

Budget Part I: Summary Budget Table (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel	490,000	480,000	480,000	480,000	1,930,000
2. Fringe Benefits	142,367	142,367	142,367	142,367	569,468
3. Travel	167,760	161,160	161,160	155,260	645,340
4. Equipment	1,913,000	1,173,000	253,600	0	3,339,600
5. Supplies	64,000	43,000	43,000	43,000	193,000
6. Contractual	18,122,050	7,048,200	5,963,650	1,675,000	32,808,900
7. Training Stipends	0	0	0	0	0
8. Other	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	4,000
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	20,900,177	9,048,727	7,044,777	2,496,627	39,490,308
10. Indirect Costs*	195,474	147,531	87,386	64,701	495,093
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	0	0	0	0	0
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	2,750,000	7,750,000	8,350,000	32,750,000	51,600,000
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	23,845,651	16,946,258	15,482,163	35,311,328	91,585,401
14. Funding Subgranted to Participating LEAs (50% of Total Grant)	22,896,350	22,896,350	22,896,350	22,896,350	91,585,401
15. Total Budget (lines 13-14)	46,742,002	39,842,608	38,378,514	58,207,678	183,170,802
<p>All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15. Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category. Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.</p> <p>*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.</p>					

VIII. Budget Summary Narrative

(Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))

Overview of the projects that the State has included in its budget. Describe overall structure of the State's budget for a RTTT grant, including a list of projects for which there is a project-level budget, and a rationale for how these will be organized and managed.

Oklahoma's overall budget structure for Race to the Top centers around seven budget projects, plus the 50% LEA allocation, and is designed to support attainment of its reform agenda and achievement of ambitious yet achievable performance measures. These projects reflect Oklahoma's commitment to engaged students, effective educators and closing the achievement gap.

Budget Framework

1. Emphasize funds that will be available directly to LEAs through competitive processes or through allocation based on a high-quality plan and established criteria. Justification for this emphasis includes Oklahoma's large number of participating LEAs (324) and Oklahoma's belief that local decision-making with strong accountability at the state is generally the most effective framework to make substantial progress toward improving student outcomes. The top budget category for Oklahoma is the required LEA subgrant at 50% of the total budget. **The second highest budget category as a percent of the total grant budget is for supplemental funding to participating LEAs, at 28.17%.**
2. Emphasize the Human Capital component. The budget was developed to provide funding in key change areas such as principal and teacher effectiveness measures that can rapidly accelerate the ability to have an effective teacher in every classroom, and an effective principal in every school. This project receives 25.69% of the total grant budget.
3. Emphasize the use of data for decision-making. Provide resources to increase the use of data, including student achievement and growth data, for decision-making by teachers and principals. Foster the availability and accessibility of longitudinal data for stakeholders, including parents, policy makers and researchers.
4. Provide strong effective implementation leadership and accountability at minimal cost. The Management Project provides funding to manage and organize the other budget projects. Oklahoma's RTTT Project Director, Dr. Cindy Koss, will be responsible for the overall implementation and monitoring of these projects, and will be supported by a cross functional team and dedicated staff that will report directly to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Oklahoma Race to the Top Commission. Oklahoma's RTTT office will coordinate with other entities, such as the P-20 Data Council (as described in A2), Higher Education, and Career

and Technology Education, to minimize overlap and enhance progress. In addition, a Turnaround Division in the Oklahoma State Department of Education is being formed using a combination of existing staff and additional school support team members. The direct cost of this project represents only .98% of Oklahoma's grant request, and Oklahoma's indirect charges are only .27%.

Budget Projects

PROJECT	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT
Human Capital Project	Develop a statewide teacher effectiveness measure) and leadership effectiveness measure, and provide training for its use. Provide incentive funding and pilot projects for locally developed compensation systems based on the results of the teacher and leader effectiveness measures. Provide effective staffing and human resource technical assistance to participating LEAs.	\$47,064,726
Low Performing School Project	Enhance availability of school support teams and educational leadership coaches for low performing schools. Provided allocations to five lowest performing schools to implement one of the four intervention models defined in Race to the Top. Provide competitive grants to districts for other low performing schools to implement one of the four intervention models defined in Race to the Top.	\$12,082,600
Data and Instruction Project	Contract with outside vendor to design, implement, and provide training for instructional improvement systems that will empower teachers with real-time instructional support and leaders with information needed to inform overall school and LEA improvement.	\$15,005,900

PROJECT	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT
Standards and Assessments Alignment Project	<p>Conduct a study to compare the alignment of high school assignments to Common Core Standards for high school and to college readiness expectations. Provide professional development to teachers that will focus on common core standards, assessments, data interpretation, and college- and career-readiness strategies.</p> <p>Develop a technology-based instruction toolkit to translate common core standards into engaging instruction.</p>	\$3,041,300
Longitudinal Data Systems Project	Complete the alignment of the state data system with the America COMPETES Act.	\$11,699,545
STEM project	Create and launch a STEM coordinating Council, expand Summer Academies in STEM disciplines, and expand STEM pre-engineering academies focused on serving underrepresented groups of students, and female students.	\$814,750
Management Project	Provide partial personnel funding for the Race to the Top implementation team, annual technical assistance conferences , third party evaluator services other research and community engagement assistance.	\$1,876,580
Participating LEA Subgrants		\$91,585,401
TOTAL		\$183,170,802

Describe how other Federal (e.g. School Improvement Grant, Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems grant, Teacher Incentive Fund grant, Title I), State, and local funds will be leveraged to further support Race to the Top education reform plans.

Oklahoma will use all appropriate funding sources available to support the implementation and goals of the Race to the Top grant, including the following:

- Federal Funds: School Improvement Grants, Longitudinal Data System Grants, Title I (including ARRA), Title IIA, and Title IIB Mathematics and Science Partnerships;
- State Funds: ACE Remediation, Oklahoma Mathematics Improvement Program, Oklahoma Robotics Grants, Advanced Placement Incentive Program, and Reading Sufficiency;
- Local Funds: Districts will be encouraged to use local funds, including private donations, to support local efforts to implement Race to the Top subgrants.

Examples of proposed activities that will be supported by other funding sources are described below.

1. Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) will hire an independent organization to conduct a cross-walk analysis of current state standards (*Priority Academic Student Skills [PASS]*) in reading/language arts and mathematics with the draft versions of the K-12 Grade-by-Grade Common Core Standards (available February 2, 2010) and the final versions of the K-12 Grade-by-Grade Common Core Standards (available March 12, 2010) as described in the narrative for selection criterion (B)(1) and (B)(3). ***Funded through state portions of Title IIA.***
2. OSDE, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE), and Oklahoma Career and Technology Education (OCTE) will continue and enhance the efforts begun with the American Diploma Project. These projects and plans are described in the narrative for selection criterion (B)(3). ***Funded through state portions of Title IIA and partnership with OSRHE and OCTE.***
3. OSDE will communicate the Common Core Standards and support teachers in implementation of the standards through existing statewide system of support infrastructure, annual Regional Curriculum Conferences, and the Master Teachers Project. This infrastructure and specific plans are described in the narrative for selection criterion (B)(3). ***Funded through state portions of Title I, Title IIA, and state funds.***
4. ACE&ADP Academies, which will be funded in part through the Race to the Top grant as described in the narrative for selection criterion (B)(3), will be supplemented by

- existing funds and programs. ***Funded through state portions of Title IIA, ACE Remediation and other state funds, and partnership with OSRHE and OCTE.***
5. OSDE will scale up the model of Windows on Curriculum implementation to include all low-performing schools as well as other schools needing assistance in implementing Common Core Standards as described in the narrative for selection criterion (B)(3) and (E)(2). ***Funded through state portions of Title IIA.***
 6. The Comprehensive School Improvement System described in the narrative for selection criterion (C)(3), (D)(5), and (E)(2) has been developed in collaboration with the National Center on Innovation and Improvement. The base development was free to the State of Oklahoma. Federal and state funds will be used to provide coaching and feedback to schools utilizing the system for comprehensive school support. ***Funded through state portions of Title I, Title IIA, and state funds.***
 7. OSDE will expand the data currently available through Oklahoma's Educator Credentialing System (OECS) to include information that identifies highly effective teachers, as described in the narrative for selection criterion (D)(3). ***Funded through state portions of Title IIA.***
 8. OSDE will provide Urban Educator Program and other differentiated roles for teacher leaders as described in the narrative for selection criterion (D)(3). ***Funded through state portions of Title IIA.***
 9. OSDE and local districts will contract with a research organization to provide data facilitators on-site for all Title I schools identified for school improvement as part of a study to determine specific gaps most characteristic of improvement schools so that a differentiated learning plan can be developed for those sites, as described in the narrative for selection criterion (D)(3). ***Funded through state and local portions of Title I School Improvement Grants.***
 10. OSDE will survey teachers to determine what conditions are required to bring them to hard-to-staff schools, as described in the narrative for selection criterion (D)(3). ***Funded through state portions of Title IIA.***
 11. Oklahoma will expand the use of school-wide intervention strategies such as Building Academic Vocabulary by establishing a train-the-trainers professional development for

instructional facilitators at each school improvement site, as described in the narrative for selection criterion (E)(2). While the facilitators will be funded through participating LEA's subgrants and other funds, the train-the-trainers professional development will be ***funded through state portions of Title IIA.***

12. Oklahoma has made significant progress with the development of its P-20 data system, as described in the narrative for selection criterion (C)(1), and has well-defined plans to complete its goal of fully implementing the elements of the America COMPETES Act. ***Funded through Statewide Longitudinal Data System Grant or Race to the Top.***

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table Project Name: Data and Instruction Project Associated with Criteria: Standards and Assessments (B3); Data Systems to Support Instruction (C3); Providing Effective Support to Teachers and Principals (D5); Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools (E2) (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel					0
2. Fringe Benefits					0
3. Travel					0
4. Equipment					0
5. Supplies					0
6. Contractual	12,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	15,000,000
7. Training Stipends					0
8. Other					0
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	12,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	15,000,000
10. Indirect Costs*	1,475	1,475	1,475	1,475	5,900
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					0
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					0
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	12,001,475	1,001,475	1,001,475	1,001,475	15,005,900
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15. Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category. Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years. *If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: Human Capital Project					
Associated with Criteria: Improving Teacher and Principal Effectiveness Based on Performance (D2); Turning Around Low Achieving Schools (E2)					
(Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	130,000	130,000	130,000	130,000	520,000
2. Fringe Benefits	43,199	43,199	43,199	43,199	172,796
3. Travel	66,260	66,260	66,260	66,260	265,040
4. Equipment					0
5. Supplies	14,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	38,000
6. Contractual	400,000	2,400,000	2,600,000		5,400,000
7. Training Stipends					0
8. Other	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	4,000
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	654,459	2,648,459	2,848,459	248,459	6,399,836
10. Indirect Costs*	16,488	16,134	17,609	14,659	64,890
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					0
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs		5,000,000	5,600,000	30,000,000	40,600,000
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	670,947	7,664,593	8,466,068	30,263,118	47,064,726
<p>All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.</p> <p>Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.</p> <p>Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.</p> <p>*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.</p>					

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table Project Name: Longitudinal Data System Project Associated with Criteria: Data Systems to Support Instruction (C2) (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					0
3. Travel	12,500	5,900	5,900		24,300
4. Equipment	1,913,000	1,173,000	253,600		3,339,600
5. Supplies					0
6. Contractual	3,862,050	2,573,200	1,688,650		8,123,900
7. Training Stipends					0
8. Other					0
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	5,787,550	3,752,100	1,948,150		11,487,800
10. Indirect Costs*	118,030	73,980	19,736		211,745
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					0
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					0
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	5,905,580	3,826,080	1,967,886	0	11,699,545
<p>All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.</p> <p>Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.</p> <p>Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.</p> <p>*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.</p>					

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table Project Name: Low Performing Schools Project Associated with Criteria: Turning Around the Lowest Achieving Schools (E2) (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	140,000	140,000	140,000	140,000	560,000
2. Fringe Benefits	46,000	46,000	46,000	46,000	184,000
3. Travel	64,000	64,000	64,000	64,000	256,000
4. Equipment					0
5. Supplies					0
6. Contractual					0
7. Training Stipends					0
8. Other					0
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	1,000,000
10. Indirect Costs*	20,650	20,650	20,650	20,650	82,600
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					0
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	2,750,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	11,000,000
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	3,020,650	3,020,650	3,020,650	3,020,650	12,082,600
<p>All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.</p> <p>Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.</p> <p>Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.</p> <p>*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.</p>					

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table Project Name: Management Project Associated with Criteria: Building Strong Statewide Capacity to Implement, Scale Up and Sustain Proposed Plans (A2) (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	170,000	160,000	160,000	160,000	650,000
2. Fringe Benefits	53,168	53,168	53,168	53,168	212,672
3. Travel					0
4. Equipment					0
5. Supplies	25,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	55,000
6. Contractual	285,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	885,000
7. Training Stipends					0
8. Other					0
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	533,168	423,168	423,168	423,168	1,802,672
10. Indirect Costs*	21,132	17,592	17,592	17,592	73,908
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					0
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					0
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	554,300	440,760	440,760	440,760	1,876,580
<p>All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.</p> <p>Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.</p> <p>Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.</p> <p>*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.</p>					

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table Project Name: Standards and Assessments Alignment Project Associated with Criteria: Developing and Implementing Common High Quality Assessments (B2); Supporting the Transition to Enhanced Standards and High Quality Assessments (B3) Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools (E2) (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	200,000
2. Fringe Benefits					0
3. Travel	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	100,000
4. Equipment					0
5. Supplies	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	100,000
6. Contractual	1,175,000	475,000	475,000	475,000	2,600,000
7. Training Stipends					0
8. Other					0
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	1,275,000	575,000	575,000	575,000	3,000,000
10. Indirect Costs*	10,325	10,325	10,325	10,325	41,300
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					0
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					0
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	1,285,325	585,325	585,325	585,325	3,041,300
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15. Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category. Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years. *If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table Project Name: STEM Project Associated with Criteria: Competition Priority (Section V); Supporting the Transition to High Quality Assessments (B3); Ensuring Equitable Distribution of Effective Teachers and Principals (D3) (Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel					0
2. Fringe Benefits					0
3. Travel					0
4. Equipment					0
5. Supplies					0
6. Contractual	400,000	400,000			800,000
7. Training Stipends					0
8. Other					0
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	400,000	400,000	0	0	800,000
10. Indirect Costs*	7,375	7,375	0	0	14,750
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					0
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					0
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	407,375	407,375	0	0	814,750
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15. Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category. Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years. *If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

**Data and Instruction Project
BUDGET NARRATIVE**

1) Personnel

\$0

2) Fringe Benefits

\$0

3) Travel

\$0

4) Equipment

\$0

5) Supplies

\$0

6) Contractual

Contractual: The following services and products will be acquired using the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40-74.48 and Part 80.36.	# of Years	Cost Per Year	Total
Develop a statewide Technology-based Instructional Improvement System that will link to local instructional improvement systems as described in the narrative for selection criterion (B)(3), (C)(3), and (E)(2). The system will be compatible with the Technology-based Instructional Toolkit described in (B)(3) and will include interim, formative, and summative assessment tools; rapid-time reporting of data from various sources; Web-based Student Mastery of Standards Tool; social networking and online collaboration between educators; filtered searches; real-time professional development; filtered 'rolodexes' of valuable contacts and community resources; dashboard for researchers to access and analyze data and report results to educators.	1	\$12,000,000	\$12,000,000
Maintain system, increase connectivity to local instructional improvement systems, and expand the use of system by educators.	3	\$1,000,000	\$3,000,000

7) Training Stipends

\$0

8) Other

\$0

9) Total Direct Costs

Total Direct Costs: The following is the sum of expenditures, across all budget categories in lines 1-8, for each year of the budget.			
Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4
\$12,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000

10) Indirect Costs

Indirect Costs: The following are the indirect costs that can be claimed for each year of the budget.			
Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4
\$1,475	\$1,475	\$1,475	\$1,475

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

\$0

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

\$0

13) Total Costs

Total Costs: The following is the sum of expenditures, across all budget categories for each year of the budget.			
Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4
\$12,001,475	\$1,001,475	\$1,001,475	\$1,001,475

**Human Capital Project
BUDGET NARRATIVE**

1) Personnel

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Effective Staffing Trainers: The Oklahoma State Department of Education will hire two employees to train human resource staff, recruiters and school leaders in the art of staffing schools with effective teachers, while focusing on high need schools. The goal is to ensure that participating schools open fully staffed with the highest-quality candidates possible. A research-based human resource model will be used to help transform district hiring processes, enabling districts to streamline hiring timelines and practices, train principals on how to interview and select effective teachers, develop feedback systems, and provide assistance for critical needs schools. Trainers will report to the Race to the Top Project Director.	100%	\$65,000 per year	\$520,000

2) Fringe Benefits

Fringe Benefits	Benefits	Total
Fringe Benefits for the Effective Staffing Trainers, including contribution to the Teachers' Retirement System and FICA	\$43,199 per year	\$172,796

3) Travel

Travel: Travel expenses include the average mile reimbursements of \$150 for each trip, per diem, and hotel reimbursements based on county of destination.	# Trips Per Year	Total
Two Effective Staffing Trainers will spend time at each participating LEA. Amount of visits per district will depend on size of district and level of needed assistance, ranging from 1 – 20 days per year. In areas where appropriate, training will be conducted regionally. Cost per trip is figured based on county of destination.	330	\$265,040

4) Equipment
\$0

5) Supplies

Supplies: The following supplies are estimated needs to provide training to participating districts in Effective Staffing Practices.	Per Year	Total
Non-consumable training materials (First Year Only).		\$8,000
Print materials, handouts, and professional literature relating to effective school staffing. Year 1 this will be \$6,000. Year 2,3 and 4 will be \$800.		\$30,000

6) Contractual

Contractual: The following services and products will be acquired using the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40-74.48 and Part 80.36.	# of Years	Per Year	Total
Develop and provide research to support the value-added components of a statewide teacher effectiveness measure (TEM). Develop a statewide rubric for teacher evaluation.	1	400,000	400,000
Develop value added assessments for subjects and grades that are currently not being tested	2	\$2,400,000	4,800,000
Evaluation system training for teachers and principals	1	200,000	200,000

7) Training Stipends

\$0

8) Other

Other:	Total
Effective Staffing Trainers will receive training in a national model for improving hiring practices. These funds will pay for conferences, workshops, or other train-the-trainer sessions and to acquire appropriate professional materials.	\$4,000

9) Total Direct Costs

Total Direct Costs: The following is the sum of expenditures, across all budget categories in lines 1-8, for each year of the budget.			
Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4
\$654,459	\$2,648,459	\$2,848,459	\$248,459

10) Indirect Costs

Indirect Costs: The following are the indirect costs that can be claimed for each year of the budget.			
Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4
\$16,488	\$16,134	\$17,609	\$14,659

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

\$0

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs: Participating LEAs will have the opportunity to apply for grants to establish a pay-for-performance pilot program.	Year	Amount Available for Grants	Total
Provide incentive funding for locally developed compensation systems based on the results of the teacher and leader effectiveness measures. Local districts can apply for this funding with high quality plans that are developed in collaboration with teachers and principals and meet other criteria	Year 1		\$40,000,000
	Year 2	\$5,000,000	
	Year 3	\$5,000,000	
	Year 4	\$30,000,000	
Pilot projects for new statewide teacher and principal evaluation system	Year 3	\$600,000	600,000

13) Total Costs

Total Costs: The following is the sum of expenditures, across all budget categories for each year of the budget.			
Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4
\$670,947	\$7,664,593	\$8,466,068	\$30,263,118

**Longitudinal Data Systems Project
BUDGET NARRATIVE**

1) Personnel

\$0

2) Fringe Benefits

\$0

3) Travel

Travel expenses include either in-state (\$66.00) or out-of-state (\$85.00) per diem; hotel rates of \$100 - \$200 based on area; mileage based on government rate. Also included may be airport parking and taxi costs where necessary. No stipends or registration fees are included in any below travel.	# Trips	\$ per Trip	Total
Travel as required by receipt of federal grant funds for evaluative purposes.	6	\$1,750	\$10,500
Travel to Oklahoma for interviews with policy, and management staff for documentation of standards and procedures related to components and practices in the Information Systems Architecture (ISA); data owners, program staff, and IT for data flow mapping; documentation of data stewards and office responsible for each collection, repository, and output; interviews with legal staff, policy makers, and management staff for documentation of mandates related to data records for accommodation in the Data Access and Management Policy.	3	\$1,000	\$3,000
Travel (by consultants) to Oklahoma for review and update interviews and presentations on the Information Systems Architecture (ISA), <i>data flow diagrams</i> , and Data Access and Management Policy.	3	\$1,267	\$3,800
Travel (by consultants) to Oklahoma for interviews with data owners, program staff, and IT for identification of collections, repositories, and outputs to be documented into the enterprise metadata dictionary; ED Facts Map and Gap Analysis Report; Planning session with curriculum program staff, data stewards, and district representatives to determine processes for mapping course classifications from LEAS to SDE to SCED using the xDUA. Standards.	1	\$1,440	\$1,440
Travel (by consultants) to Oklahoma for external LDS review for quarterly meetings and status reports	4	\$1,390	\$5,560

4) Equipment

Description	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
Hardware for hosting the new system and software for P-20 LDS. Every one of the 6 Mart Needs:	Y1: 999,000		\$999,000

	Y3: 253,600		
Hardware for hosting the new system and software for Higher Education. Server Hardware SAN Infrastructure	Y1: 114,000 Y2: 0 Y3: 0		\$114,000
Hardware for creating the P-20 Test Lab Server Hardware SAN Infrastructure	Y1:0 Y2: 350,000 Y3: 0		\$350,000
SIF Agent Test Lab Hardware 15 servers to house 15 SIS Applications Hardware for SDE software 4 Reporting servers, 2 Cube servers and 2 xDInfo servers \$6,000 each Expand SAN \$65,000 Infrastructure equipment \$37,000 Software and Maintenance and Warranties	Y1: 800,000 Y2: 547,000 Y3: 0		1,347,000

5) **Supplies**
\$0

6) **Contractual**

<u>Professional Services</u>	<u>Description</u> All services are for years 1, 2, and 3 unless otherwise noted. No activity in this project is anticipated for year 4.	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Total 3 years</u>
<u>Project Executive Manager</u> : PMP Certified; experience in program management of information technology programs in education agencies; understanding of data integration management; risk assessment and management	Provide direct oversight and direction to agencies. Assist in the management of grant activities and interface with USED/IES.	\$85,000 annually	\$255,000

<p><u>Project Management</u>: PMP Certified; experience in data integration projects; in-depth knowledge of data systems; and proficient in project planning documentation.</p>	<p>Provide direct oversight and direction to agencies. Assist in the management of grant activities and interface with USED/IES.</p>	<p>\$49,667 annually</p>	<p>\$149,000</p>
<p><u>Content Experts working with project manager</u>: Experience with NCES data standards, NEDM, SCED, SIF, and other national standards; knowledge of SEA management, LEA data issues, and technology issues impacting LDS management.</p>	<p>Provide guidance in the application of best practices to the OKLDS Project design and implementation.</p>	<p>\$100 per hour</p>	<p>\$75,000</p>
<p><u>Analyst/Designer, P20</u>: Technical expertise and experience in the design of data warehouse models and processes</p>	<p>Analyze the enhancements to the Wave data marts, requirements and design for the data marts for the other sources of SDE data for the SDE data marts for the P-20 LDS. Contractual.</p>	<p>\$175 per hour</p>	<p>\$847,500</p>
<p><u>Developers, P20/Database Administrators</u> Technical expertise in the development of data warehouse models and processes. Experience in understanding education data to formulate cubes and reports</p>	<p>Develop the enhancements to the Wave and SDE data marts.</p>	<p>\$175 per hour</p>	<p>\$1,275,000</p>
<p><u>Analyst/Developer, Wave Enhancements</u>: Understanding of education data, ED<i>Facts</i>, SDE reporting requirements. Technical expertise and experience in the development of SIF systems, zone management, integration into data marts</p>	<p>Analyze the data elements required to compute and replace the aggregate statistics.</p>	<p>\$200 per hour</p>	<p>\$757,050</p>
<p><u>Developers, Wave Enhancements</u>: Technical expertise and experience in</p>	<p>Develop the enhancements to the SIF objects in the Wave</p>	<p>\$175 per hour</p>	<p>\$347,550</p>

the development of SIF systems, zone management, integration into data marts. <u>Analyst</u> : Understanding of education data, ED <i> Facts</i> , SDE reporting requirements.	collections and certified submission process		
<u>Analyst</u> :Technical expertise and experience in the design of data warehouse models and processes	Analyze enhancements to the SLDS data marts and the requirements/design for the data marts for the other sources of SDE data for the SDE data marts; analyze the requirements and functions for the P-20 LDS	\$150 per hour	\$294,400
<u>Developer</u> : Technical expertise and experience in the development of data warehouses models and processes	Develop the enhancements to the data marts; develop the data marts for the Higher Education data sources	\$125 per hour	\$200,000
<u>Content Expert, Electronic Transcripts</u> : Experience in electronic records and transcript exchange management systems and national standards.	To provide expert guidance on best practices for Oklahoma related to PK-12 to PK-12, high school to post secondary, and postsecondary to postsecondary electronic exchanges These services will be acquired using the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40-74.48 and Part 80.36	RFP Process as per State regulations	\$636,000
<u>Data Specialist</u> : Experience in management of data, skills with databases, understanding of the data appropriate for pre-K	Manage the data provided by the pre-kindergarten programs, train the programs to provide quality data, coordinate between the programs and the P-20 LDS, and	\$66,667	\$200,000

	provide design and insights to the grant.		
<u>Developer, P-K system</u> : Technical expertise and experience in the development of data warehouses models and processes	Develop the data marts; update the UID system. Year 1 only.	\$180 per hour	\$108,000
<u>Workforce Data Specialist</u> : Experience in management of data, skills with databases, understanding of the data appropriate for workforce programs	Manage the data provided by the workforce programs, train the programs to provide quality data, coordinate between the programs and the P-20 LDS, and provide design and insights to the grant.	\$65,000	\$195,000
<u>Developer, Workforce</u> : Technical expertise and experience in the development of data warehouses models and processes	Develop the data marts	\$150 per hour	\$113,000
<u>Education Data Specialists</u> : Experience in management of data, skills with databases, understanding of the data appropriate for career and technical education programs	Manage the data provided by the career and technical education programs, train the programs to provide quality data, coordinate between the programs and the P-20. LDS, and provide design and insights to the grant.	2 contractors @ \$150 per hour	\$500,000
<u>Developers</u> : Technical expertise and experience in the development of data warehouses models and processes	Develop the data marts; update the UID system. Contractor and internal staff	4 contractors @ \$200 per hour	\$682,000
<u>Information Systems Architecture Content Expert</u> : Experience working with SEAs in the design and use of information systems in relation to Governance	Facilitate the development of the ISA, customize the ISA documents, conduct interviews, produce final deliverable.	\$175 per hour	\$17,200

<p><u>Process Flow Diagram Content Expert:</u> Education agency processes for information management, systems interoperability, application deployment; Governance</p>	<p>Facilitate documentation of data resources and relationships, creation of the data flow diagram.</p>	<p>\$120 per hour</p>	<p>\$5,000</p>
<p><u>Data Access and Management Policy Expert:</u> Deep expertise in FERPA and other information access and use issues; Governance</p>	<p>Conduct interviews, analyze policies, write Data Access and Management Policy document. Year 1 only.</p>	<p>\$120 per hour</p>	<p>\$5,000</p>
<p><u>Metadata Content Expert:</u> Experience with NCES data standards (<i>EDFacts</i>, Handbooks, SCED), NEDM, SIF, and other national standards. Standards.</p>	<p>Facilitate the planning, documentation gathering, and management of the processes with the metadata specialists who will map document the metadata. Year 1 only.</p>	<p>\$200 per hour</p>	<p>\$50,000</p>
<p><u>EDFacts Expert:</u> In-Depth understanding of <i>EDFacts</i> requirements, XML; successful experience submitting <i>EDFacts</i> for SEAs utilizing SIF. Standards.</p>	<p>Verify content and map elements to <i>EDFacts</i> submission files. Year 1 only.</p>	<p>\$250 per hour</p>	<p>\$50,500</p>
<p><u>Course Mapping Content Expert:</u> Experience mapping local and state course numbers to SCED. Standards.</p>	<p>Facilitate documentation of course classifications and mapping to SCED. Year 1.</p>	<p>\$250 per hour</p>	<p>\$42,060</p>
<p><u>External Evaluator:</u> Experience in program management of information technology programs; risk management; LDS grant process, requirements.</p>	<p>Review the project plan, monitor the plan, prepare and present status reports, prepare recommendations, present reports as requested.</p>	<p>\$120 per hour</p>	<p>\$76,440</p>
<p><u>Training and Support Staff:</u> Experienced in Application Training and Support; Database administrators</p>	<p>10 contractors to train trainers and LDS technical support staff</p>	<p>\$100 per hour</p>	<p>\$1,063,200</p>
<p><u>Software and Data Testing Expert:</u></p>	<p>Contract technical support</p>	<p>\$60,000 per</p>	<p>\$180,000</p>

Experienced in software and application testing; database administrator	professionals to meet the needs P-20 LDS Test Lab	year	
---	---	------	--

7) Training Stipends
\$0

8) Other
\$0

9) Total Direct Costs

Total Direct Costs: The following is the sum of expenditures, across all budget categories in lines 1-8, for each year of the budget.			
Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4
5,787,550	3,752,100	1,948,150	0

10) Indirect Costs

Indirect Costs: The following are the indirect costs that can be claimed for each year of the budget.			
Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4
118,030	73,980	19,736	0

11) Funding for Involved LEAs
\$0

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs
\$0

13) Total Costs

Total Costs: The following is the sum of expenditures, across all budget categories for each year of the budget.			
Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4
5,905,580	3,826,080	1,967,886	0

**Low-Performing Schools Project
BUDGET NARRATIVE**

1) Personnel

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
School Support Team Leaders (6): Oklahoma State Department of Education will hire part-time School Support Team Leaders, who are also Educational Leadership Coaches. This will allow the Oklahoma State Department of Education to expand the School Support Team offerings to more districts and sites in order to make effective changes in low-performing schools. Leaders will report to the new Turnaround Division and the Race to the Top Project Director.	.33%	\$70,710 per year	\$560,000

2) Fringe Benefits

Fringe Benefits	Benefits	Total
Fringe Benefits for the School Support Team Leaders, including contribution to the Teachers' Retirement System and FICA	\$46,000 per year	\$184,000

3) Travel

Travel: Travel expenses include the average mile reimbursements of \$150 for each trip, per diem, and hotel reimbursements based on county of destination.	# Trips Per Year	Total
Six School Support Team Leaders will lead teams through three site visits per year at low-performing schools and will conduct additional visits as Educational Leadership Coaches. Cost per trip is figured based on county of destination.	160 trips x \$300 60 trips x \$266	\$256,000

4) Equipment

\$0

5) Supplies

\$0

6) Contractual

\$0

7) Training Stipends

\$0

8) Other

\$0

9) Total Direct Costs

Total Direct Costs: The following is the sum of expenditures, across all budget categories in lines 1-8, for each year of the budget.			
Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4
\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000

10) Indirect Costs

Indirect Costs: The following are the indirect costs that can be claimed for each year of the budget.			
Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4
\$20,650	\$20,650	\$20,650	\$20,650

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

\$0

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs:	Amount Available for Grants each year	Total
Allocations will be designated to each of the five lowest performing schools to fund components of a high-quality turn-around plan. In order to receive their allocation, these districts must submit and receive approval on a plan based on one of the four intervention models defined in Race to the Top. Oklahoma State Department of Education school support teams will provide technical assistance to these districts as they develop and implement their plan.	\$1,500,000	\$6,000,000
A pool of funds will be available on a voluntary and competitive basis to participating districts that are prepared to aggressively implement one of the four intervention models defined in Race to the Top in schools that need improvement, but are not considered one of the five lowest performing schools in the state.	\$1,250,000	\$5,000,000

13) Total Costs

Total Costs: The following is the sum of expenditures, across all budget categories for each year of the budget.			
Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4
\$3,020,650	\$3,020,650	\$3,020,650	\$3,020,650

**Management Project
BUDGET NARRATIVE**

1) Personnel

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Salary Increase	Total
Race to the Top Implementation Team Project Director (1): Dr. Cindy Koss will be responsible for the overall leadership and implementation of the Race to the Top grant in addition to her regular job duties. She is an expert in school reform and has worked as Assistant State Superintendent in the School Improvement Division since 2003. She will report to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Oklahoma Race to the Top Commission. Her qualifications are described in detail A2-7.	20-25%	\$20,000 per year	\$80,000
Race to the Top Implementation Team Members (7): Implementation Team Members will be responsible for the implementation and monitoring of the Race to the Top grant in addition to their regular job duties. Team members are experts in school reform, standards, assessments, teacher and administrator certification, early childhood, STEM, and/or school support. Team members will report to the Project Director and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Team member qualifications are described in detail in A2-7.	15-30%	\$15,000-25,000 per year per team member	\$560,000
Personnel: Other			Total
Substitute teachers will be hired for those teachers participating in the state's Race to the Top Kick-Off Conference.	\$40 per substitute	250 teachers	\$10,000

2) Fringe Benefits

Fringe Benefits	Benefits	Total
Fringe Benefits for the Race to the Top Project Director and Implementation Team Members, including contribution to the Teachers' Retirement System and FICA	\$53,168 per year	\$212,672

3) Travel
\$0

4) Equipment
\$0

5) Supplies

Supplies: The following supplies are estimated needs for the Race to the Top Kick-Off Conference described in the narrative for selection criterion (A)(2).	Per Participant	Total
Conference bags, name badges, general supplies		\$2,000
District resource library containing books relating to school reform and implementing change.		\$12,000
Supplies: The following supplies are estimated needs for the Race to the Top Annual Conferences and Standards Summits described in the narrative for selection criterion (A)(2) and (B)(3).		
Conference bags, name badges, general supplies		\$8,500
District resource library containing materials relating to school reform and implementing change.		\$32,500

6) Contractual

Contractual: The following services and products will be acquired using the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40-74.48 and Part 80.36.	Per Year	Total
Facility rental for kick-off conference.	\$20,000	\$20,000
Facility rentals for Race to the Top Annual Conferences and Standards Summits	\$20,000	\$80,000
Third party evaluator to determine effectiveness of all programs and projects implemented as part of the Race to the Top grant. Further detail on purpose and use of the third party evaluator can be found in the narrative for selection criterion (A)(2), and other research services.	\$125,000	\$535,000
Community engagement initiative will increase statewide participation in school reform efforts and leverage successes to further funding opportunities for continued success.	\$100,000 in Year 1; \$50,000 in each year thereafter	\$250,000

7) Training Stipends

\$0

8) Other

\$0

9) Total Direct Costs

Total Direct Costs: The following is the sum of expenditures, across all budget categories in lines 1-8, for each year of the budget.

Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4
\$533,168	\$423,168	\$423,168	\$423,168

10) Indirect Costs

Indirect Costs: The following are the indirect costs that can be claimed for each year of the budget.

Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4
\$21,132	\$17,592	\$17,592	\$17,592

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

\$0

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

\$0

13) Total Costs

Total Costs: The following is the sum of expenditures, across all budget categories for each year of the budget.

Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4
\$554,300	\$440,760	\$440,760	\$440,760

**Standards and Assessment Pipeline Project
BUDGET NARRATIVE**

1) Personnel

Personnel: Teacher Stipends	Stipend	Per Year	Total
Teachers will be provided with stipends for participating in Achieving Classroom Excellence and American Diploma Project Academies described in the narrative for selection criterion (B)(3), which will occur outside of the contractual school day. The professional development provided in these academies will focus on Common Core Standards, assessments, data interpretation, and college- and career-readiness strategies that will further the work on the Race to the Top goals.	\$100 per teacher	500 teachers per year	\$200,000

2) Fringe Benefits

\$0

3) Travel

Travel: Travel expenses include the average mile reimbursements of \$50 each.	Travel	Per Year	Total
Teachers from participating districts who attend the Achieving Classroom Excellence and American Diploma Project Academies will be reimbursed mileage expenses to attend the academy.	\$50 per teacher	500 teachers per year	\$100,000

4) Equipment

\$0

5) Supplies

Supplies: The following supplies are estimated needs for the ACE&ADP Academies described in the narrative for selection criterion (B)(3).	Per Participant	Total
Conference bags, name badges, general supplies	2000x\$2	\$4,000
Print materials, handouts, and professional literature relating to school reform and college- and career-readiness strategies.	2000x\$48	\$96,000

6) Contractual

Contractual: The following services and products will be acquired using the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40-74.48 and Part 80.36.	Per Year	Total
Facility rentals for Achieving Classroom Excellence and American Diploma Project Academies	\$25,000	\$100,000
Alignment Study described in the narrative for selection criterion (B)(3) to	\$125,000	\$500,000

OKLAHOMA'S RACE TO THE TOP

PART VIII

(II) PROJECT LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE –STANDARDS & ASSESSMENT PIPELINE PROJECT

compare the alignment of high school assignments to Common Core Standards for high school and to college-readiness expectations, and to compare entry-level college assignments to high school assignments and college-entrance expectations.		
Technology-based Instructional Toolkit described in the narrative for selection criterion (B)(3) to develop and disseminate lessons that translate Common Core Standards into engaging instruction.	\$1,025,000 in Year 1; \$325,000 in each year thereafter	\$2,000,000

7) Training Stipends

\$0

8) Other

\$0

9) Total Direct Costs

Total Direct Costs: The following is the sum of expenditures, across all budget categories in lines 1-8, for each year of the budget.			
Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4
\$1,275,000	\$575,000	\$575,000	\$575,000

10) Indirect Costs

Indirect Costs: The following are the indirect costs that can be claimed for each year of the budget.			
Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4
\$10,325	\$10,325	\$10,325	\$10,325

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

\$0

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

\$0

13) Total Costs

Total Costs: The following is the sum of expenditures, across all budget categories for each year of the budget.			
Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4
\$1,285,325	\$585,325	\$585,325	\$585,325

**STEM Project
BUDGET NARRATIVE**

- 1) **Personnel**
\$0
- 2) **Fringe Benefits**
\$0
- 3) **Travel**
\$0
- 4) **Equipment**
\$0
- 5) **Supplies**
\$0

6) **Contractual**

Contractual: The following services and products will be acquired using the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40-74.48 and Part 80.36.	Project Year	Cost	Total
Create a STEM Coordinating Council that will be responsible for connecting, sharing, and building on the work of existing STEM initiatives, creating a common vision with aggressive goals that will support a state-wide, regional and local strategy to build STEM capacity and STEM literacy for all students. Focused targets for the council will be to enhance STEM teaching and learning capacity and increase the number of underrepresented student groups and female students' completing STEM programs of study.	Year 1	\$100,000	\$200,000
	Year 2	\$100,000	
Expand Summer Academy opportunities in the STEM disciplines for students in grades 8-12 with 5-7 new grants. Offered on college campuses, these summer enrichment opportunities will be focused on educationally at-risk and economically challenged school districts in urban and rural areas. These new career exploration activities will be developed in consultation with key STEM focused industry groups such as Aerospace, Energy, Health Care, and Advanced Manufacturing.	Year 1	\$150,000	\$300,000
	Year 2	\$150,000	
Expand high school STEM academies offered through Career and Technology Education focused on engineering, bioscience and biotechnology with 3-4 new sites per year. Strategic placement of additional academies will be focused on serving underrepresented groups of students, female students, and both urban and rural sites. Strategic talent pipeline development for Oklahoma's targeted industry sectors,	Year 1	\$150,000	\$300,000
	Year 2	\$150,000	

Aerospace, Energy, Health Care, and Advanced Manufacturing.			
---	--	--	--

7) Training Stipends
\$0

8) Other
\$0

9) Total Direct Costs

Total Direct Costs: The following is the sum of expenditures, across all budget categories in lines 1-8, for each year of the budget.			
Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4
\$400,000	\$400,000	\$0	\$0

10) Indirect Costs

Indirect Costs: The following are the indirect costs that can be claimed for each year of the budget.			
Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4
\$7,375	\$7,375	\$0	\$0

11) Funding for Involved LEAs
\$0

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs
\$0

13) Total Costs

Total Costs: The following is the sum of expenditures, across all budget categories for each year of the budget.			
Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4
\$407,375	\$407,375	\$0	\$0

