculum, (ii) implementing interim and formative assessments, (iii) ensuring Response to Intervention plans are aligned to the CCSS, and (iv) implementing P-20 STEM Programs of Study in middle and high schools that define clear student pathways, related to student academic and career interest, that help students successfully transition to high school, college, and careers.
- Providing LEAs with comprehensive State supports to implement the elements of the action framework. The Phase 2 application described focused supports for (i) assisting LEA implementation of assessment systems to inform classroom instruction and promote instructional alignment, and (ii) creating a statewide network of partners delivering high quality instructional resources supporting P-20 STEM Programs of Study in key STEM application areas.

Since the Phase 2 Application and with a greater understanding of supports needed to transition to the CCSS, the State has focused specifically on developing a more robust standards-aligned instructional model, with an emphasis on Programs of Study in STEM application areas, and developing assessments across a broader range of subjects. In addition, as the State moves forward with implementation of performance evaluation reforms pursuant to the Performance Evaluation Reform Act (PERA) (see Section D(2)), the State's assessment system must support this re-designed evaluation system, which incorporates student growth, and be in alignment with the recommendations of the Performance Evaluation Advisory Committee (PEAC), the special advisory committee charged with providing input to ISBE and monitoring PERA development and implementation. While the goals and activities remain constant, the State's plan for RTTT3, as described below, represents a more integrated, targeted, and PERA-aligned approach to supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments.

(B)(3) Goal I: Participating LEAs Deliver Standards-Aligned Instruction in Every Classroom, and for Every Student.

Key Activity 1: Establish Standards Aligned Instructional Systems in All Schools Within Participating LEAs.

As part of RTTT3, Participating LEAs will be required to implement the following steps designed to lead to the establishment of standards aligned instructional systems, informed by ISBE's further development of standards and assessment implementation strategies:

- Grade-level analysis math and ELA curriculum analysis using the CCSS;
- Cross-grade-level discussions to identify shifts in content;

- Integration of writing through-out the curriculum;
- Integration of CCSS in Math, ELA and literacy across the curriculum, including the concept of text complexity for ELA and application for Math;
- Integration of the CCSS Science framework into the curriculum; and
- Implement a standards-based reporting system in Math, ELA and Science.

To support the State's goal of developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments aligned to the CCSS and PERA, Participating LEAs, under RTTT3, will be required to:

- Develop an assessment system that includes the following types of assessments in a coherent framework to both support standards aligned-instruction and, where appropriate, measure student growth:
 - a) Through-course assessments designed to assist teachers and administrators to track students' progress [e.g. NWEA MAP]
 - b) Formative assessments designed to inform improved instruction in real time [e.g. teacher-created assessments for use throughout the year]
 - c) Summative assessments designed to measure changes in students knowledge and skills through an entire course [e.g. district or network-wide end-of-term/course assessments]
- Integrate CCSS assessments items in subjects other than math and ELA;
- Participate in district network activity to develop Type II and Type III assessment framework and items (see definition under B(3) Goal II, Key Activity 1), which can be used on a district-wide basis by all teachers in a given grade or non-tested subject area; and
- Agree to serve as a pilot district for the PARCC Consortium and the Kindergarten Individual Development Survey (KIDS).

Furthermore, Participating LEAs will ensure that the district's plan for RtI implementation provides targeted interventions and differentiated supports, aligned to the CCSS, for students who are not on pace to meet college-and-career-ready expectations. *See B(3), Goal II below for a discussion of how the State will provide comprehensive supports to assist Participating LEAs in implementing the above-mentioned steps designed to promote standards-aligned instructional systems in schools.*

Key Activity 2: P-20 STEM Programs of Study as a Framework for High School Reform.

Recognizing that a standards-aligned instructional system will need to support college and career readiness for all learners, the State's Phase 2 Application focused on implementing the Illinois P-20 Programs of Study model in nine STEM application areas in Participating LEAs. P-20 STEM Programs of Study are a sequence of courses, assessments, and applied learning experiences organized around a career cluster where students pursue their academic and career interests starting from an orientation experience and continuing through advanced pathway and dual credit courses where there are opportunities to connect to professional networks through work-based learning experiences as well as opportunities to earn stackable credentials and degrees.

Under RTTT3, the State is renewing its commitment to developing and implementing P-20 STEM Programs of Study within Participating LEAs. However, with the limited RTTT3 grant funds, the State's plan will specifically focus on establishing P-20 STEM Programs of Study that directly promote STEM application areas and developing individualized learning plans for middle-school students that are aligned to P-20 STEM Programs of Study at the high school level. As a result, RTTT3 Participating LEAs will be required to:

- As part of the Participating LEA's integration with ISLE, implement a strategy to link student data across local systems to enable the creation of integrated learner profiles that can support learning plans and other personalized learning tools;
- Establish an individual learning plan program, commencing in the 7th grade, that identifies students' academic and career interests and aligns to a P-20 STEM Program of Study model. The individual learning plan program must be implemented at minimum in the predominant feeder schools for high schools implementing P-20 STEM Programs of Study; and
- For LEAs serving grades 9-12, implement two or more P-20 STEM Programs of Study promoting STEM application areas (as discussed under B(3) Goal II below).

(B)(3) Goal II: The State Delivers Comprehensive LEA Supports for Standards Implementation, with a Focus on: (i) Assessment Tools to Inform Classroom Instruction and Promote Instructional Alignment, and (ii) High Quality STEM Instructional Resources.

The Center for School Improvement (CSI), as the nexus of the State's System for Support (as further described in Section A(2)), will be responsible for overseeing the establishment of standards-aligned instructional systems in Participating LEAs. The CSI will provide Participating LEAs with a full continuum of supports to ensure the Participating LEAs have the necessary tools and guidance to meet the expectations set forth under Goal I of this Section. In addition, ISLE (as described in Section C(3)) will enable educators to find and utilize high-quality and customizable curriculum and classroom resources to support implementation of the CCSS.

Beyond the supports offered through CSI and ISLE, RTTT3 funds will be used to (i) support the development of comprehensive local assessment systems supporting standards-aligned instruction and, where appropriate, the measurement of student growth; and (ii) establish STEM Learning Exchanges as a new State support infrastructure for P-20 STEM Programs of Study.

Key Activity 1: Establish LEA Assessment Systems Supporting Standards-aligned Instruction.

The Phase 2 Application described the State's intent to develop new capacities and undertake new investments to assist Participating LEAs in effectively assessing both college and career readiness and implementing the CCSS on an aggressive timeline. Since the Phase 2 application, the State's Performance Evaluation Advisory Committee (PEAC, more fully described in Section D(2)) has defined a framework for three distinct types of assessments that can be used to support standards-aligned instruction and, where appropriate, measure student growth. The three types of assessments included within this framework are:

- Type I: an assessment that measures a certain group of students in the same manner with the same potential assessment items, is scored by a non-district entity, and is widely administered beyond Illinois;

- Type II: an assessment developed or adopted and approved by the school district and used on a district-wide basis that is given by all teachers in a given grade or subject area;
- Type III: an assessment that is rigorous, aligned with the courses' curriculum, and that the evaluator and teacher determine measures student learning.

Through RTTT3, ISBE will incorporate this assessment classification into a two-pronged "Assessments for Learning" strategy to support standards implementation, improving instruction, and measuring student growth.

- First, ISBE will procure a statewide contract for "Type I" assessments to ensure the best available pricing and a simplified procurement/contracting process for Participating LEAs. All procured assessments must be able to measure student growth in a manner aligned to the CCSS, be coupled with appropriate training and professional development linked to the use of the assessment, and be integrated with ISLE (as described in Section C(3)) to the maximum extent possible.
- Second, ISBE will develop a network among the Participating LEAs to develop both the frameworks and, if needed, specific "Type II" and "Type III" assessments, including the facilitation of working groups across districts with similar assessment needs. An entity procured by ISBE will manage this network activity and ensure the work is informed by and integrated with appropriate subject area content expertise within the state and nationally. In particular, RTTT3 support will focus on the development of Type II and Type III assessment supports in grade levels and subjects not assessed by the State and assessments that can support a P-20 STEM Program of Study model (including employability and pathway/technical assessments).

To further support the RTTT3 Assessments for Learning strategies, ISBE will convene a panel of technical experts and practitioners to provide guidance and expertise on, at minimum, the following areas: (i) alignment to the CCSS, as integrated within the Illinois Learning Standards; (ii) alignment to PERA and the PEAC recommendations; (iii) appropriate use of the assessments, including for instructional, evaluative, predictive or multiple purposes; (iv) the demonstrated technical quality of assessments, including item quality; (v) the design of reporting systems ensuring accessibility to actionable data relating to appropriate uses; (vi) recommendations for professional development necessary to effectively use the assessments and results for instructional change; and (vii) appropriate methods for assessing English language learners and students with disabilities.

Each Participating LEA will be required to use ten percent (10%) of its RTTT3 allocation to develop Type II and Type III assessments frameworks and items which can be used on a district-wide basis by all teachers in a given grade or non-tested subject area, with all assessment frameworks and items developed using RTTT3 funds made available as "open source" and integrated with an assessment item bank and other assessment supports housed on ISLE (as described in Section C(3)). Participating LEAs can use these funds for release time for teachers to assist in the development of these assessments; hiring consultants to design assessment elements; or providing support to general network activity for development of Type II or Type III assessments.

Key Activity 2: Investing in High Quality STEM Instructional Resources and College and Career Readiness Initiatives to Support Programs of Study in Key STEM Application Areas.

Building off of the State's comprehensive framework for STEM education, the State's Phase 2 Application set forth a plan to invest in high quality instructional resources that will support the expansion of the P-20 STEM Programs of Study model through the establishment of STEM Learning Exchanges and college and career readiness supports. STEM Learning Exchanges are a new, innovative public-private education infrastructure that is organized to advance college and career readiness and support local implementation of P-20 STEM Programs of Study by coordinating statewide networks of P-20 education partners, business, labor, and other organizations on a sector-by-sector basis to coordinate planning and investment, aggregate resources, and review talent pipeline performance. Recognizing the importance of STEM instructional supports to the future success of the P-20 STEM Programs of Study model, RTTT3 funds will be used to (i) develop STEM Learning Exchanges, which will provide the resources and tools for LEAs to develop the required P-20 STEM Programs of Study promoting STEM application areas, and (ii) the Illinois Pathways Resource Center, to support a centralized resource and assistance center for the STEM Learning Exchanges and school districts that are establishing P-20 STEM Programs of Study. Furthermore, the State will use RTTT3 funds to expand the College and Career Readiness Program, which is designed to increase alignment between high school and college curriculums and support student pathways from high school to postsecondary education through Programs of Study models.

As further described in the State's Phase 2 Application, STEM Learning Exchanges are public-private partnerships including representatives from school districts, postsecondary institutions, business, industry experts, labor unions, professional associations, local workforce investment boards, state government agencies, student organizations, museums, research centers, and other community partners. Organized as collaborative communities, the STEM Learning Exchanges will be governed by and orchestrated through the public-private steering group consisting of representatives from the above-referenced stakeholders. Each Exchange will be supported by a lead non-profit organization or governmental entity that will serve as the administrative and fiscal agent, receiving tax-deductible donations and other funding from both public and private sources.

Since submission of its Phase 2 Application, the State has continued to move forward with its plan to establish the STEM Learning Exchanges. This past year, ISBE, the Illinois Community College Board (ICCB), the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE), the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (DCEO), the Illinois Department of Employment Security, and the Illinois Student Assistance Commission (ISAC) entered into the Illinois Pathways Initiative Intergovernmental Agreement (the "Pathways Agreement"), which accomplishes the following:

- Provides a framework for the establishment and management of the STEM Learning Exchanges;
- Creates an interagency management committee and public/private advisory council; and
- Permits the interagency transfer of funds and data necessary to support the STEM Learning Exchanges.

Under the Phase 2 Application, the State was planning to fund the development of nine STEM Learning Exchanges in the following application areas:

1. Agriculture, Food, and Natural Resources;	6. Transportation, Distribution, and Logistics;
2. Energy;	7. Research and Development;
3. Manufacturing;	8. Health Sciences; and
4. Information Technology;	9. Finance
5. Architecture and Construction;	

With the limited RTTT3 funding, the State's plan has been revised to provide full funding for the establishment of 3-5 STEM Learning Exchanges and partial funding, through matching planning grants, to the remaining STEM application areas. Under the authority of the Pathways Agreement and upon award notice, the "Illinois Pathways Interagency Committee" established by the Pathways Agreement will initiate the selection process for the Lead Entities for the 3-5 STEM Learning Exchanges to be established as initial priority areas, with the goal of soliciting for the establishment of the initial Lead Entities in the first quarter of 2012.

STEM Learning Exchanges will provide the curricular resources, assessment tools, and professional development systems necessary for LEAs to develop STEM-related P-20 Programs of Study in these application areas. For a more detailed description of the STEM application areas and a listing of the specific functions of the STEM Learning Exchanges, see Appendix 4. Each STEM Learning Exchange will deliver instructional resources through ISLE (see Section C(3)).

As a support for both the STEM Learning Exchanges and school districts establishing P-20 STEM Programs of Study, the Illinois Pathways Resource Center (IPRC) will serve as a centralized resource and assistance center providing services including, but not limited to, the following:

- Assistance with communicating the mission and goals of the established Learning Exchanges and assisting with external outreach and recruitment efforts for P-20 and industry partners;
- Coordinating applications and funding proposals for federal and foundation resources;
- Statewide technical assistance and training for P-20 partners in implementing STEM Programs of Study aligned to the National Career Cluster Framework;
- Developing applications, toolkits and other resources that assist with education and career planning and are common across all Learning Exchanges; and
- Assisting with performance review of sector-based P-20 talent pipelines using education and workforce longitudinal data.

Additionally, as part of the Illinois Pathways Initiative established by the Pathways Agreement, the Illinois Community College Board (ICCB) will target support through its College and Career Readiness Program to increase alignment between high school and postsecondary education and support the implementation of Programs of Study in key STEM application areas.

In addition to addressing this sub-criterion, please explain why your State has selected to address the activities in this sub-criterion in its Race to the Top Phase 3 application.

The State of Illinois is committed to the successful implementation of CCSS, and RTTT3 provides a means to obtain additional support for this critical priority. Robust local assessment systems are necessary for the successful delivery of standards-aligned instruction and the measurement of student growth across the curriculum. Preparing more Illinois students for careers in STEM fields is a key State priority, and P-20 Programs of Study and the STEM Learning Exchanges offer a comprehensive and coherent model for improving STEM education and increasing student engagement and success.

Performance Measures (B)(3)		Actual Data: Baseline (Current/most recent school year)	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014	End of SY 2014-2015
Aligning curriculum to CCSS	% of Participating LEAs implementing CCSS throughout all grade levels and applicable subject areas	NA	0%	25%	90%	100%
Implementing assessment systems	% of Participating LEA teachers providing ELA instruction who use non-summative assessments that measure student learning over the course of the school year (through administration of the assessments multiple times per year) aligned to the CCSS in ELA	NA	0%	25%	90%	100%
	% of Participating LEA teachers providing Math instruction who use non-summative assessments that measure student learning over the	NA	0%	25%	90%	100%

Performance Measures (B)(3)		Actual Data: Baseline (Current/most recent school year)	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014	End of SY 2014-2015
	course of the school year (through administration of the assessments multiple times per year) aligned to the CCSS in Math					
Participation in network activity to develop assessments	% of teachers in Participating LEAs participating in working groups that are contributing to the development of assessment frameworks and items for Type II and Type III assessments	NA	0%	5%	10%	NA
Programs of Study & STEM Implementation	% of high school students in Participating LEAs currently participating in a STEM Program of Study	NA	5%	20%	40%	55%
	% of underrepresented high school students* in Participating LEAs currently participating in STEM Program of Study	NA	10%	30%	50%	65%
	% of graduating high school seniors in Participating LEAs receiving WorkKeys National Career Readiness Certificate or other industry certification by graduation	NA	5%	20%	40%	55%
	% of 8 th graders in Participating LEAs completing an education and career plan	NA	10%	30%	50%	65%
	% of Participating LEA students currently in a STEM Program of Study participating in work-based learning experiences	NA	10%	30%	50%	65%
[Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data]						

Performance Measures (B)(3)	Actual Data: Baseline (Current/most recent school year)	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014	End of SY 2014-2015
Baseline data is not available because the State does not yet know which districts will be Participating LEAs. Baseline data will be provided and any necessary updates to the annual targets will be made within two weeks of finalizing the list of Participating LEAs.					
* "Underrepresented high school students" for purposes of this performance measure include low-income, English language-learners (ELLs), students with disabilities (SWDs), minorities, and female students.					

Sub-criteria (B)(3): Supporting the Transition to Enhanced Standards and High-Quality Assessments*		
ASSESSMENTS FOR LEARNING		
IMPLEMENTATION STEPS	TIMELINE	RESPONSIBILITY
(1) Develop and issue Request for Proposals (RFP) to assist with management of Assessments for Learning Strategy	Jan. - Apr. 2012	ISBE
(2) Assessments for Learning management entity selected	July 2012	ISBE
(3) Assessments for Learning advisory committee selected	Jan - July 2012	ISBE
(4) Development of statewide RFP for Type I assessments	July - Dec. 2012	ISBE; Assessments for Learning Management Entity; Assessments for Learning Advisory Committee
(5) Type I assessments available through the statewide RFP	July 2013 --	ISBE; Assessments for Learning Management Entity; Assessments for Learning Advisory Committee
(6) Development of plan and establishment of working groups for open-source frameworks and assessment items for Type II and Type III assessments	July - Dec. 2012	ISBE; Assessments for Learning Management Entity; Assessments for Learning Advisory Committee

(7) Working groups develop frameworks and assessment items, development of item banks and process for compilation of items into item banks.	Jan. - Dec. 2013	ISBE; Assessments for Learning Management Entity; Assessments for Learning Advisory Committee
P-20 PROGRAMS OF STUDY AND STEM LEARNING EXCHANGES		
IMPLEMENTATION STEPS	IMPLEMENTATION STEPS	IMPLEMENTATION STEPS
(8) Select and enter into agreement with lead organization to administer the Pathways Resource Center (PRC)	Jan. -Apr. 2012	Illinois Pathways Interagency Committee (IPIC)
(9) Development of plans and methods to support Programs of Study (POS) implementation and support STEM Learning Exchanges	May - Dec. 2012	IPIC; PRC
(10) Support to POS and STEM Learning Exchanges	Jan. 2013 --	IPIC; PRC
(11) Issue RFP for letters of intent/proposals for STEM Learning Exchanges	Feb. 2012	IPIC
(12) Letters of intent/proposals for STEM Learning Exchanges due	Mar. 2012	IPIC
(13) Designation of "Implementation" and "Planning" clusters. Implementation clusters will receive planning and implementation funds. Planning clusters will only receive planning funds.	Apr. 2012	IPIC
(14) Lead Entities selected for Implementation clusters; Lead Planning Entities selected for Planning Clusters	Aug. 2012	IPIC
(15) Lead Entities and Lead Planning Entities commence planning activities. Lead Entities create strategic plans and Lead Planning Entities commence stakeholder engagement.	Sept. 2012 --	Lead Entities and Lead Planning Entities
(16) Lead Entities in Implementation clusters commence	Jan. 2013	Lead Entities

STEM Learning Exchange implementation		
(17) Decisions regarding whether Lead Planning Entities will proceed to implementation are made.	July 2013	IPIC
(18) Creation of targeted supports through the College and Career Readiness Program to increase alignment between high school and postsecondary education to support implementation of POS in key STEM application areas.	Sept. 2012 --	IPIC; Illinois Community College Board (ICCB)

***The Participating LEA implementation timeline for this plan is located in Appendix 2.**

Selection sub-criterion	(C)(3)	Page references from State's Phase 2 application	100-116
-------------------------	--------	--	---------

Using Data to Improve Instruction

(C)(3) Goal I: Ensure that all Participating LEAs can implement local instructional improvement systems 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.

Key Activity 1: Undertake a State-district partnership for a next-generation instructional improvement system

The Phase 2 Application described the State's intent to partner with its school districts to implement a statewide instructional improvement platform consisting of the following two components:

- **The Learning and Performance Management System:** The "Learning and Performance Management System" (LPMS), as described in the Phase 2 application, was intended as a shared environment for LEAs, principals, teachers, and students to access instructional improvement tools and systems delivered at economies of scale far beyond what districts can achieve on their own.
- **The IlliniCloud:** In fall 2009, a core group of district tech coordinators and regional Learning Technology Center Directors, in coordination with ISBE, began to formally meet to support a grassroots effort to explore the need and interest in "building" a shared, cloud-based technology infrastructure. This grassroots effort, known as the IlliniCloud, has grown to include over 200 Illinois districts that have validated the immediate need and desire for shared, cloud-based services.

Since the Phase 2 Application submission, the State has forged ahead with the implementation of the LPMS and the expansion of the IlliniCloud. Specifically, the following four developments have advanced this work:

1. **NCSA technical requirements report:** ISBE and the Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity commissioned a report by the National Center for Supercomputing Applications at the University of Illinois-Urbana Champaign (NCSA) that addressed the technical requirements for the LPMS set forth in the Phase 2 application, but also expanded upon that vision to provide the blueprint for an architecture addressing broader P-20 educational and workforce development objectives.
2. **ARRA EETT grant to IlliniCloud:** In May 2011, ISBE issued a request for proposals for ARRA EETT competitive grant funding to provide \$4,200,000 to support the acquisition and development of data centers that can be integrated into a network to support district instructional activities and connect to a statewide instructional improvement platform. The IlliniCloud cooperative was selected to receive this grant, which has supported the expansion of its services.
3. **\$12 million state capital commitment:** The Governor committed \$12 million in state capital funds for the development of the system architecture described in the NCSA technical requirements report.
4. **Illinois selected as an SLI pilot state:** The Shared Learning Collaborative, an alliance formed by the Council of Chief State

School Officers, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, and the Carnegie Corporation of New York, is in the process of implementing the Shared Learning Infrastructure (SLI), an open-source system supported by a \$100 million philanthropic investment that will enable states to provide administrators, teachers, parents, and other education stakeholders with an array of affordable, high-quality content and tools. Illinois is one of five states chosen by the Shared Learning Collaborative to first implement the SLI. The SLI will be piloted and operational in two Illinois school districts by the end of calendar year 2012, with a scaling up to other Illinois school districts in the following year.

The "Illinois Shared Learning Environment" (ISLE) is the name for the entire project space that incorporates (i) the State investments and infrastructure previously referred to as the "LPMS" in the Phase 2 Application, (ii) the SLI and state-level extensions of the SLI, and (iii) the IlliniCloud, which serves as a proof-of-concept and foundation for a common, cloud-based solution for Illinois educational entities. The current description of ISLE, including a systems architecture diagram, is included in Appendix 5.

RTTT 3 funds are only being used for ISLE professional development support through the Center for School Improvement, and are not being used for ISLE development. Instead, other state, federal, and private funds are being directed toward the development of this system. However, as described in the Executive Summary and Section A(2), ISLE is a critical platform for carrying out multiple strategies within this Plan. Participating LEAs must agree to integrate with ISLE, participating in the 2nd phase of implementation occurring after its initial pilot, for all of the RTTT 3 strategy areas described in the Executive Summary of this Plan.

Key Activity 2: Teachers, principals, and administrators receive effective professional development on how to use ISLE

The ISLE Steering Committee, as described in Appendix 5, will develop a detailed professional development and training plan as part of ISLE's implementation. The Center for School Improvement, as further described in Section A(2), will oversee the implementation of this professional development and training plan to ensure it is aligned with other components of the instructional improvement process. This plan will also be coordinated with the training and implementation plan used for the multi-state SLI initiative, and will incorporate the following two approaches described in the Phase 2 Application:

1. **Regional and On-line Support Networks:** Each of the State's regional Learning Technology Centers will develop a regional support network of district technology leadership teams to provide support and collaboration opportunities for teachers and principals in effectively integrating the tools provided through ISLE into their daily work with students. These educational leaders will receive continuous professional development opportunities through the Learning Technology Centers, as coordinated by the Center for School Improvement, including facilitating the change process, data analysis, data-driven decision making, use of collaboration and communication tools, and curriculum and instruction applications. In addition, ISLE users will participate in on-line collaborative communities formed on ISLE to exchange effective implementation strategies.
2. **Portable Institutes.** ISLE professional development will also build off of the existing portable technology institutes led by the Learning Technologies experts at the University of Illinois College of Education in collaboration with staff from districts across the

state. Educators throughout Illinois have come to know these institutes as "Moveable Feasts," which have provided professional development to approximately 10,000 Illinois educators since their inception in 1997. The Feasts will develop strands designed to assist LEAs with the movement to ISLE and effective use of ISLE applications. Due to their portability, these opportunities are offered regionally and are easily accessible to teachers, principals, and technology staff representing all Illinois districts.

Combining the flexibility of the Moveable Feast model with the ongoing, sustained professional development and coaching to be provided in partnership by the Learning Technologies experts at the University of Illinois and the Learning Technology Centers will help establish a comprehensive and intensive system of support for the successful implementation of ISLE.

(C)(3) Goal II: Data from ISLE and the statewide longitudinal data system is available and accessible to researchers to evaluate the effectiveness and impact of RTTT 3 reforms

Key Activity: Establish the Illinois Collaborative for Education Policy Research

As has been demonstrated by the Consortium on Chicago School Research at the University of Chicago (CCSR), researchers can move beyond after-the-fact analysis to turn data into actionable tools that drive LEA policy, school improvement, and classroom instruction. The Illinois Collaborative for Education Policy Research (ICEPR), to be established through both RTTT 3 support and IES State Longitudinal Data System funding, will extend this same model of research and development to a broader number of Participating LEAs, using data obtained from the State longitudinal data system and LEA instructional improvement systems (including ISLE) through data sharing arrangements. In addition, as described in (A)(2), ICEPR will also help design and implement the State's outcomes measurement system for Participating LEAs.

A. Governance and Functions. The ICEPR will be an independent organization with a governance structure linking it closely to State agencies, participating universities, and other educational stakeholders in Illinois. The ICEPR's Steering Committee will leverage Illinois' deep "bench strength" in educational research to inform practice and policy, including membership from CCSR, the Illinois Education Research Council (IERC) at Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, the Center for the Study of Education Policy (CSEP) at Illinois State University, Northern Illinois University, the University of Illinois at Chicago, and the Forum on the Future of Public Education at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. The ICEPR Board will consist of 15-20 members, including the Steering Committee and representatives from state education agencies, the Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (DCEO), the Illinois Department of Human Services (DHS), practitioner organizations, Chicago Public Schools (CPS), regional public universities, private universities, and independent research and policy organizations. ICEPR's functional responsibilities will include recruiting researchers and coordinating their work across multiple institutions; facilitating data sharing arrangements with LEAs and easing administrative demands of research projects; communicating research findings in a way that informs ongoing practice, policy development, and innovative program implementation; and seeking and securing external funding for projects.

B. Access to LEA and State Data. Participating LEAs must cooperate with ICEPR to build local capacity to support research and development activities and share data with ICEPR in a manner consistent with all State and federal privacy protection laws. The creation of ISLE

will provide ICEPR with ready access to LEA data, as historical data will be retained in a standardized format in ISLE's data stores, with access to that data overseen by the governing board of ISLE.

C. Research Agenda. To align its work with the key objectives of this Plan, the focus for the ICEPR research agenda will be on how policies and programs in the following areas promote student growth and close achievement gaps: (1) systems to attract, develop, and support effective teachers and leaders; (2) P-20 alignment and college- and career-readiness; (3) innovations and interventions in low-performing schools and districts; (4) assessment and management of learning (formative vs. summative); and (5) approaches to teaching math and science (including STEM education), language, and literacy, and enhanced outcomes for traditionally low-achieving student groups.

D. PERA Research-based Study. The State priority of establishing systems to attract, develop, and support effective teachers and leaders will be the immediate priority for the ICEPR. In particular, ICEPR will provide critical support to the State's implementation of the redesign of performance evaluation systems through its management of an independent analysis of performance evaluation implementation. The Performance Evaluation Reform Act specifically requires that the State contract for a research-based study of performance evaluation reform by no later than September 1, 2012 (the "PERA Research-based Study").

The PERA Research-based Study will use data collected by the State including, but not limited to, performance ratings for teachers and principals, district recommendations to renew or not renew non-tenured teachers, and student achievement data. In addition, the LEA data made available through ISLE may allow the PERA Research-based Study to incorporate information from local assessment and HR systems for evaluation in a statewide manner that has never before been possible.

The ICEPR's role in this effort is to partner with ISBE to select the entity responsible for the PERA Research-based Study and, working closely with ISBE and stakeholders, provide consultation and oversight for its implementation. A leading model for the PERA Research-based Study is the Excellence in Teaching pilot in Chicago, where CCSR has partnered with Chicago Public Schools on every element of the design, implementation, and reporting, while still delivering an independent assessment of successes and challenges. Extensive access to individual student and teacher data was a critical element of the success of CCSR's work, as will be true for the PERA Research-based Study.

The PERA Research-based Study is a major priority because of its important link to RTTT and to establishing the credibility and repertoire of the ICEPR. The ICEPR, including partners such as CCSR, will play a critical role in building relationships with local districts through its hands-on approach to research that is highly connected to practice and policy. In particular, researcher access to both State and local assessment data will support the State's efforts to ensure that rigorous methods for measuring student growth are employed by all teachers, and not just those in State-tested grades and subjects. The PERA Research-based Study will serve as a model for using the State longitudinal data system and local instructional improvement systems and ensuring that local and statewide decision-making are focused on improved school performance.

In addition to addressing this sub-criterion, please explain why your State has selected to address the activities in this sub-criterion in its Race to the Top Phase 3 application.

The strategies described in Section C(3) of the State's Phase 2 application have been a continued focus for State investment and effort. The establishment of ISLE provides the opportunity to transform how data is used to impact instruction, and to provide all Illinois school districts with a comprehensive array of supports across all areas of this Plan. The State believes it needs improved research capacity to better support State policy, and ICEPR will help ensure data and evaluations are informing the ongoing implementation of this Plan.

Performance Measures (C)(3)		Actual Data: Baseline (Current/most recent school year)	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014	End of SY 2014-2015
If the State wishes to include performance measures, please enter in rows below, and provide baseline data and annual targets in the columns provided.						
IL Shared Learning Environment (ISLE)	% of Participating LEAs that have integrated local data with ISLE in the sections of standards implementation and educator quality/effectiveness strategies	NA	0%	5%	40%	100%
	% of teachers in Participating LEAs accessing instructional applications hosted on ISLE at least once per week during the school year	NA	0%	3%	30%	80%
	% of principals in Participating LEAs accessing performance dashboard applications hosted on ISLE at least once per week during the school year	NA	0%	3%	30%	80%
	% of high school students in Participating LEAs accessing instructional or college/career planning applications on ISLE at least once per week during the school year	NA	0%	3%	20%	50%
[Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data]						
Baseline data is not available because the State does not yet know which districts will be Participating LEAs. Baseline data will be provided and any necessary updates to the annual targets will be made within two weeks of finalizing the list of Participating LEAs.						
The process of LEA adoption of ISLE will become more efficient over time; therefore the adoption curve will be fairly exponential with most						

LEAs integrating with and accessing ISLE in the last year of the grant.

Sub-criteria (C)(3): Using Data to Improve Instruction*

IMPLEMENTATION STEPS	TIMELINE	RESPONSIBILITY
(1) Select and enter into agreement with lead organization to administer Illinois Collaborative for Education Policy Research (ICEPR)	Jan. - Apr. 2012	ISBE
(2) Formalization of ICEPR organizational structure and research agenda	May 2012 - Dec. 2012	ICEPR Steering Committee
(3) ICEPR supports the development of outcomes measurement plan	May 2012 - Dec. 2012	ICEPR Lead Entity; ISBE's Director of Performance Management
(4) Implementation of outcomes measurement plan	Jan. 2013 --	ICEPR Lead Entity; ISBE's Director of Performance Management
(5) ICEPR administers research and evaluation activities	Jan. 2013 --	ICEPR Lead Entity and Steering Committee
(6) Develop and issue Request for Proposals (RFP) for a PERA research-based study contractor	Jan. - June 2012	ISBE; ICEPR Lead Entity; ICEPR Steering Committee
(7) PERA research-based study contractor is selected	July - Sept. 2012	ISBE; ICEPR Lead Entity; ICEPR Steering Committee
(8) PERA research-based study is commenced and conducted	Sept. 2012 - Sept. 2014	PERA research-based study contractor

***The Participating LEA implementation timeline for this plan is located in Appendix 2. The implementation timeline for ISLE is located in Appendix 5.**

Selection sub-criterion	(D)(2)	Page references from State’s Phase 2 application	126-150
--------------------------------	---------------	---	----------------

Improving Teacher and Principal Effectiveness Based on Performance

(D)(2) GOAL I: Build robust teacher and principal evaluation systems that focus on both effective practice and student growth.

As fully explained in the State's Phase 2 Application, the foundation of Illinois' performance evaluation reforms and indeed, the State's overall educator effectiveness strategies is the Performance Evaluation Reform Act of 2010 ("PERA") (Public Act 96-0861). This legislation, which passed with overwhelming bipartisan support, substantially re-envisioned the State systems for supporting developing teachers and leaders by tightly aligning student outcomes and effectiveness measures. The critical elements of PERA, from requiring all teacher and principal evaluation systems to include student growth as a significant factor in evaluations to employing actionable plans for building on reported strengths and addressing documented shortcomings, are fundamental in improving classroom instruction and school leadership. For a more detailed description of PERA's critical elements, see Appendix 6.

To develop the system's components and framework for ongoing implementation, the State Superintendent, as required under PERA, appointed the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC), a special advisory council comprised of thirty-two members, including representatives of teacher unions, school district management, and persons with expertise in performance evaluation processes and systems. Since submission of the Phase 2 Application, PEAC and its three subcommittees have conducted regional forums and online webinars and surveys to obtain input from educators across Illinois in order to provide recommendations to ISBE regarding the regulatory structure and model templates for teacher and principal evaluations. PEAC submitted its recommendations to ISBE this past October and, based on these recommendations, ISBE recently released the draft PERA administrative rules for public comment. ISBE expects to finalize these rules in Spring 2012. In addition, Governor Quinn signed into law Senate Bill 7 (Public Act 97-0008) this past June, which, among other reforms, (i) allows the State Superintendent to initiate the suspension or revocation of certificates based on performance; (ii) streamlines the tenured teacher dismissal process, including the establishment of a streamlined process for performance-based dismissals; and (iii) places a greater emphasis on performance in key decisions such as filling of new and vacant positions, awarding tenure, and determining the order of dismissal in a reduction in force. With the heightened stakes attached to performance evaluations as the result of Senate Bill 7, Illinois believes a key focus for RTTT3 should be to ensure performance evaluation systems are implemented effectively for all teachers and principals in Participating LEAs, and that these LEAs can serve as models for scaling up redesigned performance evaluations across the State.

Key Activity 1: Create Extensive State Supports for Implementation

As referenced above and as set forth in the State's Phase 2 Application, State supports for the implementation of the redesigned teacher and principal evaluation systems will be critical to the ability of Participating LEAs to undertake the significant changes required under PERA and accelerated under this Plan. Through PERA and the work of PEAC, the State has committed to creating a robust PERA support system, including the following elements:

Table D(2)-1: State Supports for LEA Implementation of Redesigned Performance Evaluations

STATE SUPPORTS FOR LEA IMPLEMENTATION OF REDESIGNED PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS	
Practice Frameworks	Teacher and principal practice frameworks that describe the elements of good practice and provide rubrics and other tools for assessing practice. The State will also provide guidelines for the processes for collecting, reflecting on, and reporting evidence of practice with teachers and principals.
Model Evaluation Plans	Model evaluation plans for both teachers and principals for combining evidence of practice with evidence of student growth into a summative rating. The model will incorporate the requirements established by the State, but allow customization by districts in a manner that does not conflict with such requirements.
Training and Pre-qualification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An evaluator pre-qualification program aligned with the State evaluation model. • An evaluator training program based on the State evaluation model. The training program will provide multiple training options that account for the prior training and experience of the evaluator. • A superintendent training program based on the State principal evaluation model.
Supports and Tools to Implement Redesigned Systems	<p>A State provided or approved technical assistance system that supports districts with the development and implementation of teacher and principal evaluation systems. The State will also develop:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Web-based systems and tools and video-based observation processes supporting implementation of the model templates and the evaluator pre-qualification and training programs. Many of these systems and tools will be hosted on the Illinois Shared Learning Environment (ISLE) (see Section C(3)). • Multiple instruments to collect evidence of principal practice, including the State-adopted survey of learning conditions (described below).
Data Collection and Continuous Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State will measure and report correlations between local principal and teacher evaluations and (i) student growth in tested grades and subjects, and (ii) retention rates of teachers. • Pursuant to and in accordance with PERA and SB7, the State will develop a survey of learning conditions to provide feedback from, at a minimum, students in grades 6 through 12 and teachers on the instructional environment within a school.

RTTT3 funds will be used to support critical elements of the above-referenced State PERA supports, including the development and implementation of the PERA Evaluator Pre-Qualification and Training Program; the development and implementation of the Survey of Learning Conditions; and funding to support PEAC and its related subcommittee work. Under PERA, the State is required to develop an evaluator pre-qualification and training program in order to ensure that a broader range of properly trained evaluators can undertake teacher and principal evaluations, including "peer" evaluations. As a result, this past October, the State released a Request for Sealed Proposals (RFSP) for the Performance Evaluation Training Program. Under this RFSP, the State is seeking one or more contractors for the development of a performance evaluation training program, the delivery of evaluator training courses, and the provision of technical assistance and web-based resources to support the redesigned teacher and principal evaluation system. The PERA Pre-Qualification and Training Program, as detailed in the RFSP, will include the following components:

- A pre-qualification program aligned to the State's performance evaluation system that individuals conducting evaluations after September 1, 2012 must successfully complete, including incorporation of a process for ensuring that evaluators' ratings align to the requirements of the system.
- An evaluator re-training program for pre-qualified evaluators to take at least once during the five-year certificate renewal cycle for the purpose of maintaining credentials to evaluate teachers. The evaluator re-training program must be continuously updated, offer modules that build upon each other over time, and address the various skill and knowledge levels among evaluators.
- A technical assistance system that supports districts with the development and implementation of teacher and principal evaluation systems.
- Web-based systems and tools that support the implementation of the State's performance evaluation models for teacher and principal evaluations and evaluator pre-qualification and training programs.
- A train-the-trainer program that includes development and delivery of content specific to the evaluator pre-qualification program, the evaluator re-training program, the technical assistance system, and the web-based system and tools.

RTTT3 funds will be used to both support the development of the PERA Pre-Qualification and Training Program, as well as support for principal and teacher evaluators in LEAs throughout the State to participate in the trainings. Specifically, any LEA (whether or not participating in RTTT3) will receive \$200/evaluator to participate in the teacher practice training component of the pre-qualification program to be provided during the 2012-13 school year, except for any Participating LEA receiving more than 50% of the RTTT3 Participating LEA allocation.

In addition to supporting the PERA Pre-Qualification and Training Program, RTTT3 funds will be used to support the development of a survey of learning conditions to provide feedback from, at a minimum, students in grades 6 through 12 and teachers on the instructional environment within the schools. School climates and learning conditions are associated with positive youth development, effective risk prevention, student learning and academic achievement, increased student graduation rates, and teacher retention. Recognizing the importance of a positive and sustained school climate, PERA identifies surveys of learning conditions as a potential tool to collect information on principal practice. Furthermore, certain information from the survey of learning conditions will also be used in the State's redesigned School Report Cards and ISLE parent portals, as further described in Section A(2). ISBE will issue an RFSP for the creation of a research-based instrument with the goal of improving school climate and learning conditions that:

- Provides feedback on how students and school personnel perceive a school's or district's particular climate and conditions for learning, including, but not limited to:
 - Family & community engagement;

- The learning environment; and
- The teaching environment.
- Uses valid and reliable survey instruments based on leading indicators of positive school climate in order to assess and evaluate conditions for learning.
- Helps schools and districts use the data to drive school improvement, including creating summary reports and identifying areas of weakness identified by the school climate surveys.

As described above, the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC) plays a vital role in the development of re-designed teacher and principal evaluation system, and is tasked with developing recommendations for the evaluation system's components and framework for ongoing implementation. PEAC has three committees: the Teacher Evaluation System Design Subcommittee, the Principal Evaluation System Design Subcommittee, and the Evaluator Training, Prequalification and Support Subcommittee. The State will provide RTTT3 funds to support the continued work of PEAC and its subcommittees to ensure PEAC has the necessary support and capacity to continue to provide leadership for the State's performance evaluation reforms.

Key Activity 2: Establishing Participating LEAs as Reform Exemplars Through Accelerated PERA Implementation

As part of the State's strategy to highlight Participating LEAs as "reform exemplars" for the entire State, Participating LEAs, under RTTT3, will be required to implement PERA on an aggressive timeline. PERA mandates evaluations that include student growth for all principals by September 1, 2012. Under PERA, school districts having 500,000 or more inhabitants must fully implement PERA's student growth requirements for teacher evaluations by September 1, 2013. For any Participating LEA having less than 500,000 inhabitants, the LEA must implement PERA's student growth requirements for teacher evaluations on at least the following timeline, if not sooner:

- Implementation with a "no stakes" student growth component (i.e., student growth component is not used in final teacher summative evaluations) in all schools by September 1, 2013; and
- Full implementation of PERA's student growth requirements by:
 - September 1, 2014 for Participating LEAs within the lowest performing 20% of districts, as defined by ISBE; and
 - September 1, 2015 for all other school districts.

For all districts other than Chicago Public Schools, these timelines are a full year earlier than otherwise required by statute. To be eligible for a timeline that is more aggressive than required by law, PERA requires a Participating LEA to have written agreement by the exclusive bargaining representative of its teachers.

In addition to implementing PERA on an aggressive timeline, all Participating LEAs must incorporate the following elements into their performance evaluation systems:

- A formal peer evaluation system that is used for a significant portion of summative evaluations and can be used as part of evaluations

during teacher remediation;

- The use of positive performance evaluations as part of the basis for selecting peer evaluators and mentors;
- Full cooperation in the PERA Research-based Study (as further described in Section C(3)); and
- Implementation of the State-adopted survey of learning conditions or an ISBE-approved equivalent, subject to the availability of RTTT3 or State funding for its implementation.

Furthermore, as part of the Participating LEA scope-of-work, ISBE will request information about how Participating LEAs are defining teacher and principal leadership pathways and career ladder models. Generally, career ladders define a multi-level system for teachers and principals to access opportunities for increased responsibilities and leadership roles, often with additional compensation in return. With this information, ISBE can:

- Analyze what career ladder models are developing between districts and local unions, and how these models relate to performance evaluations and compensation;
- Determine whether State supports can assist districts to develop teacher and principal leadership pathways and career ladder models; and
- Use this information for federal or foundation funding requests to further promote and define teacher and principal leadership pathways and career ladder models.

In addition to addressing this sub-criterion, please explain why your State has selected to address the activities in this sub-criterion in its Race to the Top Phase 3 application.

The State is committed to the successful implementation of performance evaluation reforms as the result of the enactment of PERA and SB 7. RTTT3 provides needed support to better ensure successful implementation.

<p>Required Performance Measures</p> <p>Notes: Data should be reported in a manner consistent with the definitions contained in this application package in Section VI. Qualifying evaluation systems are those that meet the criteria described in (D)(2)(ii).</p>	<p>Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)</p>	<p>End of SY 2011-2012</p>	<p>End of SY 2012-2013</p>	<p>End of SY 2013-2014</p>	<p>End of SY 2014-2015</p>
--	---	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

Criteria	General goals to be provided at time of application:	Baseline data and annual targets				
(D)(2)(i)	Percentage of participating LEAs that measure student growth	NA	5%	25%	100%	100%
(D)(2)(ii)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for teachers.	NA	5%	10%	35%	75%
(D)(2)(ii)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for principals.	NA	5%	100%	100%	100%
(D)(2)(iv)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems that are used to inform:	NA				
(D)(2)(iv)(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developing teachers and principals 	NA	5%	10%	35%	75%
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compensating teachers and principals* 	NA	3%	5%	10%	15%
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promoting teachers and principals 	NA	5%	10%	35%	75%
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retaining effective teachers and principals 	NA	5%	10%	35%	75%
(D)(2)(iv)(c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Granting tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals 	NA	5%	10%	35%	75%
(D)(2)(iv)(d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals 	NA	5%	10%	35%	75%
<p>Baseline data is not available because the State does not yet know which districts will be Participating LEAs. Baseline data will be provided and any necessary updates to the annual targets will be made within two weeks of finalizing the list of Participating LEAs.</p> <p>* Commencing in SY 2013-2014, Participating LEAs will implement induction and mentoring systems, and must use positive peer evaluators as part of the basis for selecting mentors who will likely receive a stipend for mentoring activities. However, stipends for mentoring activities are not accounted for in the annual targets for this criterion.</p>						

Optional Performance Measures		Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014	End of SY 2014-2015
Notes: Data should be reported in a manner consistent with the definitions contained in this application package in Section VI. Qualifying evaluation systems are those that meet the criteria described in (D)(2)(ii).						
Criteria	General goals to be provided at time of application:	Baseline data and annual targets				
(D)(2)(iv)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems that are used to inform:	NA				
(D)(2)(iv)(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developing teachers 	NA	5%	10%	35%	75%
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developing principals 	NA	5%	100%	100%	100%
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compensating teachers* 	NA	3%	5%	10%	15%
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compensating principals 	NA	5%	100%	100%	100%
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promoting teachers 	NA	5%	10%	35%	75%
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promoting principals 	NA	5%	100%	100%	100%
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retaining effective teachers 	NA	5%	10%	35%	75%
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retaining effective principals 	NA	5%	100%	100%	100%
(D)(2)(iv)(c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Granting tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers 	NA	5%	10%	35%	75%
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Granting full certification (where applicable) to principals** 	NA	5%	100%	100%	100%
(D)(2)(iv)(d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers 	NA	5%	10%	35%	75%
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removing ineffective principals 	NA	5%	100%	100%	100%

Baseline data is not available because the State does not yet know which districts will be Participating LEAs. Baseline data will be provided and any necessary updates to the annual targets will be made within two weeks of finalizing the list of Participating LEAs.

* Commencing in SY 2013-2014, Participating LEAs will implement induction and mentoring systems, and must use positive peer evaluators as part of the basis for selecting mentors who will likely receive a stipend for mentoring activities. However, stipends for mentoring activities are not accounted for in the annual targets for this criterion.

** For principals, unsatisfactory performance can be a basis for certification suspension or revocation.

General data to be provided at time of application:		
Total number of participating LEAs.		NA
Total number of principals in participating LEAs.		NA
Total number of teachers in participating LEAs.		NA
[Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data] Baseline data is not available because the State does not yet know the which districts will be Participating LEAs.		
Criterion	Data to be requested of grantees in the future:	
(D)(2)(ii)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems.	
(D)(2)(iii) ²	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year.	
(D)(2)(iii)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year.	

² 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 in order to meet Department reporting requirements.

(D)(2)(iv)(b)	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.	
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	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.	
(D)(2)(iv)(c)	Number of teachers in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were eligible for tenure in the prior academic year.	
(D)(2)(iv)(c)	Number of teachers in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems whose evaluations were used to inform tenure decisions in the prior academic year.	
(D)(2)(iv)(d)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs who were removed for being ineffective in the prior academic year.	

Sub-criteria (D)(2): Improving Teacher and Principal Effectiveness Based on Performance*		
IMPLEMENTATION STEPS	TIMELINE	RESPONSIBILITY
(1) Selection of entity, pursuant to Request for Proposals (RFP), for PERA Pre-Qualification and Training Program	Jan. - Mar. 2012	Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE)
(2) PERA Pre-Qualification and Training Program entity commences work with Participating and Involved LEAs	Sept. 2012	Selected entity, ISBE, PEAC
(3) Develop and issue RFP for the administration of a State-adopted school climate survey	Jan. - March 2012	ISBE, PEAC
(4) Select entity to administer State-adopted school climate survey	May - June 2012	ISBE
(5) Establishment of plan for administration and adaptation of instrument for State-adopted school climate survey	July 2012 - June 2013	Selected entity, ISBE, PEAC

***The Participating LEA implementation timeline for this plan is located in Appendix 2.**

Selection sub-criterion	(D)(3)	Page references from State's Phase 2 application	151-174
--------------------------------	---------------	---	----------------

Ensuring Equitable Distribution of Effective Teachers and Principals

(D)(3)(i) Goal II: Create a pipeline of highly effective principals and teachers to serve the State's neediest schools.

Recognizing that the single most-important school-based factor affecting student learning is quality of instruction, the State's Phase 2 Application focused on improving teacher and principal preparation programs and the establishment of regional "School Leadership Consortia" that will coordinate the efforts of preparation programs (including universities and alternative providers), school districts, Lead and Supporting Partners to recruit and prepare teachers and principals for placements in High Poverty High Minority (HPHM) schools. With the limited RTTT3 funds, the State will target teacher preparation programs and increase the placement of highly qualified teacher candidates in HPHM schools. While RTTT3 funding will not be provided for principal preparation programs, the State will leverage School Improvement Grant (SIG) and other state and federal funding streams to support these initiatives.

Key Activity 1: Target Teacher Recruitment and Placement Initiatives to Supply a Pipeline of Teachers to Serve High Need Schools.

RTTT3 funding will be used to provide incentives for teacher preparation programs to: develop new programs aligned with the CCSS and ISLE (as further described in Section C(3)); and establish partnerships with Participating LEAs to support placements of teachers with extensive training on CCSS in HPHM schools. Specifically, elementary and middle level teacher preparation programs receiving RTTT3 funds will align their curriculum to the CCSS and ISLE while also developing new programs focusing on the four core academic areas: ELA, Math, Science and Social Science. By creating partnerships with Participating LEAs, teacher preparation programs will bring faculty together with teachers from the Participating LEAs to learn about the CCSS and develop new courses and programs to be submitted to the State Educator Preparation and Licensure Board (SEPLB) in late 2012 or early 2013, with the first class completing the new program by early 2015. A plan for transitioning candidates from the current programs to the new preparation programs will also be required. Furthermore, the teacher preparation programs receiving RTTT3 funds will also be expected to partner with and leverage other initiatives supporting placement of highly qualified candidates in HPHM schools through other state, federal and private funding sources. All Participating LEAs will be required to partner with a participating teacher preparation program.

In addition to addressing this sub-criterion, please explain why your State has selected to address the activities in this sub-criterion in its Race to the Top Phase 3 application.

Quality of instruction is critical to improving student outcomes in HPHM schools, and teacher preparation programs must be engaged as partners in the State's overall reform strategies.

Performance Measures for (D)(3)(i)*	Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or	End of SY 2011- 2012	End of SY 2012- 2013	End of SY 2013-2014	End of SY 2014- 2015
<i>Note: All information below is requested for Participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems.</i>					
* All (D)(3) performance measures will be updated within two weeks after Participating LEAs have been identified and finalized.					
General goals to be provided at time of application:	Baseline data and annual targets				
Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both who are highly effective.	NA	12	15	18	22
Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both who are highly effective.	NA	17	19	22	25
Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both who are ineffective.	NA	28	24	20	16
Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both who are ineffective.	NA	23	20	17	14
Percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both who are highly effective.	NA	12	15	18	22
Percentage of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both who are highly effective.	NA	17	19	22	25
Percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both who are ineffective.	NA	28	24	20	16
Percentage of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both who are ineffective.	NA	23	20	17	14
Baseline data is not available because the State does not yet know the which districts will be Participating LEAs.					
General data to be provided at time of application*:					
Total number of schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both.	1,054				
Total number of schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both.	1,134				
Total number of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both.	35,534				
Total number of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both.	37,230				
Total number of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both.	1,054				

Total number of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both.	1,134	
*Per clarification from the Department of Education, this general data applies only to Participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems.		
Data to be requested of grantees in the future:		
Number of teachers and principals in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both who were evaluated as highly effective in the prior academic year.		
Number of teachers and principals in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both who were evaluated as highly effective in the prior academic year.		
Number of teachers and principals in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both 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 who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year.		

Sub-criteria (D)(3): Ensuring Equitable Distribution of Effective Teachers and Principals*		
IMPLEMENTATION STEPS	TIMELINE	RESPONSIBILITY
(1) Solicitation and selection of teacher preparation programs to receive incentives for developing programs aligned with CCSS and ISLE	Jan. - June 2012	ISBE
(2) Teacher preparation programs develop programs aligned with CCSS and ISLE for submission to SEPLB	July 2012 - Feb. 2013	Teacher Preparation Programs with support from ISBE
(3) Teacher preparation programs chose Participating LEA partner(s) to support placement of teachers in HPHM schools	July 2012 - Sept. 2012	Teacher Preparation Programs with support from ISBE
(4) First class of teachers complete the new teacher preparation programs	June 2014 - Jan. 2015	Teacher Preparation Programs

***The Participating LEA implementation timeline for this plan is located in Appendix 2.**

Selection sub-criterion	(D)(5)	Page references from State's Phase 2 application	180-189
--------------------------------	---------------	---	----------------

Providing Effective Support to Teachers and Principals

With the passage of the PERA and Senate Bill 7 (both as described in Section D(2)), there is a great need for new teacher and principal induction and mentoring to support Illinois' new evaluation and accountability laws. Accountability and expectations are set high and supports to help teachers and principals are needed to provide practitioners with the tools necessary to meet these increased expectations.

(D)(5) Goal I: All Beginning Teachers and Principals in Participating LEAs Are Supported Through High Quality Induction and Mentoring Programs.

Key Activity 1: Scale Up Induction and Mentoring Programs to Support all Beginning Teachers.

Recognizing that nearly half of all new teachers leave the classroom within their first five years of service, and in some Chicago schools that figure is as high as 75 percent, the State's Phase 2 Application stressed the need to strengthen induction and mentoring programs for new teachers. As a result, all RTTT3 Participating LEAs, subject to the availability of RTTT3 funds or other State funding of at least \$1,600 per teacher in years one and two and \$1,200 per teacher in years 3 and 4, will be required to: (i) establish induction and mentoring programs for all new teachers that are at least two years in duration, use positive performance evaluations as a factor in the selection of mentors, and meet standards set forth in the School Code and administrative rules; and (ii) participate in the State's technical assistance and accountability systems to improve the quality of all new teacher induction and mentoring programs. RTTT3 funds will be provided to assist Participating LEAs in establishing these programs.

Key Activity 2: Establish the Statewide Infrastructure Necessary to Build and Maintain Induction Program Quality.

As described in the State's Phase 2 Application, the State will provide technical assistance to the induction and mentoring programs developed by the Participating LEAs while also holding these programs accountable to ensure program quality. Key components of the technical assistance system will include:

- **Tailored Program Improvement:** ISBE, working with one or more partnership organizations, will assemble a team of staff who will provide tailored technical assistance to individual program leadership teams in Participating LEAs. This focused and consistent coaching and support for individual induction programs will serve as the cornerstone for improving program quality.
- **Formative Assessment and Mentoring Materials:** Technical assistance providers will provide guidance and support to programs around the use of formative assessment of new teacher practice protocols and local teacher evaluation procedures.
- **Online Mentoring for Math, Science, and Special Education Teachers:** The technical assistance system will provide enhanced mentoring services for first-time STEM teachers via online technology. These services are particularly important for new teachers

in rural and/or many urban settings who may not have access to a qualified, experienced teacher in one of these high-need subject areas.

In order to ensure program accountability, the State will develop and implement a process of ongoing program improvement based upon the Illinois Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Beginning Teacher Induction Programs, the Illinois Continuum of Induction Program Development, and implementation and impact data. To collect the necessary data for the program accountability process, ISBE, working with its partnership organizations, will ramp-up a system, developed through an independent external evaluation, that collects and synthesizes program impact data, including teacher effectiveness, teacher retention, student achievement, and teacher efficacy. Furthermore, RTTT3 funds will be allocated to the dissemination and replication of best induction/mentoring practices beyond the Participating LEAs. The Statewide Professional Development Coordinator, as further described in Section A(2), will be responsible for overseeing and coordinating the technical assistance, program accountability process and dissemination of best practices as described above.

Key Activity 3: Individualized Mentoring Support for all New Principals.

Since 2007, the State has required individuals who first begin working as principals to engage in a one-year mentoring program. Through the Illinois New Principal Mentoring Program, an ISBE-sponsored program, new principals are matched with an experienced principal who provides on-the-job guidance and helps principals develop competencies in a broad array of leadership skills and practices aimed at improving teaching and learning in their schools. ISBE's program requirements ensure no fewer than 50 contact hours between the mentor and the principal. As part of RTTT3, the State will provide funds, subject to the availability of RTTT3 funds or other State funding of at least \$1,600 per principal in years one and two and \$1,200 per principal in years 3 and 4, to continue and strengthen the New Principal Mentoring Program in the Participating LEAs. Furthermore, as required with the new teachers mentoring and induction programs, Participating LEAs will be required to use positive performance evaluations as a factor in selecting principal mentors.

In addition to addressing this sub-criterion, please explain why your State has selected to address the activities in this sub-criterion in its Race to the Top Phase 3 application.

As stated in the introductory paragraph to this Section, new teacher and principal induction and mentoring programs provide a critical support for educators to address Illinois' new evaluation and accountability laws.

Performance Measures (D(5))		Actual Data: Baseline (Current/most recent school year)	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014	End of SY 2014-2015
If the State wishes to include performance measures, please enter in rows below, and provide baseline data and annual targets in the columns provided.						
Scaling up support for all beginning teachers and principals	% 2 nd year teachers in Participating LEAs completing a 2-year induction and mentoring program	NA	NA*	5%	20%	80%
	% of beginning teachers completing a 2-year induction and mentoring program that, for the final school year of the program, achieve an overall summative performance evaluation rating of either proficient or excellent	NA	NA*	60%	65%	70%
	% of beginning teachers rated "needs improvement" in their first year of teaching who, after completing a 2-year induction and mentoring program, achieve an overall summative performance evaluation rating of proficient or excellent	NA	NA*	60%	65%	70%
	% of beginning principals participating in a one-year mentoring program that achieve an overall summative performance evaluation rating of either proficient or excellent for the school year in which they participated in the program	NA	60%	60%	65%	70%
Baseline data is not available because the State does not yet know which districts will be Participating LEAs. Baseline data will be provided and any necessary updates to the annual targets will be made within two weeks of finalizing the list of Participating LEAs.						
* Participating LEAs are not required to establish a new teacher induction and mentoring program until the end of the 2012-13 school year, although some Participating LEAs are expected to implement a program on an earlier timeline. Therefore, the induction and mentoring performance measures are phased in starting with the end of SY 2012-13.						

Sub-criteria (D)(5): Providing Effective Support to Teachers and Principals*		
IMPLEMENTATION STEPS	TIMELINE	RESPONSIBILITY
(1) Distribution of RTTT3 funds, subject to availability, to Participating LEAs for the establishment of induction/mentoring programs	Jan. 2012 - June 2013	ISBE
(2) Assemble a team to provide tailored technical assistance to Participating LEAs on individual teacher and principal induction programs and the use of formative assessments related to evaluations	Jan. 2012 - June 2013	ISBE
(3) Development of online mentoring for math, science and special education teachers	Jan. 2012 - June 2013	ISBE, contracted support entity (or entities)
(4) Commence technical assistance to Participating LEAs	July 2013	ISBE, contracted support entity (or entities)
(5) Development of a system to collect and synthesize data on the impact of teacher and principal induction and mentoring programs	July - Dec. 2012	ISBE, contracted support entity (or entities)
(6) Collecting and disseminating best induction/mentoring practices beyond the Participating LEAs	January 2013 - December 2015	ISBE, contracted support entity (or entities)

***The Participating LEA implementation timeline for this plan is located in Appendix 2.**

PERFORMANCE MEASURES

There will be selection sub-criteria in a State's Race to the Top Phase 2 application that the State does not address in its Phase 3 application. The State need not complete or include anything about those sub-criteria, including the performance measures, in its Phase 3 Part II application. For sub-criteria to which a State is responding that are included in its Phase 2 application, the State must provide goals and annual targets, baseline data, and other information for performance measures as indicated in the Phase 2 application. For each of those criteria, the State must complete the performance measure tables or provide an attachment with the required performance measure information. In addition, the limited scope of Race to the Top Phase 3 means that funded activities might not be covered by performance measures in the Race to the Top Phase 2 application, thus potentially preventing the meaningful evaluation of grantee performance. Consequently, applicants must develop and propose for the Department's approval performance measures for sub-criteria that do not have performance measures in the Race to the Top Phase 2 application. The State may provide additional performance measures, baseline data, and targets for a criterion if it chooses. If a State does not have baseline data for a performance measure, the State should indicate that the data are not available and explain why.

IV. SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, ENGINEERING AND MATHEMATICS (STEM) SUMMARY

An applicant must explain in its detailed plan and budget for Phase 3 funding how it will allocate a meaningful share of its Phase 3 award to advance STEM education in the State. You may meet this requirement by including in your plans and budgets:

- 1) Activities proposed by the State to meet the competitive preference priority for STEM education, if applicable; or
- 2) Activities within one or more of the four core education reform areas that are most likely to improve STEM education.

A State should address this requirement throughout the Part II application (*i.e.*, indicate the plan, performance measures and budget by addressing applicable sub-criterion). Use the text box below to provide a summary of how the State is meeting this requirement.

Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) Summary

The Illinois RTTT3 Plan includes a comprehensive focus on the establishment of a rigorous course of study in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) for all students within Participating LEAs, including addressing the needs of underrepresented groups and women. As described in Section B(3), Programs of Study in key STEM application areas are a central component of the Illinois RTTT3 plan. Participating LEAs serving grades 9 through 12 must establish at least two Programs of Study promoting critical STEM application areas. The Program of Study model provides a wide set of highly flexible options for students to enter STEM-related pathways, especially for students that have not performed well in traditional science and math courses and other underrepresented groups in STEM fields, including women and minorities.

Illinois will use RTTT3 funding to establish "STEM Learning Exchanges" through public-private partnerships modeled after a long-standing, successful model for Illinois agricultural education. STEM Learning Exchanges will include representatives from school districts, postsecondary institutions, businesses, industry experts, museums, research centers, and other community partners responsible for overseeing the grant. While the State's ultimate objective is to establish separate STEM Learning Exchange in each of the nine critical STEM application areas, RTTT3 funds will be used to provide full funding for the establishment of 3-5 STEM Learning Exchanges, with partial funding, through matching planning grants, to the remaining STEM application areas (*see B(3)*). STEM Learning Exchanges will provide the curricular resources, assessments tools, professional development systems, and IT infrastructure necessary for LEAs to develop STEM-related Programs of Study in these application areas. The supports developed by each STEM Learning Exchange will be housed on the cloud computing hosting infrastructure of the Illinois Shared Learning Environment (*see C(3)*) to ensure that all Participating LEAs will have access to the software and curricular resources needed for effective instruction in the STEM disciplines.

Illinois' approach to STEM learning and career preparation and development provides a strong platform for STEM education because it integrates and vertically aligns STEM standards at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. The State's supports for the implementation of the Common Core State Standards will ensure that the CCSS math and science standards are effectively integrated into the local curriculum. This Plan's assessment strategies will provide LEAs with access to assessments to effectively measure progress in the STEM disciplines, including employability and pathway/technical assessments to support P-20 STEM Programs of Study. Additionally, the State's technical assistance system for induction and mentoring includes online math and science mentoring – particularly important for rural STEM instructors.

RACE TO THE TOP PHASE 3 BUDGET

BUDGET SUMMARY

Budget Summary Table: Attached to this Application Package is the Budget Summary Table in Excel format (titled Race to the Top Phase 3 Budget). States should complete the Budget Summary Table as the final step in their budgeting process, and include this table as the first page of the State's budget.

The State must include, on Line 14 of the Budget Summary Table, the amount of funding to be subgranted to its participating LEAs based on their relative shares of funding under Part A of Title I of the ESEA for the most recent year (that is, FY 2011), as required under section 14006(c) of the ARRA. States are not required to provide budgets for how the participating LEAs would use their funds. However, the Department expects that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that participating LEAs spend these funds in accordance with the State's plan and the scope of work described in the agreement between the State and the participating LEA.

Budget Summary Narrative: A budget narrative that accompanies the Budget Summary Table should provide an overview of the projects that the State has included in its budget. Applicants should use their budget narratives to provide a detailed description of how they plan to use their Federal grant funds and how they plan to leverage other Federal, State, and local funds to achieve their reform goals. The budget narrative should be of sufficient scope and detail for the Department to determine if the costs are necessary, reasonable, and allowable. The State must also include how it plans to direct a meaningful share of its Phase 3 award to advance STEM education in the State.

The State's budget for the Illinois RTTT3 Plan provides the State of Illinois with the resources to further accelerate the implementation of the reform blueprint laid out in the State's Phase 2 application and continue to build on the State's reform momentum. The following three goals have provided the basis for the Illinois RTTT3 plan and its corresponding budget:

1. Attract a group of Participating LEAs that can serve as "reform exemplars" for the entire State. These districts will agree to meet a high bar for participation across a comprehensive set of reforms.
2. Within the Participating LEAs, build systems and processes to accelerate and sustain improved student outcomes.
3. While the Participating LEAs will blaze the path for a comprehensive approach to key reforms, RTTT3 will also build State capacity to extend these reforms statewide.

Based on these goals and as further detailed in the Illinois RTTT3 Plan, the State's budget includes funding for the following projects:

- Establishing the Center for School Improvement to provide comprehensive supports to Participating LEAs;
- Increasing ISBE capacity to support Illinois' reform goals;
- Enhancing the State's Report Card;
- Implementing Assessment for Learning;
- Establishing Programs of Study and STEM Learning Exchanges;

- Implementing the College and Career Readiness Program to increase alignment between high school and postsecondary education and to support the implementation of Programs of Study;
- Implementing the State's redesigned performance evaluation system and a State-adopted Survey of Learning Conditions;
- Establishing the Illinois Collaborative for Education Policy Research (ICEPR) to extend the use of data in creating actionable tools that drive LEA policy, school improvement, and classroom instruction to a broader number of Participating LEAs;
- Improving and expanding teacher and principal induction and mentoring; and
- Providing supports to teacher preparation programs to increase the pipeline of high-quality teacher in high poverty, high minority schools.

For additional detail on each of these projects, see the Project-level Budget Narratives.

The State's general theory of funding allocation, as is demonstrated throughout the Project Level Budgets and Budget Narratives, is as follows:

- Grant Year 1 (12/22/11 - 12/31/12): Planning and establishment of the Illinois RTTT3 plan projects, programs and activities, including development of the state capacity and infrastructure necessary to support these project, programs and activities.³
- Grant Year 2 (1/1/13 - 12/31/13): Intensive implementation of the Illinois RTTT3 plan projects, programs and activities. This largest allocation of RTTT3 funds will be allocated during this period.
- Grant Year 3 (1/1/14 - 12/31/14) : Continuation of the Illinois RTTT3 plan projects, programs and activities implemented during Grant Years 1 and 2. These project, programs and activities will begin to see a deceleration in the amount of RTTT3 funds flowing to the projects. The programs and activities must begin to focus on self-sustainment after Grant Year 3 using other federal, State and local sources.
- Grant Year 4 (1/1/15 - 12/22/15): Projects, programs and activities funded through the Illinois RTTT3 plan will transition to non-RTTT3 funding and will implement self-sustaining strategies.

The State has and will continue to leverage other Federal, State and local funds to achieve the reform goals set forth in the Illinois RTTT3 plan. Examples, as further described in this Application include:

- Illinois Shared Learning Environment (ISLE): As further described in Criteria C(3), ISLE is the name for the entire project space

³ Illinois anticipated that the first year of the grant would be abbreviated due to start up times. Thus, in a practical sense, the first year of the budget covers the time from which funding would be available (approximately April) through December. The remaining years span the full calendar years. Please see sections below for an explanation of how grant year 1 budgets were determined or need to be modified accordingly.

that incorporates (i) the State investments and infrastructure previously referred to as the "Learning Performance Management System" in the Phase 2 Application, (ii) the Shared Learning Infrastructure (SLI) and state-level extensions of the SLI, and (iii) the IlliniCloud, which serves as a proof-of-concept and foundation for a common, cloud-based solution for Illinois educational entities. While ISLE is a central component of the Illinois RTTT3 Plan, RTTT3 funds will not be used to support the continued development of ISLE. Rather, the State has committed \$12 million in state capital funds for the development of the system architecture. Furthermore, as more fully described in Criteria C(3), Illinois has been selected to be one of the first states to implement the SLI, a multi-state collaborative supported by a \$100 million philanthropic investment to develop a next-generation technology system that will enable teachers to easily find high-quality and highly-customizable curriculum and classroom resources aligned to the Common Core State Standards.

- Illinois Collaborative for Educational Policy Research (ICEPR): As further described in Criteria C(3), both RTTT3 and IES State Longitudinal Data System funding will be used to establish ICEPR in order support the transformation of data into actionable tools that can drive LEA policy, school improvement, and classroom instruction.
- Common Core State Standards (CCSS): In addition to RTTT3 funds, ISBE is using its own funding to hire 15 content specialists to assist with Common Core State Standards implementation, with expertise in Math, English language arts, and data and assessment.
- STEM Learning Exchanges: As further described in Criteria B(3), all RTTT3 funding provided to establish STEM Learning Exchanges will require private matching grants.
- School Improvement Grant Funds (SIG): Participating LEAs with "Tier I" or "Tier II" schools will be encouraged and expected to leverage SIG funds to support its RTTT3 scope-of-work and implementation plan.

Furthermore, as demonstrated through this Application, the Illinois RTTT3 plan includes a comprehensive focus on the establishment of a rigorous course of study in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) for all students within Participating LEAs, including addressing the needs of underrepresented groups and women. Specifically, Illinois will direct a meaningful share of its Phase 3 award to advance STEM education through the following projects:

- STEM Learning Exchanges: RTTT3 funds will be used to establish "STEM Learning Exchanges" (as further described in Criteria B(3)). Full-funding will be provided to establish 3-5 STEM Learning Exchanges, with partial funding, through matching planning grants, to the remaining STEM application areas (see Criteria B(3)). STEM Learning Exchanges will provide the curricular resources, assessments tools, professional development systems, and IT infrastructure necessary for LEAs to develop STEM-related Programs of Study (as further described in Criteria B(3)) in these application areas.
- Programs of Study: Participating LEAs will be required, through their allocation of RTTT3 funds, to establish Programs of Study in key STEM application areas as a central component of the Illinois RTTT3 plan. Participating LEAs serving grades 9 through 12

must establish at least two Programs of Study promoting critical STEM application areas. The Program of Study model (as further described in Criteria B(3)) provides a wide set of highly flexible options for students to enter STEM-related pathways, especially for students that have not performed well in traditional science and math courses and other underrepresented groups in STEM fields, including women and minorities.

- Supports for Programs of Study in key STEM Application Areas: As further described in Criteria B(3), the Illinois Pathways Advisory Council (IPIC) will establish the Illinois Pathways Resource Center (IPRC) in order to support a centralized resource and assistance center for the STEM Learning Exchanges that provides services including, but not limited to, coordinating applications and funding proposals for federal and foundation resources and statewide technical assistance and training in implementing STEM Programs of Study. Furthermore, through the College and Career Readiness Program (as further described in Criteria B(3)), the Illinois Community College Board (ICCB) will target support to increase alignment between high school and postsecondary education in order to strengthen the implementation of Programs of Study in key STEM application areas.
- Integration of STEM Standards and Assessment Strategies: The State's supports for the implementation of the Common Core State Standards will ensure that the CCSS math and science standards are effectively integrated into the local curriculum. This Plan's assessment strategies will provide LEAs with access to assessments to effectively measure progress in the STEM disciplines, including employability and pathway/technical assessments to support P-20 STEM Programs of Study.
- Induction and Mentoring for STEM instructors: Additionally, the State's technical assistance system for induction and mentoring includes online math and science mentoring – particularly important for rural STEM instructors.

ISBE has extensive experience writing Requests for Proposals and letting and managing contracts. Its use of an Expenditure Review Board, which meets monthly, and Contract Authorization Form facilitates effective collaboration among its program, legal, and procurement staff. Each state fiscal year, ISBE manages approximately 100 contracts. The addition of the contracts designated in the State Plan for the length of the grant period can easily be absorbed by the current infrastructure. Unless otherwise noted, the estimated budget for contractual items is based on ISBE's prior experience with similar contractual expenses, and a determination that the estimated budget and annual allocations are reasonable and appropriate. In its contracting and procurement processes, ISBE generally does not break out budgets by work streams to enable bidders to provide the most effective cost proposal possible in light of the allocated budget.

PROJECT LEVEL BUDGET

The supporting project-level detail is required as back-up to the budget summary. For each project that the State is proposing in order to implement the plans described in its Race to the Top Phase 3 application, the State should complete the following:

Project-Level Budget Table. Attached to this Application Package is a template for project-level budgets in Excel format. States should complete a project-level budget table for each project, by budget category and for each year for which funding is requested.

Project-Level Budget Narrative: Provide a budget narrative that accompanies the Project-Level Budget Table and backup detail associated with each budget category in the Project-Level Budget.

**PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: CENTER FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT (CSI)
CRITERIA A(2)**

The Center for School Improvement (CSI) is described in Criteria (A)(2) of the Application. CSI will serve as the nexus of Illinois' Statewide System of Support (SSOS) to provide high-quality, coordinated and consistent support to districts and schools across the State. 1003(a) funds will be used to support CSI's activities in eligible low-performing schools and districts and RTTT3 funds will be used to extend CSI's services to Participating LEAs, and to build capacity within CSI to support key reform areas such as standards implementation and continuous improvement processes (see Criteria B(3)).

1) Personnel

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

2) Fringe Benefits

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

3) Travel

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

4) Equipment

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

5) Supplies

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

6) Contractual

ISBE will issue a contract with an entity to lead the CSI. The CSI provides ISBE with greater flexibility to quickly scale up capacity to work across the State's reform agenda and move ahead with intensive work in the Participating LEAs while expanding its scope in key areas such as standards implementation and instructional improvement processes. The CSI will be operated as a partnership between: (1) ISBE; (2) one or more university or nonprofit partners with a proven track record of effectively and efficiently providing high-quality support in the RTTT focus areas; and (3) the Illinois Association of Regional Superintendents of Schools (IARSS), serving as the representative of the regional delivery system. The CSI will be responsible for assisting Participating LEAs to incorporate standards-based reporting into their Math, Science and ELA programs; the training and professional development for the Statewide System of Support coaches; and the evaluation of the Statewide System of Support.

CSI's budget will be based upon a cost proposal submitted by the successful bidder and approved through ISBE's procurement process. The budget estimates per year set forth below assume that Year 1 will primarily consist of planning and start-up activities, the most intensive assistance to LEAs will occur in Year 2, and Years 3 and 4 will include a transition to other funding streams in order to continue the services as needed. The CSI will employ one full-time Director, approximately 10 area coordinators to manage the delivery of services throughout Participating LEAs, and Content Area Specialists to support the roll-out of the Common Core in Participating LEAs. The remaining funding will be allocated for training and resource development and sub-contractual assistance to support CSI's field activities. The CSI will receive an additional \$5-6 million dollars per year through Title I Part A and SIG 1003(g) state administrative funding. The SIG funding will be specifically used to support CSI's work with low-performing schools and districts.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$264,000	\$1,012,100	\$543,500	\$274,514	\$2,094,114

ISBE will be in compliance with the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40-74.48 and Part 80.36.

7) Training Stipends

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

8) Other

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

9) Total Direct Costs

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$264,000	\$1,012,100	\$543,500	\$274,514	\$2,094,114

10) Indirect Costs

An Indirect Cost rate of 16.4% will be applied to the first \$25,000 of each contract. It is estimated that one contract will be used in each of the years.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$4,100	\$4,100	\$4,100	\$4,100	\$16,400

11) Funding to Involved LEAs

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

13) Total Funds Requested

	Line 9	Line 10	Total
Year 1	\$264,000	\$4,100	\$268,100
Year 2	\$1,012,100	\$4,100	\$1,016,200
Year 3	\$543,500	\$4,100	\$547,600
Year 4	\$274,514	\$4,100	\$278,614
Total	\$2,094,114	\$16,400	\$2,110,514

**PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION (ISBE) CAPACITY
CRITERIA A(2)**

RTTT3 funds will be used to increase capacity at the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) to support the reforms set forth in the State's Plan as further described in Criteria (A)(2) of the Application. The funding will be used to pay salary, benefits, travel and equipment for four new positions.

- The **Director of Performance Management** will be charged with gathering, analyzing and making available, as appropriate, all of the data sources identified in the State's Plan that will be utilized to gauge State and Participating LEA progress toward Plan implementation, including gains in student achievement. Working with agency staff, the Director of Performance Management will oversee the development and implementation of key instructional technology initiatives including the Illinois Shared Learning Environment (ISLE) and also work closely with the Illinois Collaborative for Education Policy Research (ICEPR), both, to integrate research and evaluation data into the State's performance management processes.
- The **Director of Policy and Program Implementation** will be charged with managing and monitoring the intersecting work of the State's plan as described in this Application in order to ensure there is coherence and coordination across all reform activities. This Director will serve as the "glue" that will bind the State's multiple reform efforts into a comprehensive and effective whole. The Director will work with the Center for School Improvement to coordinate and leverage all aspects of the Center's work while also managing a process of stakeholder and partner engagement to sustain strong support for this Plan. The Director will be responsible for raising any implementation issues to the RTTT Leadership and Implementation Team for resolution.
- The **Statewide Professional Development Coordinator** will help ensure that existing and new professional development and technical assistance programs outlined in this Plan are implemented in a strategic and coordinated manner, taking into consideration the needs and capacity of Participating LEAs and timelines for implementation of the Plan's reforms. This coordinator will work closely with the Center for School Improvement Director to strengthen the quality and impact of professional development offerings.
- The **RTTT Implementation Counsel** will be tasked with handling the legal components of the State's RTTT3 plan including, but not limited to the preparation of procurement requests, inter-agency and intergovernmental agreements and the review of Participating LEA Memorandum of Understanding and related agreements. The RTTT Implementation Counsel will also serve as the liaison to the Department of Education for reporting and compliance-related matters.

1) Personnel

Director of Performance Management

Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Year 4		
% FTE	Base Salary	Total	% FTE	Base Salary	Total	% FTE	Base Salary	Total	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
50%	88,800	\$44,400	100%	\$91,500	\$91,500	100%	\$94,200	\$94,200	0%	\$0	\$0

Director of Policy and Program Implementation

Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Year 4		
% FTE	Base Salary	Total	% FTE	Base Salary	Total	% FTE	Base Salary	Total	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
50%	98,000	\$49,000	100%	\$100,940	\$100,940	100%	\$104,000	\$104,000	0%	\$0	\$0

Statewide Professional Development Coordinator

Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Year 4		
% FTE	Base Salary	Total	% FTE	Base Salary	Total	% FTE	Base Salary	Total	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
50%	88,800	\$44,400	100%	\$91,500	\$91,500	100%	\$94,200	\$94,200	0%	\$0	\$0

RTTT Implementation Counsel

Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Year 4		
% FTE	Base Salary	Total	% FTE	Base Salary	Total	% FTE	Base Salary	Total	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
50%	79,600	\$39,800	100%	\$82,000	\$82,000	100%	\$84,460	\$84,460	0%	\$0	\$0

TOTAL

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
\$177,600	\$365,940	\$376,860	\$0

Base salary is projected to increase by three percent in the first three years of the grant. In the fourth year, salary will be paid with an alternate funding source.

2) Fringe Benefits

Director of Performance Management

Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Year 4		
% FTE	Base Benefit	Total	% FTE	Base Benefit	Total	% FTE	Base Benefit	Total	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
50%	\$53,280	\$26,640	100%	\$54,900	\$54,900	100%	\$56,520	\$56,520	0%	\$0	\$0

Director of Policy and Program Implementation

Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Year 4		
% FTE	Base Benefit	Total	% FTE	Base Benefit	Total	% FTE	Base Benefit	Total	% FTE	Base Benefit	Total
50%	\$58,800	\$29,400	100%	\$60,564	\$60,564	100%	\$62,400	\$62,400	0%	\$0	\$0

Statewide Professional Development Coordinator

Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Year 4		
% FTE	Base Benefit	Total	% FTE	Base Benefit	Total	% FTE	Base Benefit	Total	% FTE	Base Benefit	Total
50%	\$53,280	\$26,640	100%	\$54,900	\$54,900	100%	\$56,520	\$56,520	0%	\$0	\$0

RTTT Implementation Counsel

Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Year 4		
% FTE	Base Benefit	Total	% FTE	Base Benefit	Total	% FTE	Base Benefit	Total	% FTE	Base Benefit	Total
50%	\$47,760	\$23,880	100%	\$49,200	\$49,200	100%	\$50,676	\$50,676	0%	\$0	\$0

TOTAL

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
\$106,560	\$219,564	\$226,116	\$0

Benefits computed as 60% of salary (41.55% retirement; 17% group insurance; 1.45% FICA) and increase three percent the first three years of the grant. In the fourth year, benefits will be paid with an alternate funding source.

3) Travel

The travel request will cover expenses of staff to and from partner meeting locations.

Given the size of Illinois and the substantial amount that state employees travel between Springfield, the capitol, and Chicago, the largest city, travel costs are always difficult to estimate, and the numbers below are estimated based on past experience with other similar positions. Travel for the four personnel was budgeted as a conservative average, and additional travel will most likely need to be paid with an alternative funding source. Ideally, these would be single day trips. In the event that one of the staff members needed to stay overnight, part of the \$175 allocated for mileage would be traded for lodging costs (unless (s)he stayed in Chicago, where lodging costs could approach \$175.) Also, in the event the overall travel costs for these four individuals begins to exceed those budgeted, ISBE may use other methods to reduce costs such as encouraging the use of agency vehicles rather than paying mileage. It is anticipated that travel costs for these individuals would transition to another fund source in the fourth year of the grant. Based on these considerations, an average of nine to eleven trips to meetings for each staff member (approximately 41 total) for each of Grant Years 1-3 are included in the budget. Each meeting is budgeted at \$200.00 per trip with such expenses including an average mileage reimbursement of \$175.00 in addition to a per diem.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$8,200	\$8,200	\$8,200	\$0.00	\$24,600

4) Equipment

The current master contract for a laptop is \$1,162 and the initial cost of an air card is \$55, or a total of \$1,217. Notably, air card usage totals \$42 per month. These costs will be paid from another funding source. The current master contract for a desktop is \$1,288. The \$1,300 was used in case a desktop is preferred.

	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
Four laptop/desktop computers will be needed in the first year to supply the needs of the four employees. Air cards will also be purchased to allow for accessibility while out of the office.	\$1,300	Laptop/Desktop Computer and Air Card	\$5,200
Total			\$5,200

5) **Supplies**

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

6) **Contractual**

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

7) **Training Stipends**

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

8) **Other**

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

9) **Total Direct Costs**

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$297,560	\$593,704	\$611,176	\$0	\$1,502,440

10) **Indirect Costs**

An Indirect Cost rate of 16.4% will be applied.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$48,800	\$97,383	\$100,217	\$0	\$246,400

11) Funding to Involved LEAs

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

13) Total Funds Requested

	Line 9	Line 10	Total
Year 1	\$297,560	\$48,800	\$346,360
Year 2	\$593,704	\$97,383	\$691,087
Year 3	\$611,176	\$100,217	\$711,393
Year 4	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total	\$1,502,440	\$246,400	\$1,748,840

**PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: STATE REPORT CARD
CRITERIA A(2)**

The State Report Card is described in Criteria (A)(2) of the Application. Legislation enacted in November 2011 will lead to a report card redesign by October 2013. For the first time, the State expects to report valuable information for stakeholders, in addition to information required by the *No Child Left Behind Act*. For example, District and School Report Cards may include new information such as how many college-level Advanced Placement courses each high school offers, how many eighth-graders passed algebra, and how many teachers received top ratings on their performance evaluations. In addition, the Report Cards will compare test results to other Illinois public schools with similar student compositions. RTTT3 funds will be used to support this work. The State Report Card will be an integrated part of the RTTT Outcomes Measurement Plan as described in Criteria A(2).

1) Personnel

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

2) Fringe Benefits

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

3) Travel

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

4) Equipment

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

5) Supplies

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

6) Contractual

ISBE will contract with an entity to provide supports and enhancements to complement the re-designed State Report Card.

The contractor's budget will be based upon a cost proposal submitted by the successful bidder and approved through ISBE's procurement process. The budget estimates per year set forth below are based on ISBE experience with other data management and reporting projects. The estimates assume that most contractual expenditures will occur in Years 1 and 2, when the report card design and data configuration work will occur. Years 3 and 4 will include data management and production of the new report card.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$491,800	\$295,000	\$98,400	\$98,400	\$983,600

ISBE will be in compliance with the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40-74.48 and Part 80.36.

7) Training Stipends

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

8) Other

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

9) Total Direct Costs

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$491,800	\$295,000	\$98,400	\$98,400	\$983,600

10) Indirect Costs

An Indirect Cost rate of 16.4% will be applied to the first \$25,000 of each contract. It is estimated that one contract will be used in each of the years.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$4,100	\$4,100	\$4,100	\$4,100	\$16,400

11) Funding to Involved LEAs

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

13) Total Funds Requested

	Line 9	Line 10	Total
Year 1	\$491,800	\$4,100	\$495,900
Year 2	\$295,000	\$4,100	\$299,100
Year 3	\$98,400	\$4,100	\$102,500
Year 4	\$98,400	\$4,100	\$102,500
Total	\$983,600	\$16,400	\$1,000,000

**PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: ASSESSMENTS FOR LEARNING
CRITERIA B(3)**

The Assessments for Learning Project is described in Criteria (B)(3) of the Application. The State plans to support an accelerated transition by Participating LEAs to high quality assessments by contracting with an entity to provide a two-pronged Assessments for Learning strategy to support standards implementation, instructional improvement and measures of student growth.

1) Personnel

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

2) Fringe Benefits

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

3) Travel

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

4) Equipment

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

5) Supplies

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

6) Contractual

ISBE will contract with an entity to oversee and manage the two-pronged Assessment for Learning strategy set forth in B(3) of the application.

- In Prong 1, the Assessments for Learning management entity will develop and administer a Statewide RFSP for Type I assessments.
- In Prong 2, the Assessments for Learning management entity will develop, plan, establish, and administer working groups for development of open-source frameworks and assessment items for Type II and III assessments.

The support vendor's budget will be based upon a cost proposal submitted by the successful bidder and approved through ISBE's procurement process. The budget estimates per year set forth below assume that Year 1 will primarily consist of planning and start-up activities, the most intensive assessment development activities will occur in Year 2, and Years 3 and 4 will include a transition to other funding streams in order to continue the services as needed. The budget assumes at least one full-time staff member with administrative support, with the remainder of funding allocated for funding for assessment and subject-area experts and administration of the working groups.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$175,300	\$672,000	\$361,000	\$175,300	\$1,383,600

ISBE will be in compliance with the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40-74.48 and Part 80.36.

7) Training Stipends

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

8) Other

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

9) Total Direct Costs

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$175,300	\$672,000	\$361,000	\$175,300	\$1,383,600

10) Indirect Costs

An Indirect Cost rate of 16.4% will be applied to the first \$25,000 of each contract. It is estimated that one contract will be used in each of the years.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$4,100	\$4,100	\$4,100	\$4,100	\$16,400

11) Funding to Involved LEAs

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

- While no supplemental funding will be provided to Participating LEAs, 10% of the Participating LEAs' allocation must be used for network activity to design open source assessment frameworks and items. Participating LEAs will be able to use these funds for release time for teachers to develop or hire consultants to design items or to help fund an ISBE contract to support this work.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

13) Total Funds Requested

	Line 9	Line 10	Total
Year 1	\$175,300	\$4,100	\$179,400
Year 2	\$672,000	\$4,100	\$676,100
Year 3	\$361,000	\$4,100	\$365,100
Year 4	\$175,300	\$4,100	\$179,400
Total	\$1,383,600	\$16,400	\$1,400,000

**PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: STEM LEARNING EXCHANGES,
PATHWAYS RESOURCE CENTER AND ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT CRITERIA B(3)**

1) Personnel

Existing ISBE personnel will manage the administration of the contracts described below. .

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

2) Fringe Benefits

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

3) Travel:

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
--	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	--------------

Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
--------------	--------	--------	--------	--------	---------------

4) Equipment

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

5) Supplies

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

6) Contractual

STEM Learning Exchanges

STEM Learning Exchanges, as further designed in Criteria B(3), a public-private education infrastructure designed to advance college and career readiness by coordinating statewide networks organized around the career cluster frameworks. Each STEM Learning Exchange will operate as a consortium of public-private partners that is supported by a lead non-profit organization that will serve as the administrative and fiscal agent for the Learning Exchange.

This network will reduce the transaction costs by connecting with a wide range of partners to share resources and coordinate public-private investments to support local implementation of Programs of Study (POS) in key STEM application areas. IPIC, as described above and more fully in Criteria B(3), is responsible for selecting the lead entity for each Learning Exchange as well as supporting them through data sharing and alignment with state policies and programs.

IPIC will award both planning and implementation grants through a competitive selection to establish the STEM Learning Exchanges. ISBE anticipates providing approximately 4 implementation grants at \$500,000 each and 6 planning grants at \$50,000 each over the course of three-years. Each implementation and planning grant will require, at minimum, a one-to-one match thereby leveraging an additional \$2,300,000 to support STEM education in Illinois. The funding for the Learning Exchanges will be used to support staffing and the convening of statewide meetings, but the majority of resources (approximate 60-40 split) will support implementation of the nine functions described in the application narrative. Such activities include supporting the development, aggregation and implementation of career cluster-based curriculum and career guidance resources as well as supporting and funding work-based learning opportunities for students and professional development workshops for teachers. Planning grants will specifically be used to support staffing, the convening of regional meetings, and the publication of final reports and recommendations that will be disseminated statewide.

Below is a list of example allowable expenses and activities for Learning Exchanges accompanied by an example allocation for a Learning Exchange funded at \$500,000.

- 1/2 of Salary and benefits for full-time staff members, e.g. \$119,925 for one full-time staff member over three years (\$39,975 each year) (based on a total salary of \$239,850 or \$79,950 each year).
- 1/2 of Travel and travel-related expenses, e.g. \$28,125 over three years (based on total travel of \$56,250, or \$18,750 per year).
- Supporting the nine functions of the Learning Exchanges identified in Attachment 4, including activities related to the development of e-learning curriculum, developing and hosting competitive challenges, distributing career development information, professional development support (including sponsoring STEM externships), and other materials and resources, e.g. \$351,950 over three years.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$1,250,000	\$850,000	\$200,000	\$0.00	\$2,300,000

Illinois Pathways Resource Center

IPIC will establish the Illinois Pathways Resource Center (IPRC) in order to support a centralized resource and assistance center for the Learning Exchanges that provides services including, but not limited to, the following:

1. Annual STEM Learning Exchange Conference: 1 to 1.5 day conference for 300-400+ participants who are interested in the STEM Learning Exchange Initiative in Illinois. Comprehensive agenda to showcase STEM Learning Exchange progress on an annual basis.
2. Regional Meetings and Workshops: .5 to 1 day targeted regional meetings and workshops focused on critical aspects of planning, implementing and evaluating Programs of Study . These meetings and workshops align well with the strategy already employed by the Illinois Community College Board (ICCB) to support POS through the "Pathways to Results" program.
3. Train the Trainer Workshops: 1-3 day workshops focused on preparing state, regional, STEM Learning Exchange, Teacher Educator, Graduate Educator and other qualified professionals to support POS planning and implementation.
4. Leadership Workshops: .5 to 1 day workshops designed to engage K-12, community college and university, business and other leaders in essential knowledge and skills to support POS planning and implementation.
5. Cross-site Meetings: 1-day meetings that bring together K-12 school, community colleges and universities, businesses, CBOs and others who are working together as partners to support POS planning and implementation. Meetings will be organized by cluster sites that have similar POS implementation plans, based on stage of implementation, regions, challenges, etc.
6. Networking Strategies: Organizations involved in POS will be encouraged to support one another using strategies such as Lead sites,

Learning sites, etc. These strategies will be modeled after current strategies used with Pathways to Results.

7. One-on-one consulting, coaching and facilitation: Limited opportunity exists for one-on-one support (if extensive support needed, outside organizations may need to provide financial support).
8. Website: created and maintained by IPRC with extensive interconnectivity to STEM Learning Exchanges, state agencies, employers, and others.
9. Evidence-based materials and resources: Accessible and downloadable on IPRC Website. Selected materials will be produced in print format to ensure widespread dissemination statewide. Examples of such materials and resources include: a STEM Learning Exchange Resource Directory; e-learning modules created, maintained and accessible on the IPRC website; and webinars and go to meetings on high priority topics and special issues to help link experts with practitioners.
10. Grant Writing: Support to secure additional resources to help scale up STEM Learning Exchanges and POS reform.

In addition to these technical assistance strategies, the IPRC will engage in applied research activities that support the STEM Learning Exchanges. Without research to produce the evidence-based materials mentioned above, the STEM Learning Exchange initiative may have difficulty achieving sustainability and scale up because new dollars are likely to depend on a baseline of evidence of success.

The IPRC may be a single entity or multiple entities tasked with different activities. The entity(ies) will be established through a competitive procurement process or through intergovernmental agreements with eligible entities, such as university systems. A breakdown of approximate costs for the IPRC is as follows:

Budget Category	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Salary and Benefits	\$180,250	\$250,000	\$230,000	\$0.00	\$660,250
Professional services (conference registration fees, consultations)	\$15,400	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$0.00	\$45,400
Travel	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$0.00	\$30,000
Room rental and refreshments	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$0.00	\$60,000

Communications (telephone, postage & mailings)	\$2,000	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$0.00	\$5,000
Duplication & Printing	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$8,500	\$0.00	\$28,500
Workman's Compensation	\$200	\$250	\$200	\$0.00	\$650.00
Consumable Project supplies	\$2,550	\$3,250	\$2,300	\$0.00	\$8,100
Facilities & administrative costs	\$10,000	\$15,000	\$12,500	\$0.00	\$37,500
Total	\$250,400	\$325,000	\$300,000	\$0.00	\$875,400

The State has followed the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40 - 74.48 and Part 80.36.

7) Training Stipends

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

8) Other

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

9) Total Direct Costs

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$1,500,400	\$1,175,000	\$500,000	\$0.00	\$3,175,400

10) Indirect Costs

- The indirect cost rate is 16.4% of the initial \$25,000 of the contracted amount. It is estimated that two contracts will be used in each of grant years 1-3.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$8,200	\$8,200	\$8,200	\$0.00	\$24,600

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

13) Total Costs

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$1,508,600	\$1,183,200	\$508,200	\$0.00	\$3,200,000

**PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: COLLEGE AND CAREER READINESS PROGRAM
CRITERIA B(3)**

1) Personnel

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

2) Fringe Benefits

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

3) Travel

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

4) Equipment

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

5) Supplies

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

6) Contractual: ISBE will enter an intergovernmental agreement with the Illinois Community College Board to manage and implement the College and Career Readiness Program, as further described in Criteria B(3), which focuses on the development and utilization of target interventions in high schools by community colleges in an effort to reduce remediation for students with a particular focus on STEM application areas. These interventions include instruction, targeted support services, and work with high schools and community colleges to improve curriculum alignment to support implementation of Programs of Study in key STEM application areas. RTTT3 funding will be used to support the following goals:

- Diagnosing college readiness for students in Programs of Study by aligning placement assessments from secondary to postsecondary education in developmental and freshmen curriculum;
- Reduction of remediation by utilizing targeted interventions in the high schools to decrease remedial needs for students in math, reading and writing;
- Alignment of high school and college curriculum;
- Provision of resources and academic support to students in their senior year of high school through remedial or advanced coursework and other interventions; and
- Evaluating the performance of the interventions through both self-evaluation processes and an external evaluation.

Specifically, funding will be allocated approximately as follows:

- Personnel: one project director at \$36,200 throughout the grant period (reduced amount in Grant Year 1). The Senior Director for Academic Affairs and Director for Academic Affairs time on this project will be provided in kind over the grant period.
- Fringe: \$14,500 annually (reduced amount in Grant Year 1).
- Sub-contract/Intergovernmental Agreement: A sub-contract/intergovernmental agreement will be entered for the evaluation of this

project, with reports required on an annual basis. Total cost of the evaluation over the grant period, as further delineated below, is estimated at \$100,000.

- **Professional Development:** ICCB will partner with professional organizations to provide training on the core elements of the project, including, but not limited to: (1) curriculum alignment in Math and ELA; (2) curriculum alignment in STEM careers; (3) integrating the Common Core State Standards and the Common Technical Core (under development) into curriculum; (4) building partnerships across secondary and postsecondary education; and (5) developing effective high school interventions. Total cost of the professional services over the grant period, as further delineated below, is \$28,649.50.
- **College Sites:** Funding will be provided to seven colleges that serve Participating LEAs to support the engagement of low-performing high schools within those districts. Funding for Grant Year 1 will be focused on developing a protocol for the alignment and delivery of college and career readiness assessments and the delivery of those assessment to no less than 3 partner high schools' junior classes in CTE and STEM focused programs/courses. In addition, Grant Year 1 funding will also be used for the development of a targeted remedial intervention model to reduce remedial needs in math and/or CTE gatekeeper courses and the convening of meetings with high school and postsecondary faculty to assess and develop a plan for the alignment of curriculum. Funding in Grant Years 2-4 will be focused on the delivery of college and career readiness assessments to partner high schools' junior classes in CTE and STEM focused programs/courses; the delivery of targeted remedial interventions in math and CTE gatekeeper courses; continuing alignment activities between high school and postsecondary institutions; and the delivery of an academic and student services support plan to directly engage the targeted high school juniors. Total cost for the College Site component over the grant period, as further delineated below, is \$630,000 (\$10,000 per college site in Grant Year 1, \$30,000 per college site in each of Grant Years 2 and 3, and \$20,000 per college site in Grant Year 4).
- **Travel/Meetings:** \$7,200 is budgeted for travel to and from meetings to support the activities referenced above, as further delineated below.
- **Indirect Costs:** \$27,625.50 is budgeted for indirect costs to support the activities referenced above, as further delineated below.
- The State has followed the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40 - 74.48 and Part 80.36.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Personnel	27,150	36,200	36,200	36,200	135,750
Fringe	10,875	14,500	14,500	14,500	54,375
Evaluation	4,000	28,000	28,000	40,000	100,000
Professional Development	4,233.50	9,297	9,297	5,822	28,649.50
College Sites	70,000	210,000	210,000	140,000	630,000

Travel / Meeting Expenses	1,200	2,000	2,000	2,000	7,200
Indirect Costs	5,491.50	7,378	7,378	7,378	27,625.50
TOTAL	122,950	307,375	307,375	245,900	\$983,600

7) Training Stipends

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

8) Other

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

9) Total Direct Costs

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$122,950	\$307,375	\$307,375	\$245,900	\$983,600

10) Indirect Costs

- The indirect cost rate is 16.4% of the initial \$25,000 of the contracted amount. It is estimated that one contract will be used in each of the years.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$4,100	\$4,100	\$4,100	\$4,100	\$16,400

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

13) Total Costs

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$127,050	\$311,475	\$311,475	\$250,000	\$1,000,000

**PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: ILLINOIS COLLABORATIVE
FOR EDUCATION POLICY RESEARCH CRITERIA C(3)**

The Illinois Collaborative for Education Policy Research (ICEPR) is described in Criteria (C)(3) of the Application. ICEPR will be established with both RTTT3 and IES State Longitudinal Data System funding, and will extend the practice of using data to create actionable tools that drive LEA policy, school improvement, and classroom instruction to a broader number of Participating LEAs. Data will be obtained from the State longitudinal data system and from LEA instructional improvement systems (including ISLE). In addition, as described in (A)(2), ICEPR will also help design and implement the State's outcomes measurement system for Participating LEAs.

1) Personnel

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

2) Fringe Benefits

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

3) Travel

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

4) Equipment

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

5) Supplies

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

6) Contractual

ISBE will contract with an entity to manage ICEPR, including recruiting researchers and coordinating their work across multiple institutions; facilitating data sharing arrangements with LEAs and easing administrative demands of research projects; communicating research findings in a way that informs ongoing practice, policy development, and innovative program implementation; and seeking and securing external funding for projects. In particular, ICEPR will provide critical support to the State's implementation of the redesign of performance evaluation systems through its management of an independent analysis of performance evaluation implementation. The Performance Evaluation Reform Act specifically requires that the State contract for a research-based study of performance evaluation reform by no later than September 1, 2012.

To align its work with the key objectives of this Plan, ICEPR research agenda will be focused on how policies and programs in the following areas promote student growth and close achievement gaps: (1) systems to attract, develop, and support effective teachers and leaders; (2) P-20 alignment and college- and career-readiness; (3) innovations and interventions in low-performing schools and districts; (4) assessment and management of learning (formative vs. summative); and (5) approaches to teaching math and science (including STEM education), language, and literacy, and enhanced outcomes for traditionally low-achieving student groups.

Budget estimates assume that Year 1 will focus on organizing the ICEPR partnership, governance structure, policies, and building relationships. ICEPR will be creating the initial ILDS Research Agenda and providing consultation in the selection of a PERA research entity. Year 2 will continue to reach out to policy researchers and engaging them in implementing the ICEPR, including creating processes to create human subjects review capacity, creating processes to review and approve policy studies tied to the proposed ILDS research agenda, etc. Year 3 will focus on growing capacity of policy researchers and the state systems to provide researcher access to data, to support dissemination of policy research, and to pursue additional funding to support research supportive of RTTT3 and ILDS.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$165,900	\$195,900	\$125,900	\$0.00	\$487,700

ISBE will be in compliance with the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40-74.48 and Part 80.36.

7) Training Stipends

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

8) Other

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

9) Total Direct Costs

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$165,900	\$195,900	\$125,900	\$0.00	\$487,700

10) Indirect Costs

An Indirect Cost rate of 16.4% will be applied to the first \$25,000 of each contract. It is estimated that one contract will be used in each of Grant Years 1-3.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$4,100	\$4,100	\$4,100	\$0.00	\$12,300

11) Funding to Involved LEAs

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

13) Total Funds Requested

	Line 9	Line 10	Total
Year 1	\$165,900	\$4,100	\$170,000
Year 2	\$195,900	\$4,100	\$200,000
Year 3	\$125,900	\$4,100	\$130,000
Year 4	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total	\$487,700	\$12,300	\$500,000

**PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: PERFORMANCE EVALUATION IMPLEMENTATION
CRITERIA D(2)**

The Performance Evaluation Implementation Project is described in Criteria (D)(2) of the Application. RTTT3 funds will be provided to support implementation of the Performance Evaluation Reform Act of 2010, which substantially re-envisioned the State systems for supporting developing teachers and leaders by tightly aligning student outcomes and effectiveness measures. These state supports will be critical to the ability of Participating LEAs to undertake the significant changes required under PERA and accelerated under this Application. Specifically, ISBE will contract with entities for the development and implementation of the PERA Evaluator Pre-Qualification and Training Program and the development and implementation of the Survey of Learning Conditions and will also provide funding to support the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC) and its related subcommittee work. In addition, ISBE will provide funding to local districts to support evaluator training and will contract with an entity, as further described in Criteria C(3), for the PERA Research-based Study.

1) Personnel

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

2) Fringe Benefits

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

3) Travel

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

4) Equipment

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

5) Supplies

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

6) Contractual

ISBE will contract with an entity for the development and implementation of the PERA Evaluator Pre-Qualification and Training Program. Under this Request for Proposals, which was released this past October in anticipation of the future availability of RTTT3 funds, the State is seeking one or more contractors for the development of a performance evaluation training program, the delivery of evaluator training courses, and the provision of technical assistance and web-based resources to support the redesigned teacher and principal evaluation system. The contractor will commence work in Spring 2012. As shown below, this contractual component is weighted heavily in Grant Year 1 because Illinois is required to create evaluation materials and train 7,500 to 8,000 evaluators by September 1, 2012. The \$2.5 million budgeted for this contract in Grant Years 1 and 2 will be allocated approximately as follows:

- **Personnel:** Funds are budgeted for individuals to manage this project including the supervision of all staff and deliverables for the teacher and principal evaluation training programs. Specifically, funding will be allocated to management of the instructional design, required technology integration, program logistics, project tracking and reporting, content design, and the train the trainer and re-training programs. In addition, funding will be provided to individuals who will serve as master trainers for the training of the teacher and principal evaluators, the train-the trainer programs, and the remediation modules. Funding will also be allocated for technical assistance (development, coordination and support for web-based and online system components). The total personnel budget over Grant Years 1 and 2 is \$1,003,000.
- **Supplies and Materials:** Funding will be used for the purchase of laptop computers for data analysis and reporting, LDC projects for statewide meetings, and related office supplies. The total supplies and materials budget over Grant Years 1 and 2 is \$10,000.
- **Travel:** Funding will be allocated for travel costs associated with statewide/regional meetings and training sessions for both teacher and principal evaluators. The total travel budget over Grant Years 1 and 2 is \$33,000.
- **Production Costs:** Funding will be provided for the duplication of numerous materials for the teacher and principal evaluator

trainings. The total production budget over Grant Years 1 and 2 is \$85,000.

- Subcontracts: The contractor will enter into subcontracts for the development of the student growth component for both the teacher and principal evaluation trainings; regional kick-off training events and technical support components of the overall project. The total subcontract budget over Grant Years 1 and 2 is \$1,369,000.

PERA Evaluator Pre-Qualification and Training Program Contract

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$2,150,000	\$350,000	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,500,000

ISBE will also contract with an entity for the development and administration of a Survey of Learning Conditions. RTTT3 funds will be used to support the development of a survey of learning conditions to provide feedback from, students in grades 6 through 12 and teachers on the instructional environment within the schools and the administration of said survey in approximately 1500 schools. Illinois budgeted \$375,000 in the first year of the grant and \$275,000 in the second year of the grant to develop, pilot and commence implementation of a climate survey which will be applied uniformly across the state at approximately one-fourth of its schools. Illinois used \$500 per school as the estimated amount for development and implementation of the survey based on the cost Illinois school districts and other states have previously experienced to administer similar surveys. None of these funds will be granted directly to LEAs, but rather such numbers were used as a basis to calculate the contract with the entity that will design and administer the Survey of Learning Conditions. \$50,000 was budgeted in the third and fourth years of the grant for continued implementation of the survey across schools to measure changes in the climate over the elapsed time. Schools within Participating LEAs will be given first priority and if additional funds remain, those funds will be used to administer the Survey of Learning Conditions in schools within Involved LEAs. If such funding is not enough to cover the schools within Participating LEAs, a competitive process will be used to select the schools within the Participating LEAs where the Survey of Learning Conditions will be administered. School climates and learning conditions are associated with positive youth development, effective risk prevention, student learning and academic achievement, increased student graduation rates, and teacher retention.

Survey of Learning Conditions Contract

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$375,000	\$275,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$750,000

ISBE will contract with an entity, as further described in Criteria C(3), to develop a PERA Research-based Study. This study will use data collected by the State including, but not limited to, performance ratings for teachers and principals, district recommendations to renew or not renew non-tenured teachers, and student achievement data. In addition, the LEA data made available through ISLE may allow the PERA Evaluation to incorporate information from local assessment and HR systems for evaluation in a statewide manner that has never before been possible. ICEPR will partner with ISBE on the management of this contract. ISBE has extensive experience contracting with entities for external evaluations of agency programs, and ISBE anticipates the contractual funds will be used for at least one principal researcher, administrative support, data collection and analysis, and other related activities.

PERA Research-based Study Contract

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$181,000	\$728,000	\$545,900	\$0.00	\$1,454,900

In addition, ISBE will contract with entities and individuals for work designed to support PEAC and its subcommittees with PERA-related implementation activities. Illinois plans on contracting with a single facilitator in the first year of the grant. The \$50,000 budgeted for the facilitator's services was based on ISBE's previous experience hiring facilitators for other advisory groups of stakeholders. Another \$150,000 was budgeted in Grant Year 1 for additional consultants to assist PEAC. Again, Illinois budgeted this amount for additional consultants based on its previous experience hiring consultants to assist other advisory groups of stakeholders. The \$200,000 for these contractual relationships was budgeted for the second year of the grant as well, but was eliminated in the third and fourth year of the grant in anticipation of declining need for support over time.

PEAC Committee Support Contract

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$400,000

Total Contractual Budget

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$2,906,000	\$1,553,000	\$595,900	\$50,000	\$5,104,900

ISBE will be in compliance with the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40-74.48 and Part 80.36.

7) Training Stipends

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

8) Other

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

9) Total Direct Costs

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$2,908,400	\$1,558,600	\$600,200	\$50,000	\$5,117,200

10) Indirect Costs

An Indirect Cost rate of 16.4% will be applied to the first \$25,000 of each contract. It is estimated that four contracts will be used in Grant Years 1 and 2, two contracts in Grant Year 3 and one contract in Grant Year 1.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$16,400	\$16,400	\$8,200	\$4,100	\$45,100

11) Funding to Involved LEAs

See description under Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

\$1.3 million will be distributed to Participating and Involved LEAs during the first two years of the grant for evaluator training. First priority will be given to Participating LEAs, followed by Involved LEAs. Given that the State does not yet know which LEAs will be Participating LEAs, the exact breakdown between funding to Participating and Involved LEAs can not be ascertained at this time.

All of this funding will be used for training occurring during the 2012-2013 school year (which includes a portion of Year 1 and Year 2 of the grant). It is anticipated that most of the training will occur in the first half of the 2012-13 school year. It is anticipated that \$200 per evaluator will be provided to 6,500 individuals. ISBE has estimated that 6,500 evaluators must be trained to ensure one evaluator of principals per district, and one evaluator of teachers per school building (not including evaluators in an LEA that receives 50% or more of the RTTT3 Participating LEA allocation, per the last sentence of this paragraph). ISBE has estimated \$200/per evaluator based upon its experience with the cost of other similar training programs. LEAs will select the individuals that will participate in the training; PERA allows administrators and teachers to serve as qualified evaluators. No funding will be provided for any RTTT3 Participating LEA receiving 50% or more of the RTTT3 Participating LEA allocation. If the allocated funding is not sufficient, ISBE will administer to Involved LEAs using a competitive process.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$1,050,000	\$250,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,300,000

13) Total Funds Requested

	Line 9	Line 10	Line 12	Total
Year 1	\$2,906,000	\$16,400	\$1,050,000	\$3,972,400
Year 2	\$1,553,000	\$16,400	\$250,000	\$1,819,400
Year 3	\$595,900	\$8,200	\$0	\$604,100
Year 4	\$50,000	\$4,100	\$0	\$54,100
Total	\$5,104,900	\$45,100	\$1,300,000	\$6,450,000

**PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: TEACHER PIPELINE FOR
HIGH POVERTY HIGH MINORITY SCHOOLS
CRITERIA D(3)**

The Teacher Pipeline for High Poverty High Minority (HPHM) Schools is described in Criteria (D)(3) of the Application. Funding will be used to provide incentives for teacher preparation programs to: develop new programs aligned with the CCSS and ISLE; and establish partnerships with Participating LEAs to support placements of teachers with extensive training on CCSS in HPHM schools.

1) Personnel

No personnel will be hired for this project. Existing ISBE personnel will support any administrative functions relating to this project.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

2) Fringe Benefits

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

3) Travel

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

4) Equipment

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

5) Supplies

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

6) Contractual

Funding will be provided to elementary and middle level teacher preparation programs to align their curriculum to the CCSS and ISLE while also developing new programs focusing on the four core academic areas: ELA, Math, Science and Social Science. By creating partnerships with Participating LEAs, teacher preparation programs will bring faculty together with teachers from the Participating LEAs to learn about the CCSS and develop new courses and programs to be submitted to the State Educator Preparation and Licensure Board (SEPLB). All grantees will be required to partner with a Participating LEA.

ISBE anticipates providing funding for up to two universities in Year 1 to provide stipends to faculty to develop the changes in curriculum to align with CCSS and align with ISLE. By Year 2, it is anticipated that the design phase will be completed and ISBE will be able to enter into agreements with approximately six more institutions, who will use the funding for stipends to faculty for alignment activities. It is then anticipated that the number of institutions to which funding will be offered will decline in the third year of the grant and even further in the fourth year as the re-alignment is completed.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$120,000	\$467,600	\$235,000	\$120,000	\$942,600

ISBE will be in compliance with the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40-74.48 and Part 80.36.

7) Training Stipends

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

8) Other

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

9) Total Direct Costs

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$120,000	\$467,600	\$235,000	\$120,000	\$942,600

10) Indirect Costs

An Indirect Cost rate of 16.4% will be applied to the first \$25,000 of each contract. It is estimated that contracts with two higher education institutions will be used in years one and four, six contracts will be used in year two and four contracts will be used in year three.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$8,200	\$24,600	\$16,400	\$8,200	\$57,400

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

13) Total Funds Requested

	Line 9	Line 10	Total
Year 1	\$120,000	\$8,200	\$128,200

Year 2	\$467,600	\$24,600	\$492,200
Year 3	\$235,000	\$16,400	\$251,400
Year 4	\$120,000	\$8,200	\$128,200
Total	\$942,600	\$57,400	\$1,000,000

**PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE: TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL INDUCTION AND MENTORING
CRITERIA D(5)**

The Teacher and Principal Induction and Mentoring Program is described in Criteria (D)(5) of the Application. Illinois needs to secure its investment in educator induction and mentoring. Since FY 2007, Illinois has spent over \$50 million to develop and refine state and district capacity to implement high quality educator induction including the development of program standards and a continuum for program improvement for teachers. With the passage of PERA and adoption of the CCSS, there is even a greater need for strong teacher and principal induction and mentoring programs.

1) Personnel

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

2) Fringe Benefits

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

3) Travel

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

4) Equipment

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

5) Supplies

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

6) Contractual

ISBE will contract with entities to provide technical assistance for the induction and mentoring programs developed by the Participating LEAs and also for the development of mechanisms to ensure program quality and accountability. Key components of the technical assistance system will include:

- **Tailored Program Improvement:** ISBE, working with one or more partner organizations, will assemble a team of staff who will provide tailored technical assistance to individual program leadership teams in Participating LEAs. This focused and consistent coaching and support for individual induction programs will serve as the cornerstone for improving program quality.
- **Formative Assessment and Mentoring Materials:** Technical assistance providers will provide guidance and support to programs around the use of formative assessment of new teacher practice protocols and local teacher evaluation procedures.
- **Online Mentoring for Math, Science, and Special Education Teachers:** The technical assistance system will provide enhanced mentoring services for first-time STEM teachers via online technology. These services are particularly important for new teachers in rural and/or many urban settings who may not have access to a qualified, experienced teacher in one of these high-need subject areas.

In order to ensure program accountability, the State will contract with an entity to develop and implement a process of ongoing program improvement based upon the Illinois Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Beginning Teacher Induction Programs, the Illinois Continuum of Induction Program Development, and implementation and impact data. To collect the necessary data for the program accountability process, ISBE, working with the contracted entity, will develop a system that collects and synthesizes program impact data, including teacher effectiveness, teacher retention, student achievement, and teacher efficacy. The Statewide Professional Development Coordinator will be responsible for overseeing and coordinating the contracts specified above. The breakdown of the total contractual budget of \$1,165,200 is outlined in the table below.

Activities Work Stream	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Network Meetings	30,000	80,000	70,000	24,000
Online Mentoring for STEM Teachers	90,000	205,000	200,000	45,000
Induction Institutes	30,000	30,000		
State Level Accountability Plan	10,000	15,000	5,000	
Technical Assistance re Incorporating New Teacher Practice Protocols	10,000	15,000	5,000	
Individual Program Coaching and Support	41,200	105,000	105,000	50,000
Contractual Services Total	211,200	450,000	385,000	119,000

ISBE will be in compliance with the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40-74.48 and Part 80.36.

7) Training Stipends

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

8) Other

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

9) Total Direct Costs

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$211,200	\$450,000	\$385,000	\$119,000	\$1,165,200

10) Indirect Costs

An Indirect Cost rate of 16.4% will be applied to the first \$25,000 of each contract. It is estimated that two contracts will be used in each of the years.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$8,200	\$8,200	\$8,200	\$8,200	\$32,800

11) Funding to Involved LEAs

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

The distribution of \$1,802,000 to Participating LEAs was developed based on the goal of serving 300 teachers and 40 principals annually. In years one and two, \$1,600 per teacher and principal is budgeted; in year three, \$1,200 per teacher and principal is budgeted; and in year four, \$900 per teacher and principal is budgeted. Increased funding was provided in Grant Years 1 and 2 based on the assumption that success of the program in the first two years of the grant program will reduce the cost per mentor in the subsequent years. Also, if the program experiences measurable success in the first two years, alternative funding streams may be identified in the last two years of the grant program and beyond. As the State does not yet know the number and identify of its Participating LEAs, it is uncertain whether funding will be available to Involved LEAs. If the budgeted funds under this line item are indeed greater than needed, ISBE will utilize any remaining funds for induction and mentoring programs in the Involved LEAs. If the allocated funds are less than needed, ISBE will administer to Participating LEAs using a competitive process.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Total	\$544,000	\$544,000	\$408,000	\$306,000	\$1,802,000

13) Total Funds Requested

	Line 9	Line 10	Line 12	Total
Year 1	\$211,200	\$8,200	\$544,000	\$763,400

Year 2	\$450,000	\$8,200	\$544,000	\$1,002,200
Year 3	\$385,000	\$8,200	\$408,000	\$801,200
Year 4	\$119,000	\$8,200	\$306,000	\$433,200
Total	\$1,165,200	\$32,800	\$1,802,000	\$3,000,000

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 Federal government?

YES X
NO O

If yes, please provide the following information:




Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (mm/dd/yyyy):
From: _7/1/2011 To: 6/30/2012

Approving Federal agency: X ED ___ Other
(Please specify agency): _____

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 “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.
3. 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.

VI. SIGNATURE PAGE

Required Applicant Signatures:	
To the best of my knowledge and belief, all of the information and data in this Part II application and the certified assurances I the Part I application are true and correct.	
I further certify that I have read both Parts I and II of the application, am fully committed to it, and will support its implementation:	
Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor (Printed Name): Pat Quinn, Governor	
Signature of Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor: 	Date: 12/8/2011
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D.	
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: 	Date: 12/9/11
President of the State Board of Education (Printed Name): Gery J. Chico, Chairman	
Signature of the President of the State Board of Education: 	Date: 12/14/11

INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE

IMPORTANT: State populates white and yellow cells. Purple boxes are automatically calculated.

- 1) Begin with Project 1. This project includes sample numbers to demonstrate how this workbook works. Update the numbers in white and the indirect/fringe rates in yellow, but do not change the purple cells.
- 2) Be sure to include your State's indirect and fringe rates, as applicable.
Once you have inserted all the relevant information for your projects, insert "Funding subgranted to LEAs" in the white cells within the Total worksheet (first tab after the Instructions).
- 3) Everything else in Total worksheet will be auto-calculated.
Add worksheets as needed by copying and pasting the existing template sheets as needed. Fifteen project worksheets are currently included for your use. Make sure to check that the Total
- 4) budget summary table includes those sheets as well.
- 5) If you are NOT using 15 projects, be sure to delete any extra project-level budget worksheets out of this workbook before submitting.

Total

STATE NAME	Illinois
-------------------	----------

TOTAL	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
1. Personnel	\$ 177,600.00	\$ 365,940.00	\$ 376,860.00	\$ -	\$ 920,400.00
2. Fringe	\$ 106,560.00	\$ 219,564.00	\$ 226,116.00	\$ -	\$ 552,240.00
3. Travel	\$ 8,200.00	\$ 8,200.00	\$ 8,200.00	\$ -	\$ 24,600.00
4. Equip	\$ 5,200.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,200.00
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ 5,957,550.00	\$ 6,127,975.00	\$ 3,152,075.00	\$ 1,083,114.00	\$ 16,320,714.00
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct (1-8)	\$ 6,255,110.00	\$ 6,721,679.00	\$ 3,763,251.00	\$ 1,083,114.00	\$ 17,823,154.00
10. Indirect	\$ 110,300.00	\$ 175,283.00	\$ 161,717.00	\$ 36,900.00	\$ 484,200.00
11. Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplements to participating LEA	\$ 1,594,000.00	\$ 794,000.00	\$ 408,000.00	\$ 306,000.00	\$ 3,102,000.00
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$ 7,959,410.00	\$ 7,690,962.00	\$ 4,332,968.00	\$ 1,426,014.00	\$ 21,409,354.00
14. Funding Subgranted to Participating LEA's (50% of Total Grant)	\$ 3,566,670.00	\$ 7,138,008.00	\$ 7,138,009.00	\$ 3,566,666.00	\$ 21,409,353.00
15. Total Budget (lines 13-14)	\$ 11,526,080.00	\$ 14,828,970.00	\$ 11,470,977.00	\$ 4,992,680.00	\$ 42,818,707.00

Project1

State Name	Illinois				
Project Name:	A(2): Center for School Improvement				
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equip	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ 264,000.00	\$ 1,012,100.00	\$ 543,500.00	\$ 274,514.00	\$ 2,094,114.00
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct (Lines 1-8)	\$ 264,000.00	\$ 1,012,100.00	\$ 543,500.00	\$ 274,514.00	\$ 2,094,114.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 16,400.00
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$ 268,100.00	\$ 1,016,200.00	\$ 547,600.00	\$ 278,614.00	\$ 2,110,514.00

Fringe - Check

Rate	60.00%				
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Indirect - Check

Rate	16.40%				
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 16,400.00

Project2

State Name	Illinois				
Project Name:	A(2): Illinois State Board of Education Capacity				
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
1. Personnel	\$ 177,600.00	\$ 365,940.00	\$ 376,860.00	\$ -	\$ 920,400.00
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ 106,560.00	\$ 219,564.00	\$ 226,116.00	\$ -	\$ 552,240.00
3. Travel	\$ 8,200.00	\$ 8,200.00	\$ 8,200.00	\$ -	\$ 24,600.00
4. Equip	\$ 5,200.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,200.00
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct (Lines 1-8)	\$ 297,560.00	\$ 593,704.00	\$ 611,176.00	\$ -	\$ 1,502,440.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$ 48,800.00	\$ 97,383.00	\$ 100,217.00	\$ -	\$ 246,400.00
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$ 346,360.00	\$ 691,087.00	\$ 711,393.00	\$ -	\$ 1,748,840.00

Fringe - Check

Rate	60.00%				
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
	\$ 106,560.00	\$ 219,564.00	\$ 226,116.00	\$ -	\$ 552,240.00

Indirect - Check

Rate	16.40%				
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
	\$ 48,800.00	\$ 97,383.00	\$ 100,217.00	\$ -	\$ 246,400.00

Project3

State Name	Illinois				
Project Name:	A(2): State Report Card				
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equip	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ 491,800.00	\$ 295,000.00	\$ 98,400.00	\$ 98,400.00	\$ 983,600.00
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct (Lines 1-8)	\$ 491,800.00	\$ 295,000.00	\$ 98,400.00	\$ 98,400.00	\$ 983,600.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 16,400.00
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$ 495,900.00	\$ 299,100.00	\$ 102,500.00	\$ 102,500.00	\$ 1,000,000.00

Fringe - Check

Rate	60.00%				
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Indirect - Check

Rate	16.40%				
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 16,400.00

Project4

State Name	Illinois				
Project Name:	B(3): Assessments for Learning				
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equip	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ 175,300.00	\$ 672,000.00	\$ 361,000.00	\$ 175,300.00	\$ 1,383,600.00
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct (Lines 1-8)	\$ 175,300.00	\$ 672,000.00	\$ 361,000.00	\$ 175,300.00	\$ 1,383,600.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 16,400.00
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$ 179,400.00	\$ 676,100.00	\$ 365,100.00	\$ 179,400.00	\$ 1,400,000.00

Fringe - Check

Rate	60.00%				
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Indirect - Check

Rate	16.40%				
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 16,400.00

Project5

State Name	Illinois				
Project Name:	B(3): STEM Learning Exchanges and Pathways Resource Center				
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equip	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ 1,500,400.00	\$ 1,175,000.00	\$ 500,000.00	\$ -	\$ 3,175,400.00
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct (Lines 1-8)	\$ 1,500,400.00	\$ 1,175,000.00	\$ 500,000.00	\$ -	\$ 3,175,400.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$ 8,200.00	\$ 8,200.00	\$ 8,200.00	\$ -	\$ 24,600.00
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$ 1,508,600.00	\$ 1,183,200.00	\$ 508,200.00	\$ -	\$ 3,200,000.00

Fringe - Check

Rate	60.00%				
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Indirect - Check

Rate	16.40%				
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Project6

State Name	Illinois				
Project Name:	B(3): College and Career Readiness Program				
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equip	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ 122,950.00	\$ 307,375.00	\$ 307,375.00	\$ 245,900.00	\$ 983,600.00
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct (Lines 1-8)	\$ 122,950.00	\$ 307,375.00	\$ 307,375.00	\$ 245,900.00	\$ 983,600.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 16,400.00
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$ 127,050.00	\$ 311,475.00	\$ 311,475.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 1,000,000.00

Fringe - Check

Rate	60.00%				
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Indirect - Check

Rate	16.40%				
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 16,400.00

Project7

State Name	Illinois				
Project Name:	C(3): Illinois Collaborative for Education Policy Research				
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equip	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ 165,900.00	\$ 195,900.00	\$ 125,900.00	\$ -	\$ 487,700.00
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct (Lines 1-8)	\$ 165,900.00	\$ 195,900.00	\$ 125,900.00	\$ -	\$ 487,700.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ -	\$ 12,300.00
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$ 170,000.00	\$ 200,000.00	\$ 130,000.00	\$ -	\$ 500,000.00

Fringe - Check

Rate	60.00%				
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Indirect - Check

Rate	16.40%				
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 16,400.00

Project8

State Name	Illinois				
Project Name:	D(2): Performance Evaluation Implementation				
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equip	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ 2,906,000.00	\$ 1,553,000.00	\$ 595,900.00	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 5,104,900.00
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct (Lines 1-8)	\$ 2,906,000.00	\$ 1,553,000.00	\$ 595,900.00	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 5,104,900.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$ 16,400.00	\$ 16,400.00	\$ 8,200.00	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 45,100.00
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ 1,050,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,300,000.00
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$ 3,972,400.00	\$ 1,819,400.00	\$ 604,100.00	\$ 54,100.00	\$ 6,450,000.00

Fringe - Check

Rate	60.00%				
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Indirect - Check

Rate	16.40%				
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
	\$ 8,200.00	\$ 8,200.00	\$ 8,200.00	\$ 8,200.00	\$ 32,800.00

Project9

State Name	Illinois				
Project Name:	D(3): Teacher Pipeline for High Poverty Minority Schools				
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equip	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ 120,000.00	\$ 467,600.00	\$ 235,000.00	\$ 120,000.00	\$ 942,600.00
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct (Lines 1-8)	\$ 120,000.00	\$ 467,600.00	\$ 235,000.00	\$ 120,000.00	\$ 942,600.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$ 8,200.00	\$ 24,600.00	\$ 16,400.00	\$ 8,200.00	\$ 57,400.00
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$ 128,200.00	\$ 492,200.00	\$ 251,400.00	\$ 128,200.00	\$ 1,000,000.00

Fringe - Check

Rate	60.00%				
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Indirect - Check

Rate	16.40%				
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
	\$ 8,200.00	\$ 24,600.00	\$ 16,400.00	\$ 8,200.00	\$ 57,400.00

Project10

State Name	Illinois				
Project Name:	D(5): Teacher and Principal Induction and Mentoring				
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equip	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ 211,200.00	\$ 450,000.00	\$ 385,000.00	\$ 119,000.00	\$ 1,165,200.00
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct (Lines 1-8)	\$ 211,200.00	\$ 450,000.00	\$ 385,000.00	\$ 119,000.00	\$ 1,165,200.00
10. Indirect Costs	\$ 8,200.00	\$ 8,200.00	\$ 8,200.00	\$ 8,200.00	\$ 32,800.00
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ 544,000.00	\$ 544,000.00	\$ 408,000.00	\$ 306,000.00	\$ 1,802,000.00
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$ 763,400.00	\$ 1,002,200.00	\$ 801,200.00	\$ 433,200.00	\$ 3,000,000.00

Fringe - Check

Rate	60.00%				
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Indirect - Check

Rate	16.40%				
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	total
	\$ 8,200.00	\$ 8,200.00	\$ 8,200.00	\$ 8,200.00	\$ 32,800.00