1:30 pm  1) Welcome and introductions – All
       - Check list/make corrections

1:55 pm  2) Where we have been/Where we are...
       - Overview – Robin Munson
       - Student – Robin Munson
       - Fiscal – Cal Brodie
       - Educator – David Kinnunen

2:55 pm  3) Where we are going...
       - Federal Longitudinal Data grant – Debbie Spaulding
       - Data provisions of the Basic Ed Funding Bill (HB 2261) – Bob Butts

3:30 pm  4) Break

3:40 pm  5) Discussion of Legislative expectations – Senator Eric Oemig

4:00 pm  6) Questions and discussion

4:20 pm  7) Next steps
       - Meeting topics
       - Meeting dates

4:30 pm  8) Adjourn
Washington’s K–12 Education Data System

Presentation by OSPI Staff to the Data Governance Group Meeting
July 16, 2009
(Updated)
The Plan

The Journey: Where we have been…Where we are
- Overview – Robin Munson
- Student – Robin Munson
- Fiscal – Cal Brodie
- Educator – David Kinnunen

Where we are going
- Federal data grant – Debbie Spaulding
- Data provisions of HB 2261 – Bob Butts

Additional Questions and Answers
Where we have been: Overview

OSPI’s Journey to a K–12 Longitudinal Data System…
OSPI’s Longitudinal Data System is Part of Washington’s P–20 Longitudinal Data System
OSPI's Evolution to a K–12 Longitudinal Data System

- **CSRS** Core Student Record System (2004-09)
  - State Student Identifier
  - Student Demographics
  - Enrollment Status
  - Program Participation

- **Feasibility Study** Spring 2008
  - Standard Course Codes
  - Racial Subgroups
  - Certification Numbers
  - School Level Financials (postponed)

- **Initial Course and Teacher Collection** 2008-09
  - RCW 28A.320.175
    - Student Schedules
    - Certification Numbers

- **Certification** Winter 2008
  - Certifications
  - Endorsements
  - Teacher test scores
  - National Board Certifications
  - Highly Qualified Teacher status (HQT)

- **CEDARS** Comprehensive Education Data & Research System (Fall 2009)
  - Course Catalog
  - Teacher Schedule
  - Student Schedule
  - Student Grade History
  - More Program Participation
CEDARS Data Warehouse vs. CEDARS Submissions

CEDARS Submissions

Student, Course & Teacher Data

Assessment

Financial

Certification

Facilities & Transportation

CEDARS Data Warehouse
CEDARS Warehouse Outcomes

- Will reduce duplicate information requests from OSPI to districts: CEDARS will be first stop for information
- Allows OSPI to generate & consolidate reports for district use
- Links teacher, student, and assessment data -- and eventually financial and facilities data -- to inform policy and funding decisions
- Integration will highlight data quality
- Maintain K–12 longitudinal data that can be shared with Education Research and Data Center and other researchers
CEDARS Warehouse vs CEDARS Submissions

CEDARS Submissions

- Student Enrollment Dates
- Courses
- Grade History
- Student & Staff Schedules
- Student Demographics
- Programs
- Assessment
- Financial
- Certification
- Facilities & Transportation

CEDARS Data Warehouse
Additional Data for the Warehouse

CEDARS Data Warehouse

Assessment
- Statewide Assessments
- Language Proficiency
- College Readiness Tests

Financial

Certification

Facilities & Transportation
Additional Data for the Warehouse

CEDARS Data Warehouse

Financial
- Budgets
- Expenditures
- Apportionment
- Grant Payments

CEDARS
Assessment
Certification
Facilities & Transportation
Additional Data for the Warehouse

CEDARS
Assessment
Financial
Facilities & Transportation

Certification
- Teaching Certificates
- Fingerprints
- Teacher Test Scores
- Natl. Board
- HQT
- CTE Certifications
- S-275

CEDARS Data Warehouse
Additional Data for the Warehouse

CEDARS Data Warehouse

- CEDARS
- Assessment
- Financial
- Certification

Facilities & Transportation

- Transportation
- Facilities Inventory
- Safety

Recommendations
1. Collect racial subgroup data, beginning in 2010–11
   a. Hispanic/Latino (8 subgroups)
   b. American (15 subgroups)
   c. Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (9 subgroups)
   d. American Indian/Native Alaskan students (31 subgroups: 28 federally-recognized Washington tribes, “Other Washington tribe”, “Native Alaskan tribe”, and “Other American Indian tribe”)
   e. White and African American/Black are stand-alone sub-groups
Recommendations, cont’d

2. Implement reporting of state standardized course codes using the National Center on Education Statistics (NCES) coding scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>November 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>November 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Language Arts</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All High School courses</td>
<td>May 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Incorporate all teacher databases into the CEDARS warehouse

4. Continue the e-Certification project to improve teacher data

5. Build new reports and queries based on stakeholder needs
Financial and Compensation Data

- Postponed building-level analysis due to simultaneous Basic Education Task Force work

- Finance Task Force recommendations:
  - Allocate resources in new categories
  - Collect detailed salary data by staff for supplemental salaries
  - Separate expenditures by state, federal and local sources
  - Collect expenditure data by school
Kinds of questions we will be able to answer with these data

- **Student Achievement**
  - Achievement over time for individual students and groups of students (e.g., students in the Transitional Bilingual Program, students in foster-care)
  - Rate at which English Language Learners are entering the state for the first time in high school and how they are doing on the state’s high school exit exam.*

- **Teacher preparation**
  - The relationship between the performance of each district’s low-income students on the end-of-course Algebra 1 exam and teacher preparation in that subject.*

- **Teacher deployment**
  - National Board certification rates in districts of high-poverty.

- **Course taking patterns**
  - Number of and percent of students enrolling in and completing more rigorous courses in high school, disaggregated by ethnicity and income status.*

- **Grade history**
  - Course grades vs. end-of-course assessment scores

- **Etc.**
  - *These questions are taken from the Data Quality Campaign’s list of questions to be answered by state education data systems
CEDARS Implementation Schedule

Timeline

◦ CEDARS training/support for all districts April/May 2009
◦ Pilots continue to submit CEDARS through Aug 2009
◦ CEDARS full implementation Sept 2009
◦ State course codes phased in 2009–10
◦ Ethnicity and racial subgroups submitted by 2010–11
◦ New reports/data displays developed 2009 (and ongoing) based on key questions identified through data governance
STUDENT DATA

Student data elements collected through CSRS:
- State student identifier
- District identifier
- Name
- Ethnicity
- Gender
- Birth date
- Social Security number (optional)
- Grade level
- School and district of enrollment
- Enrollment & withdrawal dates, district & school
- Primary language
- Language spoken at home
- Expected graduation year
- Cumulative grade point average (GPA)
- Homeless status
- Free/reduced meal eligibility
- ELL program participation/eligibility
- Migrant program participation
- Special education program participation
- Disability category
- Least restricted environment
- Highly capable program participation
- Title I and LADEP program participation
- Career and Technical Education flags

New data elements collected through CEDARS:
- Student course schedule (started in “.175”)
- Federal ethnicity and race codes
  - Hispanic/Non–Hispanic
  - Asian, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Caucasian, Alaskan Native/Native American, Black/African American, or Multi–racial
- Birth country
- Graduation requirements year (i.e., which set of requirements are needed)
- Grade history information (i.e., data you’d see on HS transcript)
- Special education program details
- Bilingual program details

New data elements for CEDARS identified by feasibility workgroup:
- State course codes
- Expand race and ethnicity codes for students
Course data elements collected through CSRS:
- Flag if student is taking an AP/IB course
- Career & Technical Ed CIP codes
- Career & Technical Ed Direct Transcription flag

New data elements collected through CEDARS:
- Course catalog
  - District Course Title
  - District Course ID
  - Content Area Code
  - Course Designation Code (required on HS transcript)
- Student schedules and teacher schedules
  - District Course Title
  - District Course ID
  - Term
  - Section ID

New data elements collected through CEDARS (cont’):
- Grade history
  - District Course Title
  - District Course ID
  - Credits attempted
  - Credits earned
  - Grade level in course
  - Letter grade earned
  - Cumulative GPA
  - Term (grading period)
  - CTE Completer flag
  - CTE Received National Certification
  - CTE Tech Prep Completer flag

New data elements for CEDARS identified by feasibility workgroup:
- Common state course codes (NCES–SCED)
Data is collected through the following systems for the primary purpose of calculating and providing state funding to WA Public Schools.

- S–275 School District Personnel Data
- F–196 Year End Financial Data
- F–195 District Budget
- P–223 Monthly Student Enrollment Count

These systems have historically been VAX based and will be fully rehosted onto a new platform for the 2009–10 school year.
Each district is required to report all staffing information as of October 1\textsuperscript{st} of each school year.

Staff hired after October 1\textsuperscript{st} are not included.

This information collected by employee contains the following major elements:

- Personal identifying information: Names, SS#, Certificate #, Birth Date, Sex, Ethnic Code
- Total years of experience
- Highest Degree
- Assignment information as of October 1\textsuperscript{st} is reported by building, program, duty, activity, and grade group assignment
- Salary information including detail of base versus other salary

This collection has information on 160,000+ school employees.

This dataset captured 94\% of total final salary costs for 2007–08.
SAFS
Personnel Data: Reports Out

- We annually publish 275+ pages of reports and analysis of this data at both the school district and state-level.
- This data exists on our website, in some version, back to 1988.
- The data is housed in an Access database format that is regularly shared with School districts, ESDs, Legislative staff, media, and others.
- Per popular request, these reports have been posted in Excel version since 2002–03.
- We are currently developing building-based report models using the S–275 data.
Each is an annual report system

Each report contains financial information reported under state defined codes that capture:
- Revenue by type/source (122 active revenue codes)
- Expenditure summarized by:
  - Program (42 active program codes)
  - Object (9 codes)
  - Activity (38 codes)

In addition to this, the budget captures summarized staffing data by program
SAFS

Financial Information: Reports Out

- Each F–195 & F–196 report is available on our website back to 1997–98
- We annually publish 300+ pages of reports and analysis of the year-end data at both the school district and state-level
- By popular request these reports have been posted in Excel formats since 2003–04
- The working data is in an Access database that is regularly shared
- We also publish 15 five-year models that support analysis of district data by district by program area
Captures student headcount and full-time equivalency (FTE):
- At district-level
- By grade by month
- Captures a snapshot of enrollment on a single specified day each month
- Also captures discrete categorical enrollment information for Vocational and Skills Centers, Bilingual, Special Education, Running Start, Middle School Voc & Full Day Kindergarten
- It currently does not capture enrollment by school
- Reporting is performed in compliance with statute and WAC
SAFS
Student Enrollment Data: Data Out

- Each month the enrollment reports are posted on the OSPI website.

- The annual historical enrollment reports available on the OSPI website go back to 1997–98.

- With the new systems, we are able to provide Excel/Access copies of the database to Districts, ESDs, OFM, and others.
SAFS: Future Directions

- SHB 2261 addresses further collection of building-level data to include all non-personnel costs and those additional staffing costs not included in the S-275 reporting.

- This will require extensive development and deployment of new accounting standards for building level accounting, additional staffing, and modification of systems at both OSPI and district level.

- Furthermore, the bill addresses matching all expenditures back to the funding source. Specifically, this would provide transparency as to how districts are spending their discretionary dollars.
Current status of data systems at OSPI: Educators

Current Data Reporting
1) Annual Report
   a) Certifications Issued
   b) Certificated Personnel Placement Statistics

2) Teacher Quality

3) Various requests from Researchers
Our new layout as of June 2008 presents 11 tabs for identifying teacher certificate data. Sources include:

1. Certification input from certification office
2. S–275 from school districts
3. Educator fingerprint data—WSP/FBI
Data screen identifies certificate:

1. Type---Issue date/expiration date---
2. Recommending agency/institution---
3. When printed---endorsements
Occupation Tab Identifies:

1. Certification data which will eventually include quick view of HQT Core Academic Subject/Route and Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certification Type</th>
<th>Issue Date</th>
<th>Expiration Date</th>
<th>Organization codes</th>
<th>Recommended Agency</th>
<th>Endorsements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C260700 SUB TCHR</td>
<td>4/27/2007</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>SPI. OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T310500 RESIDENCY TCHR (PS)</td>
<td>4/27/2007</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>SPI. OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Curriculum</td>
<td>State Test</td>
<td>1/1/1900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Occupation also Includes:
1. S-275 Data
2. Organization---Duty---Type of Program---% of Contract
Applications if submitted by e–Cert

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Application Type</th>
<th>Submitted</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>e-Messages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Test Score Data:
1. WEST–E/WEST–B uploaded from vendor report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Birth Date</th>
<th>Test Code</th>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Test Date</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Passed</th>
<th>Test Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADAM D SMITH</td>
<td>4/8/1971</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Elementary Education (10014)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>PRAXIS II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Utilities Include Reporting Tools: Cert Use Only

1. All certificates by certificate type
2. Endorsement
3. New printing tool
Upload Tab Function for Test Scores from Vendor
Upload includes:

1. Sort by certificate type by recommending agency
   *(Not in development at This Time)*
Highly Qualified Teacher Data (In Development)

1. Identifies teacher/content area/route to HQT and grade-level
2. By district and by school
Drop Down Menu Provides: (In Development):
1. Options for content area
Drop Down Menu Provides:
1. Route to HQT
Reports Tab Provides Sorting Expiration Dates by:
1. Organization
Reports Tab Provides Sorting Expiration Dates by:
2. Certificate type
Reports Tab Provides Sorting Expiration Dates by:

3. Certificate type and issued date
# Teacher Information Summary

**Serving District:** 31002 Everett  
**School:** 4334 HEATHERWOOD MIDDLE  
**Certificate Number:** 387470H  
**Staff Id:** 2916  
**Name:** E White  
**Birth Date:** 1955-08-11  
**Gender:**  
**Teacher Courses:**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area Code</th>
<th>Course Designation Code</th>
<th>Course ID</th>
<th>District Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td>MTH101</td>
<td>ALGEBRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td>02052</td>
<td>Algebra I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>MTH201</td>
<td>GEOMETRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td>02072</td>
<td>Geometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>MTH201</td>
<td>GEOMETRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td>02072</td>
<td>Geometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Course Designation Code:</td>
<td>MTH301</td>
<td>MATH 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Subject</td>
<td>Course ID:</td>
<td>02001</td>
<td>Informal Mathematics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education Degree Code:** M  
**Education Degree Year Date:** 2001  
**Credit Grandfather Number:** 23  
**Credit Vocational Number:** 0  
**Credit Academic Number:** 14  
**Credit In-Service Number:** 58.5  

**Test Results:**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cert. Descriptive Type ID Code:</th>
<th>Cert. Descriptive Title:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C270700</td>
<td>EMERGENCY SUBSTITUTE TEACHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cert. Issue Date:</td>
<td>20010606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cert. Exp Date:</td>
<td>20030630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Area:**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cert. Descriptive Type ID Code:</th>
<th>Cert. Descriptive Title:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T320500</td>
<td>RESIDENCY TEACHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cert. Issue Date:</td>
<td>20010718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cert. Exp Date:</td>
<td>20070630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Area:**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cert. Descriptive Type ID Code:</th>
<th>Cert. Descriptive Title:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T330500</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL TEACHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cert. Issue Date:</td>
<td>20070727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cert. Exp Date:</td>
<td>19160630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Area:**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cert. Descriptive Type ID Code:</th>
<th>Cert. Descriptive Title:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T330500</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL TEACHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cert. Issue Date:</td>
<td>20070727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cert. Exp Date:</td>
<td>19160630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Area:**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cert. Descriptive Type ID Code:</th>
<th>Cert. Descriptive Title:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T330500</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL TEACHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cert. Issue Date:</td>
<td>20070727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cert. Exp Date:</td>
<td>19160630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Federal Longitudinal Data System (LDS) Grant

- $5.9M over 4 years
- [http://nces.ed.gov/Programs/SLDS/index.asp](http://nces.ed.gov/Programs/SLDS/index.asp)
- 27 states were awarded this grant in March 2009. Forty-one states have received a grant since 2005.
- Start Date: 6/1/2009
  End Date: 5/31/2013
Major Outcomes

1) To develop a governance model and to enhance data quality and stewardship from data entry through reporting

2) To implement an infrastructure encompassing all K–12 business areas that will facilitate communication and efficiency within the agency and with primary stakeholders
Major Outcomes

3) To develop tools that will enhance data driven decision-making at all system levels

4) To incorporate external education partner organization membership into the proposed K–12 education data governance system
Major Outcomes

5) To extend the statewide, longitudinal data system to external systems with infrastructure components that meets technical requirements and standards while protecting individual student privacy.
Data Provisions of HB 2261

- Includes five **major** components
  - Overall P–20 framework, and relationship of the K–12 data system with LEAP and the ERDC
  - Legislative “vision” and “expectations” for a K–12 data system
  - Gap Analysis: What will it take to meet the expectations?
  - K–12 Data Governance Group
    - Membership, duties, and reporting
  - Identifies specific reports to be available
Establish a comprehensive K–12 education data improvement system for financial, student, and educator data to:

- Monitor student progress
- Provide information on the quality of the educator workforce
- Monitor and analyze the costs of programs
- Provide for financial integrity/accountability
- **Link** various data components by student, class, teacher, school, district, and statewide

Provide info for teachers, parents, superintendents, school boards, Legislature, OSPI, and public
Legislative Intent: Major Data System Features

- **Educator**
  - Education, assignment, class information, and more...

- **Student**
  - Coding of courses
  - Dropout early warning system
  - Link educator info with student info

- **Fiscal**
  - Reporting of program costs
  - Sources of revenue
  - Formulas to budgeting/accounting
  - Program cost/student performance
Legislative Requirements:

Data Governance

- K–12 Data Governance Group established
  - Staffed by OSPI

- Membership:
  - OFM Education Data and Research Center
  - Legislative Evaluation and Accountability Program Committee
  - OSPI
  - State Board of Education
  - Professional Educators Standards Boards
  - School Districts
  - Other entities with an interest in K–12 data
Legislative Requirements: Data Governance continued...

- **Duties:**
  - Critical research and policy questions
  - Reports and information to be available
  - Needs requirement/gap analysis to meet legislative expectations
  - Financial data to support new K–12 funding model/formulas
  - Operating rules and governance structure for K–12 data collections
If data is available, OSPI shall put specified reports online:

- Data compliance and accuracy
- Spending per students
- Cost of Basic Education
- Cost of Special Education
- Student Assessment results
- Teacher/student ratios
- Cost per student
Legislative Requirements: Data Export and Funding

- **Data Export**
  - Districts must have the capability to export data in a standard format

- **Funding costs**
  - Legislature’s intent that districts collect and report data elements required by the act only to the extent funds are available for this purpose
## HB 2261 and Federal Data Grant:
Comparison of Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>HB 2261</th>
<th>Federal Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Governance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Enhance data quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify Policy/Research Questions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap Analysis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting and Tools</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Ed Funding Data</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Data Submission Training</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## New Funds Available for K–12 Data Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 09–10</th>
<th>FY 10–11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriated in State Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– State</td>
<td>$1,475,000</td>
<td>$1,045,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Federal</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>$435,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Data System Grant</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$2,428,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,675,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,473,000–</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$3,908,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on current information, these federal funds may not be available because of an issue with the proposed source of the funds
More Detail...

Review Sections 202 and 203 of ESSB 2261
Next Steps

- Implementation of HB 2261
- K–12 Longitudinal Data System Grant
- e-Certification: Providing online applications and streamlined processing
- ARRA: P–20 Longitudinal Data System Grant
  - Application in progress through OFM
What’s Next:
OSPI’s Evolution to a K-12 Longitudinal Data System

- HB2261 (Data portion)
  - Data Governance
  - Identify Policy & Research Questions
  - Gap Analysis
  - User Portals, Dashboards, Reporting, Data Displays
  - Financial Data Feasibility
  - Eliminate Duplicate Reporting

- USDOE LDS Grant
  - Data Governance
  - Enterprise Architecture
  - Gap Analysis
  - User Portals, Dashboards, Reporting, Data Displays
  - Data Quality Training

- E-Cert Next phase
  - Applicants apply online
  - Streamline the submission, review and approval process
  - OFM Data Center to develop P-20 grant proposal

- ARRA P-20 Grant

- ??
More Information?

- Bob Butts  
  bob.butts@k12.wa.us
- Joe Willhoft  
  joe.willhoft@k12.wa.us
- Robin Munson  
  robin.munson@k12.wa.us
- Dave Kinnunen  
  david.kinnunen@k12.wa.us
- Cal Brodie  
  cal.brodie@k12.wa.us
- Peter Tamayo  
  peter.tamayo@k12.wa.us
- Debbie Spaulding  
  debbie.spaulding@k12.wa.us
NEW SECTION. Sec. 202. A new section is added to chapter 28A.300 RCW to read as follows:

Legislative Intent
(1) It is the legislature’s intent to establish a comprehensive K-12 education data improvement system for financial, student, and educator data. The objective of the system is to monitor student progress, have information on the quality of the educator workforce, monitor and analyze the costs of programs, provide for financial integrity and accountability, and have the capability to link across these various data components by student, by class, by teacher, by school, by district, and statewide. Education data systems must be flexible and able to adapt to evolving needs for information, but there must be an objective and orderly data governance process for determining when changes are needed and how to implement them. It is the further intent of the legislature to provide independent review and evaluation of a comprehensive K-12 education data improvement system by assigning the review and monitoring responsibilities to the education data center and the legislative evaluation and accountability program committee.

Clients
(2) It is the intent that the data system specifically service reporting requirements for teachers, parents, superintendents, school boards, the legislature, the office of the superintendent of public instruction, and the public.

Data System Features: Legislative Intent
(3) It is the legislature's intent that the K-12 education data improvement system used by school districts and the state include but not be limited to the following information and functionality:

(a) Comprehensive educator information, including grade level and courses taught, building or location, program, job assignment, years of experience, the institution of higher education from which the educator obtained his or her degree, compensation, class size, mobility of class population, socioeconomic data of class, number of languages and which languages are spoken by students, general resources available for curriculum and other classroom needs, and number and type of instructional support staff in the building;

(b) The capacity to link educator assignment information with educator certification information such as certification number, type of certification, route to certification, certification program, and certification assessment or evaluation scores;

(c) Common coding of secondary courses and major areas of study at the elementary level or standard coding of course content;

(d) Robust student information, including but not limited to student characteristics, course and program enrollment, performance on statewide and district summative and formative assessments to the extent district assessments are used, and performance on college readiness tests;

(e) A subset of student information elements to serve as a dropout early warning system;
(f) The capacity to link educator information with student information;

(g) A common, standardized structure for reporting the costs of programs at the school and district level with a focus on the cost of services delivered to students;

(h) Separate accounting of state, federal, and local revenues and costs;

(i) Information linking state funding formulas to school district budgeting and accounting, including procedures:
   (i) To support the accuracy and auditing of financial data; and
   (ii) Using the prototypical school model for school district financial accounting reporting;

(j) The capacity to link program cost information with student performance information to gauge the cost-effectiveness of programs;

(k) Information that is centrally accessible and updated regularly; and

(l) An anonymous, nonidentifiable replicated copy of data that is updated at least quarterly, and made available to the public by the state.

District Data Systems Export Requirement

(4) It is the legislature's goal that all school districts have the capability to collect state-identified common data and export it in a standard format to support a statewide K-12 education data improvement system under this section.

Reports

(5) It is the legislature's intent that the K-12 education data improvement system be developed to provide the capability to make reports as required under section 203 of this act available.

Legislative Funding for New Data Elements Required

(6) It is the legislature's intent that school districts collect and report new data elements to satisfy the requirements of RCW 43.41.400, this section, and section 203 of this act, only to the extent funds are available for this purpose.
K-12 Education Data System: Governance
Excerpt from ESSB 2261

NEW SECTION. Sec. 203. A new section is added to chapter 28A.300 RCW to read as follows:

Purpose
(1) A K-12 data governance group shall be established within the office of the superintendent of
public instruction to assist in the design and implementation of a K-12 education data
improvement system for financial, student, and educator data. It is the intent that the
data system reporting specifically serve requirements for teachers, parents,
superintendents, school boards, the office of the superintendent of public instruction,
the legislature, and the public.

Membership
(2) The K-12 data governance group shall include representatives of the education data center,
the office of the superintendent of public instruction, the legislative evaluation and accountability
program committee, the professional educator standards board, the state board of education,
and school district staff, including information technology staff. Additional entities with expertise
in education data may be included in the K-12 data governance group.

Duties
(3) The K-12 data governance group shall:
(a) Identify the critical research and policy questions that need to be addressed by
the K-12 education data improvement system;

(b) Identify reports and other information that should be made available on the
internet in addition to the reports identified in subsection (5) of this section;

(c) Create a comprehensive needs requirement document detailing the specific
information and technical capacity needed by school districts and the state to meet the
legislature's expectations for a comprehensive K-12 education data improvement
system as described under section 202 of this act;

(d) Conduct a gap analysis of current and planned information compared to the
needs requirement document, including an analysis of the strengths and limitations of
an education data system and programs currently used by school districts and the state,
and specifically the gap analysis must look at the extent to which the existing data can
be transformed into canonical form and where existing software can be used to meet the
needs requirement document;

(e) Focus on financial and cost data necessary to support the new K-12 financial
models and funding formulas, including any necessary changes to school district
budgeting and accounting, and on assuring the capacity to link data across financial,
student, and educator systems; and

(f) Define the operating rules and governance structure for K-12 data collections,
ensuring that data systems are flexible and able to adapt to evolving needs for
information, within an objective and orderly data governance process for determining
when changes are needed and how to implement them. Strong consideration must be
made to the current practice and cost of migration to new requirements. The operating rules should delineate the coordination, delegation, and escalation authority for data collection issues, business rules, and performance goals for each K-12 data collection system, including:

(i) Defining and maintaining standards for privacy and confidentiality;
(ii) Setting data collection priorities;
(iii) Defining and updating a standard data dictionary;
(iv) Ensuring data compliance with the data dictionary;
(v) Ensuring data accuracy; and
(vi) Establishing minimum standards for school, student, financial, and teacher data systems. Data elements may be specified "to the extent feasible" or "to the extent available" to collect more and better data sets from districts with more flexible software. Nothing in RCW 43.41.400, this section, or section 202 of this act should be construed to require that a data dictionary or reporting should be hobbled to the lowest common set. The work of the K-12 data governance group must specify which data are desirable. Districts that can meet these requirements shall report the desirable data. Funding from the legislature must establish which subset data are absolutely required.

Updates and oversight (4)
(a) The K-12 data governance group shall provide updates on its work as requested by the education data center and the legislative evaluation and accountability program committee.

(b) The work of the K-12 data governance group shall be periodically reviewed and monitored by the educational data center and the legislative evaluation and accountability program committee.

Reports (5) To the extent data is available, the office of the superintendent of public instruction shall make the following minimum reports available on the internet. The reports must either be run on demand against current data, or, if a static report, must have been run against the most recent data:

(a) The percentage of data compliance and data accuracy by school district;

(b) The magnitude of spending per student, by student estimated by the following algorithm and reported as the detailed summation of the following components:
   (i) An approximate, prorated fraction of each teacher or human resource element that directly serves the student. Each human resource element must be listed or accessible through online tunneling in the report;
   (ii) An approximate, prorated fraction of classroom or building costs used by the student;
   (iii) An approximate, prorated fraction of transportation costs used by the student; and
   (iv) An approximate, prorated fraction of all other resources within the district. District-wide components should be disaggregated to the extent that it is sensible and economical;

(c) The cost of K-12 basic education, per student, by student, by school district, estimated by the algorithm in (b) of this subsection, and reported in the same manner as required in (b) of this subsection;
(d) The cost of K-12 special education services per student, by student receiving those services, by school district, estimated by the algorithm in (b) of this subsection, and reported in the same manner as required in (b) of this subsection;

(e) Improvement on the statewide assessments computed as both a percentage change and absolute change on a scale score metric by district, by school, and by teacher that can also be filtered by a student's length of full-time enrollment within the school district;

(f) Number of K-12 students per classroom teacher on a per teacher basis;

(g) Number of K-12 classroom teachers per student on a per student basis;

(h) Percentage of a classroom teacher per student on a per student basis; and

(i) The cost of K-12 education per student by school district sorted by federal, state, and local dollars.

**Reports**

(6) The superintendent of public instruction shall submit a preliminary report to the legislature by November 15, 2009, including the analyses by the K-12 data governance group under subsection (3) of this section and preliminary options for addressing identified gaps. A final report, including a proposed phase-in plan and preliminary cost estimates for implementation of a comprehensive data improvement system for financial, student, and educator data shall be submitted to the legislature by September 1, 2010.

**Technical requirements for submitting data**

(7) All reports and data referenced in this section, RCW 43.41.400, and section 202 of this act shall be made available in a manner consistent with the technical requirements of the legislative evaluation and accountability program committee and the education data center so that selected data can be provided to the legislature, governor, school districts, and the public.

**Data Accuracy/Disclosure**

(8) Reports shall contain data to the extent it is available. All reports must include documentation of which data are not available or are estimated. Reports must not be suppressed because of poor data accuracy or completeness. Reports may be accompanied with documentation to inform the reader of why some data are missing or inaccurate or estimated.
10 Essential Elements of a State Longitudinal Data System

Although each state’s education system is unique, 10 elements are essential in a longitudinal data system. See the 2008 DQC Survey Results to view state progress on implementing a comprehensive longitudinal data system.

1. Statewide Student Identifier

48 states have this element | View all state responses for element 1 (.pdf 38 KB)

A unique statewide student identifier that connects student data across key databases across years

A unique statewide student identifier is a single, non-duplicated number that is assigned to and remains with a student throughout his or her P-12 career. Assignment of a unique statewide student identifier to every student in the P-12 system provides a way to follow students as they move from grade to grade and across campuses and/or districts within the state.

A statewide student identifier can help policymakers and educators know, among other things:

- The academic value-added of a school or program.
- The achievement levels in early grades that indicate that a student is on track to succeed in subsequent grades.
- The test scores in early grades which should be thresholds for intervention.

2. Student-Level Enrollment Data

49 states have this element | View all state responses for element 2 (.pdf 29 KB)

Student-level enrollment, demographic and program participation information

Accurate information on student enrollment, demographics, and program participation (e.g., student participation in special education or the free and reduced price lunch program, the most common indicator of student poverty status) is essential to evaluate the effects of schools and programs, and to assess the impact of student mobility and continuous enrollment on learning.

With student-level enrollment, demographic and program participation information, policymakers and educators will know:

- The extent to which free and reduced price lunch enrollment drops off in high school and how that might affect measures of each high school's poverty rate.
- How the percentage of minority students in gifted and talented programs compares with that of white students.
- The rate at which English language learners are entering the state for the first time in high school and how are they doing on the state's high school exit exams.
3. Student-Level Test Data

48 states have this element | View all state responses for element 3 (.pdf 14 KB)

The ability to match individual students' test records from year to year to measure academic growth

A statewide database of individual student performance on state exams (and state-mandated local exams) should be maintained with the ability to disaggregate the results by individual item and objective, in order to provide good diagnostic information to teachers. Though most states do have annual test records for individual students, only some of these states have created the ability to match records for individual students across time and with other databases (e.g., enrollment, course completion, and graduation databases).

With the ability to match individual student test records across years to follow student progress, policymakers and educators will know (by grade and subject):

- The percent of last year's below proficient students who met the state's proficiency standard this year.
- Whether or not proficient and advanced students are achieving at least a year's growth every year.

4. Information on Untested Students

41 states have this element | View all state responses for element 4 (.pdf 17 KB)

Information on untested students and the reasons they were not tested

States need to go further than tracking students who do not take the test to find out why they are not tested and then match those records to separate enrollment and program participation databases. This makes it possible to identify patterns associated with specific student populations (e.g., special education students or English language learners) and ensure that all students are held to high expectations.

With information on untested students, policymakers and educators will know:

- Which students were not tested by grade and subject and why.
- Trends over time in the number and percentage of untested students from each student group (English language learners, special education students, different ethnic groups, etc.).
- Whether or not particular schools and districts have excessive absences on test day or questionable patterns of absences and exemptions across years (these measures can be used in a state's data audit system to ensure data quality).

5. Statewide Teacher Identifier with a Teacher-Student Match

21 states have this element | View all state responses for element 5 (.pdf 24 KB)

A teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students

Many states collect data on teacher education and certification, but matching teachers to students by classroom and subject is critical to understanding the connection between teacher training and qualifications and student academic growth. Collecting this data makes it possible to identify which students and which courses are being taught by teachers with different levels and types of preparation or
certification, and which forms of teacher training and certification have the greatest impact on students' academic growth in the classroom.

*With a teacher identifier and the ability to connect teacher and student data, policymakers and educators will know:*

- The teacher preparation programs that produce graduates whose students have the strongest academic growth.
- How the experience levels of the teachers in the district's high-poverty schools compare with those of teachers in the schools serving affluent students, and how these experience levels are related to the academic growth of the students in their classrooms.
- The relationship between the performance of the district's low-income students on the state algebra exam and teacher preparation in that subject.

### 6. Student-Level Course Completion (Transcript) Data

17 states have this element | [View all state responses for element 6](.pdf 25 KB)

**Student-level transcript information, including information on courses completed and grades earned**

Many states are encouraging students, particularly low-income and minority students, to take rigorous courses in high school so that they are better prepared for success in postsecondary education and the job market. In most states, however, course taking data is not collected at the state level, making it impossible to monitor the impact of these policies. To fill in the missing information, states should collect student-level transcript information from middle and high school, including courses taken and grade earned.

*With student-level transcript information, policymakers and educators will know:*

- The number and percent of students who are enrolling in and completing rigorous courses in high school, disaggregated by ethnicity and income status.
- The middle schools that are doing the best job of preparing students for rigorous courses in high school.
- Whether or not students in more rigorous courses in high school have been more successful in college or in the workplace.
- Whether or not there is evidence of grade inflation (e.g., students with the same test scores receive dramatically higher grades in the same course in certain schools or districts.)

### 7. Student-Level SAT, ACT, and Advanced Placement Exam Data

29 states have this element | [View all state responses for element 7](.pdf 23 KB)

**Student-level college readiness test scores**

To ensure that students make a successful transition from high school to postsecondary education, it is important for states to collect and report student performance data on college admissions, placement and readiness tests. Student performance on SAT, SAT II, ACT, Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) exams are important indicators of students' college readiness; states should collect and report this data on an annual basis.

*With student-level college readiness test scores, policymakers and educators will know:*
- How participation rates and scores on SAT, ACT, AP and IB exams change over time for low-income and minority students.
- The percent of students who meet the proficiency standard on the state 8th grade test who also take AP or IB courses in high school and pass the corresponding AP or IB exams.
- The percent of low-income students who met the proficiency standard on the state high school test who take the SAT and ACT exams and score at college readiness benchmark levels on those exams.

8. Student-Level Graduation and Dropout Data

50 states have this element | View all state responses for element 8 (.pdf 2 KB)

**Student-level graduation and dropout data**

A majority of states currently collect annual records on individual graduates and dropouts, but to calculate the graduation rates defined in the new National Governors Association compact, states need to be able to track individual students over time.

The calculation of accurate graduation rates also requires the ability to accurately account for what happens to students who leave public education. For example, states must be able to distinguish correctly between departing students who drop out or get a GED from students who transfer to another school.

*With good graduation and dropout data in place and the ability to match records to other databases, policymakers and educators will know:*

- When and why students leave the state's public education system.
- The percent of first-time 9th graders in a given year who graduate from high school within four, five, or six years.
- The schools and school systems that are doing the best job reducing the dropout rate.
- The characteristics of high school dropouts and whether or not there are early warning signs that schools can look for in elementary and middle school.

9. Ability to Match Student-Level P-12 and Higher Education Data

28 states have this element | View all state responses for element 9 (.pdf 3 KB)

**The ability to match student records between the P-12 and higher education systems**

As states and school systems work to align expectations in high school with the demands of postsecondary education, they need better data on student success when they leave the P-12 system and enter college. Most states today do not have data systems that enable this two-way communication.

*With the ability to match student records between P-12 and higher education systems, policymakers and educators would know:*

- The percentage of each district's high school graduates who enrolled in college within 15 months after graduation.
- The percentage of last year's graduates from each high school or school district who needed remediation in college and how these percentages varied by student income and ethnicity.
- The percentage of students who met the proficiency standard on the state high school test and still needed remediation in the same subject in college.
• How the students' ability to stay in and complete college is related to their high school courses, grades and test scores.

10. A State Data Audit System

45 states have this element | View all state responses for element 10 (.pdf 16 KB)

A state data audit system assessing data quality, validity and reliability

Invalid or unreliable reporting by some schools and districts is a problem in a number of states, and this problem is likely to continue in the absence of checks on the accuracy and quality of the data submitted by schools and districts. Without a well-designed and well-implemented state data audit system, the public cannot have confidence in the quality of the information coming out of the state's public education system.

With a robust data audit system in place, policymakers and educators will know:

• Whether or not the disaggregated student information used to rate schools for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) is valid.
• The districts that do the best job of reporting valid and reliable dropout data.
• Whether or not districts are reporting their numbers of untested students and reasons for not testing the students.
• The amount and type of data quality problems identified by districts and how those problems are being addressed.

Data Quality Campaign
Phone: 512.320.1816
Fax: 512.320.1877
Email: info@dataqualitycampaign.org