State Fiscal Stabilization Phase II

When submitting the Phase II application, please provide the indicator or descriptor the State has amended.

Indicator/Descriptor	Date Amended
MOE page	June 15, 2010
(a)(2)	May 3, 2010
(c)(7)	May 3, 2010
(d)(7)	July 7, 2010
(d)(8)	July 7, 2010
(d)(11)	May 3, 2010
(d)(12)	May 3, 2010
Descriptor (d)(1)	May 3, 2010
(d)(1)	July 7, 2010
(d)(2)	July 7, 2010
(d)(3)	May 3, 2010
(d)(4)	May 3, 2010
(d)(5)	May 3, 2010
(d)(6)	May 3, 2010
(d)(9)	July 7, 2010
(d)(10)	July 7, 2010
Descriptor (a)(1)	May 3, 2010
Descriptor (a)(2)	May 3, 2010
(a)(3)	May 3, 2010
(a)(4)	May 3, 2010
(a)(5)	May 3, 2010
(a)(6)	May 3, 2010
(a)(7)	May 3, 2010
(b)(1)	July 7, 2010
(b)(2)	June 15, 2010
(b)(3)	May 3, 2010
(c)(4)	May 3, 2010
(c)(6)	May 3, 2010
(c)(10)	May 3, 2010
(c)(11)	May 3, 2010
(c)(12)	May 3, 2010

COMPARE PHASE I AND PHASE II MOE FIGURES

Local Support of Elementary and Secondary Education	Phase I	Phase II UPDATED BY PA 10-179	Explanation Change from Phase I to Phase II
FY 2006	$ 1,619,662,393.00	$ 1,619,662,393.00	No change
FY 2009	$ 1,889,182,288.00	$ 1,889,182,288.00	No change
FY 2010	$ 1,619,662,393.00	$ 1,620,089,162.00	PA 09-03 added $426,769 to ecs formula for Stamford utilizing state funds
FY 2011	$ 1,619,662,393.00	$ 1,620,089,162.00	PA 09-03 added $426,769 to ecs formula for Stamford utilizing state funds

Higher Education			
FY 2006	$ 565,538,477.00	$ 565,538,477.00	No change
FY 2009	$ 665,651,849.00	$ 664,455,383.00	Phase I was an estimate; Phase II reflects actual expenditures
FY 2010	$ 698,847,703.00	$ 664,633,736.00	Phase I was an estimate; Phase II reflects budget act (PA 09-03)
FY 2011	$ 701,943,386.00	$ 665,268,813.00	Phase I was an estimate; Phase II reflects budget act (PA 10-179)

STATE FISCAL STABILIZATION FUND PHASE II APPLICATION

PART 1: APPLICATION COVER SHEET

(CFDA No. 84.394)

Legal Name of Applicant (Office of the Governor):	Applicant's Mailing Address:
M. Jodi Rell	Executive Chambers State Capitol Hartford, CT 06106

State Contact for the Education Stabilization Fund

Name: Mark McQuillan

Position and Office: Commissioner, Connecticut State Department of Education

Contact's Mailing Address: 165 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, CT 06106

Telephone: 860-713-6500

Fax: 860-713-7001

E-mail address: mark.mcquillan@ct.gov

To the best of my knowledge and belief, all of the information and data in this application are true and correct.

Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor (Printed Name):	Telephone:
M. Jodi Rell	860-566-4840
Signature of Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor: x M. Jodi Rell	Date: 7/13/2010

Recommended Statement of Support from the Chief State School Officer *(Optional)*:
The State educational agency will cooperate with the Governor in the implementation of the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund program.

Chief State School Officer (Printed Name):	Telephone:
Dr. Mark K. McQuillan	860-713-6500
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: x Mark McQuillan/gac	Date: 7/13/2010

Form Approved OMB Number: 1810-0695; Expiration Date: 05/31/2010

PART 2: MAINTENANCE-OF-EFFORT INFORMATION

In the SFSF Phase I Application, States were required to submit the following in order to receive the first portion of funds:

- A *Maintenance-of-Effort Assurance* (Part 4, Section A) of maintaining State support for elementary and secondary education and for public institutions of higher education (IHEs) at least at the level of such support in FY 2006 for FYs 2009, 2010, and 2011.
- A *Maintenance-of-Effort Waiver Assurance* (Part 4, Section B). In the event that a State anticipated being unable to comply with one or more of the Stabilization program MOE requirements referenced in the Maintenance-of-Effort Assurance, the State would provide an assurance that it met the eligibility criteria for a MOE waiver.[3]
- A *Maintenance-of-Effort Baseline Data* form.

In order to complete this Phase II Application, States must reaffirm and/or update the MOE baseline data referenced above as requested in Phase I. Part 2A of this application, *Update of Maintenance-of-Effort Data*, asks that a State reaffirm or update the baseline data provided in Phase I (Maintenance-of-Effort Baseline Data), including actual levels of support for FY 2009.

In Part 2B, a Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor must provide an attestation that the State has met the MOE requirements as was assured in Phase I. If a State cannot meet the MOE requirements, it must submit a Waiver of MOE Requirements or note that it has submitted one already.

Additional information on the MOE requirements can be found in Appendix D—*Instructions for Part 2, Maintenance-Of-Effort*.

[3] Guidance on the Maintenance of Effort Requirements for SFSF and MOE Waiver Form are available at http://www.ed.gov/policy/gen/leg/recovery/statutory/moe-guidance.pdf.

PART 2A: UPDATE OF MAINTENANCE-OF-EFFORT DATA

SPECIAL NOTES:

- In the SFSF Phase I Application, States were required to submit MOE data. The Department is requesting that States reaffirm these data for Phase II, and in particular, to update FY 2009 data to actual levels of State support.
- *For further information, see* Appendix D – Instructions for Part 2: Maintenance of Effort.

1. **Levels of State support for elementary and secondary education** *(the amounts may reflect the levels of State support on either an aggregate basis or a per-student basis):*

FY 2006	**$ 1,619,662,393**	FY 2006 ACTUAL EDUCATION COST SHARING (ECS) GRANT EXPENDITURE Source: http://www.osc.state.ct.us/2006annual/generalfund/scheduleb3.asp
FY 2009	**$ 1,889,182,288**	FY 2009 ACTUAL ECS EXPENDITURE adjusted by prior year reimbursement of $6.2 million in special education/other grant overpayments. Figure shown Source: http://www.osc.state.ct.us/2009annual/generalfund/scheduleb3.asp
FY 2010*	**$ 1,620,089,162**	FY 2010 and FY 2011 APPROPRIATIONS as adjusted by SFSF Funding of $269,519,895 in each year. Figures shown are net of SFSF. SOURCE: http://www.cga.ct.gov/2009/ACT/PA/2009PA-00003-R00HB-06802SS1-PA.htm
FY 2011*	**$ 1,620,089,162**	

(* Provide data to the extent that data are currently available.)

2. **Levels of State support for public institutions of higher education** *(enter amounts for each year)*:

FY 2006	**$ 565,538,477**
FY 2009	**$ 664,455,383**
FY 2010*	**$ 664,633,736**
FY 2011*	**$ 665,268,813**

See attachment 1

3. **Additional Submission Requirements**: In an attachment to the application – **(See Attachment 1)**

   (a) Identify and describe the data sources used in determining the levels of State support for elementary and secondary education; - and –

   (b) Identify and describe the data sources used in determining the levels of State support for public IHEs.

PART 2B: ATTESTATION OF MAINTENANCE-OF-EFFORT COMPLIANCE

The Governor or his/her authorized representative attests to the following:

To the best of his/her knowledge and based on the best available data, the State has met all maintenance-of-effort requirements for the State Fiscal Stabilization Program for FY 2009 (check all that apply):

☒ for elementary and secondary education.

☒ for public Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs).

Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor (Printed Name):	
M. Jodi Rell	
Signature: M. Jodi Rell	Date: 7/13/2010

<u>If a State has not met or cannot meet MOE for either elementary and secondary education or public IHEs, or both, it must complete the following:</u>

The State has not met all maintenance-of-effort requirements for the State Fiscal Stabilization Program for FY 2009 and

(check one):

☐ has already submitted a MOE Waiver Request to the US Department of Education.

☐ is submitting a MOE Waiver Request with this application package.

PART 3: DATA COLLECTION, PUBLIC REPORTING, AND PLANNING

Requirements

The State plan must describe the State's current ability to collect the data or other information needed for the assurance indicators and descriptors as well as the State's current ability to publicly report (as defined in the Notice of Final Requirements, included here as Appendix E) the data. If the State is currently able to fully collect and publicly report the required data or other information, the State must provide a URL where the most recent data or information may be accessed. If a State is not currently able to collect or publicly report the data or other information, the plan must describe the State's process and timeline for developing and implementing the means to do so as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 2011. These requirements apply to the assurance indicators and descriptors in the following education reform assurance areas: (a) Achieving Equity in Teacher Distribution, (c) Standards and Assessments (with the exception, in many cases, of Indicators (c)(11) and (c)(12)), and (d) Supporting Struggling Schools. Sections related to these assurances are located in sections I, III, and IV of Part 3A and Section I of Part 3B in the application.

In the event that a State will develop, but not implement, the ability to fully collect and publicly report the data for Indicator(s) (c)(11) and/or (c)(12), its plan need not meet the requirements of Section I of Part 3B. Rather, a State should complete a plan that meets the requirements of Section V of Part 3B for the relevant indicator(s). If a State will be able to both develop and implement collection and public reporting of either of these indicators, the plan requirements of Section I of Part 3B will apply to the relevant indicator(s).

Regarding education reform assurance area (b) Improving Collection and Use of Data, the State must describe in the State plan whether the State's data system includes the required elements of a statewide longitudinal data system and whether the State provides teachers with their students' growth data and information related to individual teacher impact. If the State does not meet the requirement, the State plan must describe the State's process and timeline for developing and implementing the means to meet the requirement in accordance with the requirements in the notice. Sections related to this assurance are Section II of Part 3A and Sections II, III, and IV of Part 3B.

The data or information needed for an assurance indicator or descriptor are in some cases already reported to the Department by the State, or are provided by the Department. In those cases, it is understood that the State does and is currently able to collect the data or information. For those elements, the State's plan only needs to address the State's ability to publicly report the data or information, and the State does not need to include a plan for collecting the data or information in Part 3B. The indicators and descriptors involving data or information currently reported to the Department or provided by the Department are marked below with a Confirm icon (see Icon Key below). Sections requiring States to confirm data or information already reported to the Department contain specific links to the appropriate Department webpage. The overall webpage housing all information for indicators requiring confirmation is http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/confirm-indicators.html.

Some elements in this application are of a cross-cutting nature, sharing indicators and/or definitions with another Recovery Act initiative, Race to the Top. These elements are marked by a Cross-Cutting icon with the recovery.gov logo and the Race to the Top logo (see Icon Key below). It is the Department's hope that marking these cross-cutting elements will facilitate consistency and improve the ease of completing the application for the Race to the Top program.

Icon Key

Confirm Icons

Cross-Cutting Icon

Numbering of Fields

Applicants may notice small numbers to the left of checkboxes and text fields in Part 3A. These numbers do not have any significance in terms of point values or codes. Rather, they are designed to be used by both applicants and Department staff alike as a convenient reference point when referring to a particular part of the application.

Overview of Part 3

Part 3A, *Indicators and Descriptors under the Assurances*, is designed to collect short answers about the State's current status with respect to each indicator and descriptor. If you are using the macro-enabled[4] MS Word version of this form, you will be able to check boxes and type your answers directly into the form. If you wish to attach narrative answers in a separate document, you may do so, but be sure to clearly note in the relevant text box that the response is attached and mark the attachment with the citation of the indicator or descriptor to which you are responding.

[4] To enable macros in Microsoft Word, select Save As (if you are using the 2007 version, Save As is under the round icon in the top left hand corner; in older versions, Save As is under the File menu) and from the Save File as Type menu, select Word Macro-Enabled Document.

Part 3B is the *State Plan* section. For those indicators and descriptors for which the State is not currently collecting and/or publicly reporting the requested data and information in such a way that addresses the program requirements, you must provide a plan for doing so in Part 3B. If, based on your answer, you are directed to address the element in Part 3B, write the element reference in the Plan Element Verification chart in Part 3B to keep a running list of the items you will need to address in your State Plan. Directions for which elements must be addressed in the State Plan are embedded into each indicator and descriptor boxes below. Part 3B contains five subsections. The subsections provide separate instructions for the plan elements that must be included for:

I. Assurances (a), (c) (with the exception of Indicators (c)(11) and (c)(12)), and (d);
II. Indicator (b)(1);
III. Indicator (b)(2);
IV. Indicator (b)(3); and,
V. If applicable, Indicators (c)(11) and (c)(12) (Section V).

PART 3A: ASSURANCE INDICATORS AND DESCRIPTORS

Instructions

For each indicator and descriptor, please follow the specific directions in the boxes below. There are two basic types of elements: indicators and descriptors.

- An **indicator** requests a discrete response (e.g., a yes/no answer or short answer) about whether a State is collecting or publicly reporting certain information, as well as where the information can be found. Indicators that involve data already submitted by States to the Department through preexisting collections will only need to be confirmed. The Department will ask States to confirm whether or not these data are accurate and to verify public reporting of them. States need not submit the actual data for each indicator; rather, the data should be reported directly to the public per the application instructions.
- A **descriptor** asks about information which could be provided in a narrative response (e.g., about the development of a type of assessment or teacher evaluation system) about the progress or development of system elements. The Department of Education also asks whether information requested in descriptors is publicly reported. As with the indicators, States do not have to submit the actual descriptor information to the Department. Rather, the State must publicly report the information per the application instructions.

State's ARRA Website Information

State's Main ARRA Website:
http://www.recovery.ct.gov/recovery/site/default.asp

Connecticut State Department of Education's (CSDE) ARRA Website:
http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322296

CSDE's ARRA SFSF Website:
http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314

I. Assurance (a): Achieving Equity in Teacher Distribution

A State must collect and publicly report data and other information on: (1) the extent that students in high- and low-poverty schools in the State have access to highly qualified teachers; (2) the extent that current strategies and efforts to address inequities in the distribution of inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers; (3) how teacher and principal performance is evaluated and how performance ratings are used; and (4) the distribution of performance evaluation ratings or levels among teachers and principals.

Indicator (a)(1)	**Confirm, for the State, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of core academic courses taught, in the highest-poverty and lowest-poverty schools, by teachers who are highly qualified consistent with section 9101(23) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (ESEA).**

Please respond (Yes or No): Are the data related to this indicator at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-a1.xls correct?

[1] ☒ Yes, the data are correct.

[2] ☐ No, the data are not correct.

If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct data and any supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:[3] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check only one):

[4] ☒ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are provided by the State to the public:[5] http://www.csde.state.ct.us/public/cedar/nclb/dist_school_nclb_results/index.htm

[6] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website but updates it *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Provide the State website where the most recently updated data are provided by the State to the public: [7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (a)(2)	Confirm whether the State's Teacher Equity Plan (as part of the State's Highly Qualified Teacher Plan) fully reflects the steps the State is currently taking to ensure that students from low-income families and minority students are not taught at higher rates than other students by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers (as required in section 1111(b)(8)(C) of the ESEA).

Please respond (Yes or No): Is the State's Teacher Equity Plan located at http://www.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/hqtplans/index.html correct?

[1]☒ Yes, the information is correct.

[2]☐ No, the information is not correct.

➔ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the State's most updated Teacher Equity Plan. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:[3] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check only one):

[4]☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *annually* on a website.

Provide the State website where the information is provided by the State to the public:[5]

[6]☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website but updates it *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 2B. Cite "Indicator (a)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:[7] Click here to enter text.

[8]☒ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating the information annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification chart in Part 4B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Descriptor (a)(1)	Describe, for each local educational agency (LEA) in the State, the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding teacher development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State collect a description of the system each LEA uses to evaluate the performance of teachers?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information are provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☒ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State collect a description of the manner in which each LEA uses the results of the evaluation systems described above related to the performance of teachers in decisions regarding teacher development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal?

[8] ☐ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[9] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[10] Click here to enter text.

[11] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information are provided by the State to the public:
[12] Click here to enter text.

[13] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[14] ☒ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (a)(3)	Indicate, for each LEA in the State, whether the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State request information on whether the system each LEA uses to evaluate the performance of teachers includes student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☒ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (a)(4)	Provide, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State collect, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage of teachers rated at each performance rating or level?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated data are provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☒ No, the State does not collect these data.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (a)(5)	Indicate, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, whether the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level are publicly reported for each school in the LEA.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State collect, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column. Provide the State website where the most recently updated data are provided by the State to the public: [5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☒ No, the State does not collect these data.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Descriptor (a)(2)	Describe, for each LEA in the State, the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding principal development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State collect a description of the system each LEA uses to evaluate the performance of principals?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates it *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☒ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State collect a description of the manner in which each LEA uses the results of the evaluation systems described above related to the performance of principals in decisions regarding principal development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal?

[8] ☐ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[9] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[10] Click here to enter text.

[11] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information are provided by the State to the public:
[12] Click here to enter text.

[13] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[14] ☒ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (a)(6)	Indicate, for each LEA in the State, whether the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect information on whether the system each LEA uses to evaluate the performance of principals includes student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates it *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates it *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☒ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (a)(7)	Provide, for each LEA in the State whose principals receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of principals rated at each performance rating or level.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect and publicly report, for each LEA in the State whose principals receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage of principals rated at each performance rating or level?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated data are provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☒ No, the State does not collect these data.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

II. Assurance (b): Improving Collection and Use of Data

A State must collect and publicly report information on the elements of its statewide longitudinal data system, on whether teachers receive data on student growth in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs, and on whether the State provides teachers with reports of individual teacher impact on student achievement.

Indicator (b)(1)	Indicate which of the 12 elements described in section 6401(e)(2)(D) of the America COMPETES Act are included in the State's statewide longitudinal data system.

Instructions: Please indicate which of the 12 elements of the America COMPETES Act are included in the State's statewide longitudinal data system.

Please respond (check Yes or No): For pre-K through postsecondary education, does the State's statewide longitudinal data system include the following elements:

(1) A unique statewide student identifier that does not permit a student to be individually identified by users of the system?

☐ Yes.
☒ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #1 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(2) Student-level enrollment, demographic, and program participation information?

☐ Yes.
☒ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #2 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(3) Student-level information about the points at which students exit, transfer in, transfer out, drop out, or complete pre-K through postsecondary education programs?

☐ Yes.
☒ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #3 in the Plan Element

Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

4) The capacity to communicate with higher education data systems?

☐ Yes.
☒ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #4 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(5) An audit system assessing data quality, validity, and reliability?

☒ Yes.
☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #5 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

Please respond (check Yes or No): For pre-K through grade 12 education, does the State's statewide longitudinal data system include the following elements:

(6) Yearly State assessment records of individual students?

☒ Yes.
☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #6 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(7) Information on students not tested, by grade and subject?

☒ Yes.
☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #7 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(8) A teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students?

☐ Yes.
☒ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #8 in the Plan Element

Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(9) Student-level transcript information, including on courses completed and grades earned?

☐ Yes.
☒ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #9 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(10) Student-level college readiness test scores?

☒ Yes.
☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #10 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

Please respond (check Yes or No): For postsecondary education, does the State's statewide longitudinal data system include the following elements:

(11) Information regarding the extent to which students transition successfully from secondary school to postsecondary education, including whether students enroll in remedial coursework?

☐ Yes.
☒ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #11 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(12) Other information determined necessary to address alignment and adequate preparation for success in postsecondary education?

☐ Yes.
☒ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #12 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

Indicator (b)(2)	Indicate whether the State provides student growth data on their current students and the students they taught in the previous year to, at a minimum, teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State provide student growth data on their current students and the students they taught the previous year to, at a minimum, teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects, in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs?

☐ Yes. You are not required to provide further information. In Part 3B, Section III, check "Not Applicable."

☒ No. Provide a plan for providing this information to teachers in Part 3B, Section III.

Indicator (b)(3)	Indicate whether the State provides teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects with reports of individual teacher impact on student achievement on those assessments.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State provide teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects with reports of individual teacher impact on student achievement on those assessments?

☐ Yes. You are not required to provide further information. In Part 3B, Section IV, check "Not Applicable."

☒ No. Provide a plan for providing this information to teachers in Part 3B, Section IV.

III. Assurance (c): Standards and Assessments

A State must collect and publicly report data and other information on whether students are provided high-quality State assessments; whether students with disabilities and limited English proficient students are included in State assessment systems; whether the State makes information available regarding student academic performance in the State compared to the academic performance of students in other States; and on the extent to which students graduate from high school in four years with a regular high school diploma and continue on to pursue a college education.

Indicator (c)(1)	**Confirm the approval status, as determined by the Department, of the State's assessment system under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA with respect to reading/language arts, mathematics, and science assessments.**

Please respond (check one): Is the status of the Department's approval, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c1.xls correct?

[1] ☒ Yes, the status is correct.

➔ [2] ☐ No, the status is not correct. If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct information and any other supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient: [3] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one):

[4] ☒ The State makes the status information *publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

Provide the State website where the status is provided by the State to the public:[5]
http://www.csde.state.ct.us/public/cedar/nclb/correspondence/index.htm

[6] ☐ The State makes the status information *publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ If checked, provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public: [7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the status information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(2)	Confirm whether the State has developed and implemented valid and reliable alternate assessments for students with disabilities that are approved by the Department.

Please respond (Yes or No): Is the information related to this indicator, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c1.xls, correct?

[1] ☒ Yes, the status is correct.

➔ [2] ☐ No, the status is not correct. If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct information and any other supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient: [3] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one):

[4] ☒ The State makes the status information *publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

Provide the State website where the status is provided by the State to the public:[5]
http://www.csde.state.ct.us/public/cedar/nclb/correspondence/index.htm

[6] ☐ The State makes the status information *publicly available* on a website and *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the status publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the status information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the status publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(3)	Confirm whether the State's alternate assessments for students with disabilities, if approved by the Department, are based on grade-level, modified, or alternate academic achievement standards.

Please respond (check one): Is the information related to this indicator, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c1.xls, correct?

[1] ☒ Yes, the information is correct.

[2] ☐ No, the information is not correct.

➔ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct information and any other supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient: [3] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one):

[4] ☒ The State makes the information *publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[5]
http://www.csde.state.ct.us/public/cedar/assessment/agl/index.htm

[6] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(4)	Indicate whether the State has completed, within the last two years, an analysis of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations it provides students with disabilities to ensure their meaningful participation in State assessments.

Please respond (check one): Has the State, within the last two years, completed an analysis of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations it provides students with disabilities to ensure their meaningful participation in State assessments?

[1]☒ Yes, this has been completed within the last two years.

[2]☐ No, this has been completed, but it occurred more than two years ago.

[3]☐ No, this has never been completed.

Please respond (check one):

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☒ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(5)	Confirm the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of students with disabilities who are included in State reading/language arts and mathematics assessments.

Please respond (check one): Can the State confirm that the number and percentage of students with disabilities who are included in State *reading/language arts* assessments, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c5r.xls , are correct?

[1] ☒ Yes, the data are correct.

[2] ☐ No, the data are not correct.

➔ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct data and any supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:
[3] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one):

[4] ☒ The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of students with disabilities on State assessments in *reading/language arts publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[5] http://solutions1.emetric.net/cmtpublic/Default.aspx;

http://solutions1.emetric.net/captpublic/Default.aspx

[6] ☐ The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of students with disabilities on State assessments in *reading/language arts publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the data relative to the inclusion of students with disabilities on State assessments in *reading/language arts publicly available* on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Please respond (check one): Can the State confirm that the number and percentage of students with disabilities who are included in State *mathematics* assessments, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c5m.xls , are correct?

[9]☒ Yes, the data are correct.

[10] ☐ No, the data are not correct.

➔ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct data and any supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:
[11] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one):

[12]☒ The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of students with disabilities on State assessments in *mathematics publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[13] http://solutions1.emetric.net/cmtpublic/Default.aspx;

http://solutions1.emetric.net/captpublic/Default.aspx

[14] ☐ The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of students with disabilities on State assessments in *mathematics publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[15] Click here to enter text.

[16]☐ The State does not make the data relative to the inclusion of students with disabilities on State assessments in *mathematics* publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(6)	Indicate whether the State has completed, within the last two years, an analysis of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations it provides limited English proficient students to ensure their meaningful participation in State assessments.

Please respond (check one): Has the State completed, within the last two years, an analysis of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations it provides limited English proficient students to ensure their meaningful participation in State assessments?

[1] ☐ Yes, this was completed within the last two years.

[2] ☐ No, this was completed more than two years ago.

[3] ☒ No, this has never been completed.

Please respond (check one):

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☒ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(7)	Confirm whether the State provides native language versions of State assessments for limited English proficient students that are approved by the Department.

Please respond (check one): Is the information related to this indicator, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c1.xls, correct?

[1] ☒ Yes, the information is correct.

[2] ☐ No, the information is not correct.

➔ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct information and any supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:
[3] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one): Is the State's current status available on the State's website?

[4] ☒ The State makes the information *publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[5]

Below is the link to the latest version, 2009-10, of the Assessment Guidelines. On page 12, the Guidelines state that we administer the CMT and CAPT exclusively in English.

http://www.csde.state.ct.us/public/cedar/assessment/agl/resources/AssessmentGuideline2009-10.pdf

[6] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(8)	Confirm the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of limited English proficient students who are included in State reading/language arts and mathematics assessments.

Please respond (check one): Can the State confirm that the number and percentage of limited English proficient students who are included in State *reading/language arts* assessments, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c8r.xls , are correct?

[1] ☒ Yes, the data are correct.

[2] ☐ No, the data are not correct.

➔ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct data and any supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:
[3] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one):

[4] ☒ The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of limited English proficient students on State assessments in *reading/language arts publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[5] http://solutions1.emetric.net/cmtpublic/Default.aspx; http://solutions1.emetric.net/captpublic/Default.aspx

[6] ☐ The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of limited English proficient students on State assessments in *reading/language arts publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(8)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the data relative to the inclusion of limited English proficient students on State assessments in *reading/language arts publicly available* on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(8)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Please respond (check one): Can the State confirm that the number and percentage of limited English proficient students who are included in State *mathematics* assessments, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c8m.xls , are correct?

[9]☒ Yes, the data are correct.

[10] ☐ No, the data are not correct.

➔ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct data and any supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:
[11] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one):

[12]☒ The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of limited English proficient students on State assessments in *mathematics publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[13] http://solutions1.emetric.net/cmtpublic/Default.aspx; http://solutions1.emetric.net/captpublic/Default.aspx

[14] ☐ The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of limited English proficient students on State assessments in *mathematics publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(8)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[15] Click here to enter text.

[16]☐ The State does not make the data relative to the inclusion of limited English proficient students on State assessments in *mathematics* publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(8)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(9)	Confirm that the State's annual State Report Card (under section 1111(h)(1) of the ESEA) contains the most recent available State reading and mathematics National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) results as required by 34 CFR 200.11(c).

Please respond (check one): Does the State Report Card include the most recent available State reading and math National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) results?

☒ Yes, the State Report Card includes this information.

☐ No, the State Report Card does not include this information.

➔ If checked, please provide a plan for including this information on the State Report Card in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(9)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I, and mark the Public Reporting column.

Please supply the following information:

Please attach the State Report Card or provide the URL where the State Report Card is provided to the public:
http://www.csde.state.ct.us/public/cedar/nclb/dist_school_nclb_results/index.htm

Indicator (c)(10)	Provide, for the State, for each LEA in the State, for each high school in the State and, at each of these levels, by student subgroup (consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA), the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of students who graduate from high school using a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate as required by 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i).

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect these data (as defined in Indicator (c)(10))?

[1] ☒ Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(10)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☒ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(10)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect these data.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(10)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Collection and Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(11)	Provide, for the State, for each LEA in the State, for each high school in the State and, at each of these levels, by student subgroup (consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA), of the students who graduate from high school consistent with 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i), the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) who enroll in an institution of higher education (IHE) (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA)) within 16 months of receiving a regular high school diploma.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect these data (as defined in Indicator (c)(11))?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Mark the Public Reporting column next to "Indicator (c)(11)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I.
➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Mark the Public Reporting column next to "Indicator (c)(11)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I.

[7] ☒ No, the State does not collect these data.

If No, please respond (check one):

☒ The State will develop and implement the means to collect and publicly report the data (i.e., the State will collect and publicly report the data) by September 30, 2011.

➔ Provide the State's plan for collecting, making the data publicly available, and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B, Section I. Mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns next to "Indicator (c)(11)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I.

☐ The State will develop but not implement the means to collect and publicly report the data (i.e., the State will not collect and publicly report the data) by September 30, 2011.

➔ Provide the State's plan for developing the means to collect and to publicly report the data (but not the State's implementation of those means) in Part 3B, Section V.

Indicator (c)(12)	**Provide, for the State, for each LEA in the State, for each high school in the State and, at each of these levels, by student subgroup (consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA), of the students who graduate from high school consistent with 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i) who enroll in a public IHE (as defined in section 101(a) of the HEA) in the State within 16 months of receiving a regular high school diploma, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) who complete at least one year's worth of college credit (applicable to a degree) within two years of enrollment in the IHE.**

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect these data (as defined in Indicator (c)(12))?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Mark the Public Reporting column next to "Indicator (c)(12)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I.
➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Mark the Public Reporting column next to "Indicator (c)(12)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I.

[7] ☒ No, the State does not collect these data.

If No, please respond (check one):

☒ The State will develop and implement the means to collect and publicly report the data (i.e., the State will collect and publicly report the data) by September 30, 2011.

➔ Provide the State's plan for collecting, making the data publicly available, and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B, Section I. Mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns next to "Indicator (c)(12)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I.

☐ The State will develop but not implement the means to collect and publicly report the data (i.e., the State will not collect and publicly report the data) by September 30, 2011.

➔ Provide the State's plan for developing the means to collect and to publicly report the data (but not the State's implementation of those means) in Part 3B, Section V.

IV. Assurance (d): Supporting Struggling Schools

A State must collect and publicly report data and other information on the progress of certain groups of schools in the State on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics; on the extent to which reforms to improve student academic achievement are implemented in the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State; and on the extent to which charter schools are operating in the State.

Indicator (d)(1)	**Provide, for the State, the average statewide school gain in the "all students" category and the average statewide school gain for each student subgroup (as under section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v) of the ESEA) on the State assessments in reading/language arts and for the State and for each LEA in the State, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that have made progress (as defined in this notice) on State assessments in reading/language arts in the last year.**

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect these data?

[1] ☒ Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated data are provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☒ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect these data.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(2)	**Provide, for the State, the average statewide school gain in the "all students" category and the average statewide school gain for each student subgroup (as under section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v) of the ESEA) on State assessments in mathematics and for the State and for each LEA in the State, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that have made progress on State assessments in mathematics in the last year.**

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect these data?

[1] ☒ Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated data are provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☒ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect these data.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Descriptor (d)(1)	Provide the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (consistent with the requirements for defining this term set forth in the Definitions section of the NFR) that the State uses to identify such schools.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State have a definition of "persistently lowest achieving schools" (consistent with the requirements for defining this term set forth in the Definitions section of the NFR) for the purposes of this indicator?

[1] ☒ Yes, the State has a definition of "persistently lowest achieving schools" for the purposes of this indicator.

Provide the definition here:[2]

The CSDE followed the sequence of steps outlined in the SIG guidance to identify Connecticut's persistently lowest-achieving schools:

Step 1: Determine all relevant definitions—*i.e.*, the definition of "secondary school," of determining "lack of progress" on the state's assessments.

Secondary schools in Connecticut are defined as high schools.

Three years was used as the definition of a "number of years" for purposes of determining whether a high school has a graduation rate less than 60 percent.

Three years was used as the definition of "number of years" for determining "lack of progress."

Step 2: Determine the number of schools that make up five percent of schools in each of the relevant sets of schools (*i.e.*, five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring and five percent of the secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds); determine whether that number or the number five should be used to determine the lowest-achieving schools in each relevant set of schools, depending on which number is larger.

The number of schools that make up five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring is 18 (100 percent = 353; 296 elementary and middle + 57 high schools).

The number of schools that make up five percent of secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds is two (100 percent= 37 secondary schools.); five as it is the larger number was used.

Step 3: Determine the method for calculating combined English/language arts and mathematics proficiency rates for each school.

A single percentage method was used for calculating a combined English/language arts and mathematics proficiency rate in the "all students"

group. The following steps were conducted:

A. Establish the numerator

a. Calculate the total number of proficient students in the "all students" group in reading/language arts by adding the number of proficient students in each grade tested in a school. Calculate the total number of proficient students in the "all students" group in mathematics by adding the number of proficient students in each grade tested in the school.
b. Add the total number of proficient students in reading/language arts and mathematics.

B. Establish the denominator

a. Calculate the total number of students in the "all students" group in the school who took the state's reading/language arts assessment and the total number of students in the "all students" group who took the state's mathematics assessment.
b. Add the total number of students in the "all students" group in the school who took the state's reading/language arts assessment and the total number of students in the "all students" group who took the state's mathematics assessment.

C. Divide the numerator by the denominator to determine the percent proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics in the school.

D. Rank the schools in each relevant set of schools from highest to lowest using the percentages in Step D.

Step 4: Determine the method for determining "lack of progress" by the "all students" group on the state's assessments.

Lack of progress was determined by repeating the single percentage method (see Step 3) for the three previous years for each school. Then, five percent of the schools with the lowest combined percent proficient, based on three previous years of data , were identified to define the persistently lowest-achieving schools in Connecticut.

Step 5: Determine the weights to be assigned to academic achievement of the "all students" group and lack of progress on the state's assessments.

Weights were not assigned to academic achievement in determining lack of progress.

Step 6: Determine the weights to be assigned to elementary schools and secondary schools.

Weights were not assigned to elementary schools and secondary schools.

Step 7: Using the process identified in Step 3, rank the Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring from highest to lowest based on the academic achievement of the "all students" group.

Step 8: Using the process identified in Step 4, as well as the relevant weights identified in steps 5 and 6, apply the second factor—lack of progress—to the list identified in Step 7.

Step 9: After applying lack of progress, start with the school at the bottom of the list and count up to the relevant number determined in Step 2 to obtain the list of the lowest-achieving five percent (or five) Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

Step 10: Identify the Title I high schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that have had a graduation rate of less than 60 percent over a number of years (as defined in Step 1) that were not captured in the list of schools identified in Step 9.

There were no Connecticut high schools that met these criteria.

Step 11: Add the high schools identified in Step 10 to the list of schools identified in Step 9.

Step 12: Using the process identified in Step 3, rank the secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds from highest to lowest based on the academic achievement of the "all students" group.

Step 13: Using the process identified in Step 4, as well as the relevant weights identified in steps 5 and 6, apply the second factor—lack of progress—to the list identified in Step 12.

Step 14: After applying lack of progress, start with the school at the bottom of the list and count up to the relevant number determined in Step 2 to obtain the list of the lowest-achieving five percent (or five) secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds.

Step 15: Identify the high schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds and that have had a graduation rate of less than 60 percent over a number of years (as defined in Step 1) that were not captured in the list of schools identified in Step 14.

There were no Connecticut high schools that met these criteria.

Step 16: Add the high schools identified in Step 15 to the list of schools identified in Step 14.

Because no high schools were identified in Step 15, this step was not applicable.

In addition, please note that the CSDE did not exclude any type of school.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[3] ☒ The State has made the definition *publicly available* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the definition is publicly available:[4]
http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322312, under State's Application Information

[5] ☐ The State does not make the definition publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the definition publicly available in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (d)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[6] ☐ No, the State does not have a definition of "persistently lowest achieving schools" for the purposes of this indicator.

➔ Provide the State's plan for developing a definition and making it publicly available on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (d)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(3)	Provide, for the State, the number and identity of the schools that are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, that are identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

[1] ☒ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☒ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322312, under State's Application Information (see Tier I of the List)

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(4)	Provide, for the State, of the persistently lowest-achieving schools that are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, the number and identity of those schools that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed (as defined in the NFR) in the last year.	

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

[1] ☒ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☒ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(5)	Provide, for the State, the number and identity of the schools that are secondary schools that are eligible for but do not receive, Title I funds, that are identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

[1] ☒ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☒ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322312, under State's Application Information (see Tier II of the List)

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(6)	Provide, for the State, of the persistently lowest-achieving schools that are secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, the number and identity of those schools that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed in the last year.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

[1] ☒ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☒ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(7)	Provide, for the State and, if applicable, for each LEA in the State, the number of charter schools that are currently permitted to operate under State law.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

[1] ☒ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☒ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] The choice booklet (link below) contains information for the public regarding the number of charter schools. http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/lib/sde/pdf/equity/choice/choicebooklet1011.pdf. Please note that there is no stipulation in Connecticut state law on the total number of charter schools "that are able to operate" as (d)(7) infers. Rather, Connecticut General Statutes Section 10-66bb provides that the State Board of Education may grant applications for charters. The Charter School Legislation is linked on CSDE's web site at http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/lib/sde/PDF/Equity/charter/charter_schools_statutes.pdf .

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(8)	**Confirm, for the State and for each LEA in the State that operates charter schools, the number of charter schools currently operating.**

Please respond (check one): Is the number of charter schools publicly reported as currently operating for the State and for each LEA at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-d8.xls correct?

[1] ☒ Yes, the data are correct.

[2] ☐ No, the data are not correct.

➔ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct data and any supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:
[3] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one):

[4] ☒ The State makes the data *publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[5]

http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/lib/sde/pdf/equity/choice/choicebooklet1011.pdf

➔ [6] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(8)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(8)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (d)(9)	Provide, for the State and for each LEA in the State that operates charter schools, the number and percentage of charter schools that have made progress on State assessments in reading/language arts in the last year.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

[1] ☒ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(9)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☒ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(9)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(9)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(10)	Provide, for the State and for each LEA in the State that operates charter schools, the number and percentage of charter schools that have made progress on State assessments in mathematics in the last year.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

[1] ☒ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(10)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☒ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(10)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(10)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(11)	Provide, for the State and for each LEA in the State that operates charter schools, the number and identity of charter schools that have closed (including schools that were not reauthorized to operate) within each of the last five years.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

[1] ☒ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☒ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3]
http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/lib/sde/pdf/equity/charter/report_on_the_operation_of_charter_schools.pdf. The 2008-09 Charter School Operating report, an annual report, was completed in December 2009 and considers charter school issues one year earlier, the 2008-09 school year. This is the most current report. Also, this serves to confirm that *Cross Cultural Academy of Arts and Technology* was the only charter school to close in the last five years. In the report under "Accountability", Page 3, last paragraph, school closures and timing of such closures are indicated.

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(11)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(11)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(11)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(12)	Indicate, for each charter school that has closed (including a school that was not reauthorized to operate) within each of the last five years, whether the closure of the school was for financial, enrollment, academic, or other reasons.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

[1] ☒ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3]

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(12)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☒ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(12)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(12)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

PART 3B: DATA COLLECTION & PUBLIC REPORTING PLAN

Requirement: The State must collect and publicly report the data or other information required by an assurance indicator or descriptor. If the State is not able to fully collect or publicly report, at least annually through September 30, 2011, the State plan must describe the State's process and timeline for developing and implementing, as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 2011, the means to fully collect and publicly report the data or information, including the milestones that the State establishes toward developing and implementing those means, the date by which the State expects to reach each milestone, and any obstacles that may prevent the State from developing and implementing those means by September 30, 2011, including but not limited to requirements and prohibitions of State law and policy. The plan must also include the nature and frequency of reports that the State will provide to the public regarding its progress in developing and implementing those means; the website where the State will make the plan and progress reports publicly available (as defined in the Notice of Final Requirements, Definitions, and Approval Criteria for the SFSF Phase II), the amount of funds the State is using or will use to develop and implement those means, and whether the funds are or will be Federal, State, or local funds.

I. ASSURANCES (a), (c), AND (d)

Important note regarding indicators (c)(11) and (c)(12):

If the State will develop and implement the means to collect and publicly report the data (i.e., the State will collect and publicly report the data) for either of these indicators by September 30, 2011, the plan requirements of this section apply to the indicator(s) for which this is the case.

If the State will develop but not implement the means to collect and publicly report the data (i.e., the State will not collect and publicly report the data) by September 30, 2011, for either of these indicators the requirements for this section do not apply to the indicator for which this is the case. Proceed to Section V.

State Plan Instructions: For each assurance indicator or descriptor under education reform areas ***(a), (c), and (d)*** for which the State is not able to fully collect or publicly report annually the required data or information (as indicated in Part 3A), please attach a plan that provides:

The process and timeline for developing and implementing, as soon as possible, but no later than September 30, 2011, the means to fully collect and/or publicly report (as required) the data or information, including:

- The milestones that the State establishes toward developing and implementing those means;
- The date by which the State expects to reach each milestone;

- Any obstacles that may prevent the State from developing and implementing those means by September 30, 2011, including but not limited to requirements and prohibitions of State law and policy;
- The nature and frequency of reports that the State will provide to the public regarding its progress in developing and implementing those means; and
- The amount of funds the State is using or will use to develop and implement those means, and whether the funds are or will be Federal, State, or local funds.

Furthermore, the plan must satisfy the following general requirements:

(A) Describe the agency or agencies in the State responsible for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, including the institutional infrastructure and describe the capacity of the agency or agencies as they relate to each of those tasks;

(B) Describe the agency or agencies, institutions, or organizations, if any, providing technical assistance or other support in the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, and describe the nature of such technical assistance or other support;

(C) Provide the overall budget for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan.

(D) Describe the way the State will publicly report the plan and the State's progress reports on its plan, including the nature and frequency of updated reports to the public on State actions taken under the plan and the website where the State will make the plan and progress reports publicly available (as defined in the Notice of Final Requirements, Definitions, and Approval Criteria for the SFSF Phase II).

Plan Element Verification: Please fill out the following chart to indicate which elements, per the instructions in Part 1, must be addressed in the State plan, and whether they must address collection, public reporting, or both. Do not list elements that do not need to be addressed in the State plan. Only list those for which the State has been directed to do so in completing Part 3A.

Element	Collection (check if applies)	Public Reporting (check if applies)
Descriptor (a)(1)	X	X
Indicator (a)(2)	X	X
Indicator (a)(3)	X	X
Indicator (a)(4)	X	X
Indicator (a)(5)	X	X
Descriptor (a)(2)	X	X
Indicator (a)(6)	X	X
Indicator (a)(7)	X	X

Element	Collection (check if applies)	Public Reporting (check if applies)
Indicator (c)(4)		X
Indicator (c)(6)		X
Indicator (c)(10)		X
Indicator (c)(11)	X	X
Indicator (c)(12)	X	X
Indicator (d)(1)		X
Indicator (d)(2)		X
Indicator (d)(4)		X
Indicator (d)(6)		X
Indicator (d)(9)		X
Indicator (d)(10)		X
Indicator (d)(12)		X

State Plans

Descriptor (a)(1)

The State has developed and will distribute an electronic survey to every district in the state that will report on the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers in the district and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding teacher development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal. Please see attachment 2 for a copy of this survey.

The results of this survey will be posted by the summer 2011 on the Connecticut State Department of Education's (CSDE) State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) Website at http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314. Thereafter, this survey will be redistributed and reported upon **annually** until a newly designed, consistent evaluation system is developed and implemented over the next 3 years.

The State expects to be able to meet the following timelines to develop and implement the above plan:

- Spring 2011 – obtain survey results from all districts regarding teacher evaluation systems.
- Summer 2011 – Post results of survey at CSDE's SFSF Website at http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314.
- Spring 2012-2013 – CSDE will redistribute this survey **annually** to all LEAs and report the outcomes on CSDE's SFSF Website.

There are no obstacles to completing this plan.

(A) and (B) The CSDE will be the single agency developing, executing, and overseeing implementation of the teacher evaluation system survey.

(C) Overall Budget projected for development of a new teacher evaluation system is:

Year 1	Development and distribution of survey to all LEAs; post results on CSDE's SFSF Website	$0
Year 2-4	Distribute survey, post results on CSDE's SFSF Website	$0
Total Costs		$0

(D) The Teacher and Principal Evaluation survey will be distributed **annually** and the results of this survey will be posted **annually** on the CSDE's SFSF Website at http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314. In addition, plan updates on this indicator will be provided **twice a year** and posted on the CSDE's SFSF website.

Indicator (a)(2)

The Teacher Equity Plan is already developed. We will update the Teacher Equity Plan annually and publicly report the plan on the CSDE's SFSF Website annually.

The State expects to be able to meet the following timelines to update and implement the above plan:

- July, 2010 – update and post plan at CSDE's SFSF Website at http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314.
- Thereafter, CSDE will update the plan **annually** and post the plan with updated data **annually** at CSDE's SFSF Website.

There are no obstacles to completing this plan.

(A) and (B) The CSDE will be the single agency developing, executing, and overseeing the development and posting of the Teacher Equity Plan.

(C) Overall Budget projected for updating and annual posting of the Teacher Equity Plan is:

Year 1	Post the Teacher Equity Plan on CSDE's SFSF Website	$0
Year 2-4	Update plan, post plan on CSDE's SFSF Website	$0
Total Costs		$0

(D) The state will publicly report on the progress of the state's Teacher Equity Plan **twice a year**, posting the plan and all plan updates to its ARRA SFSF Website http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314.

Indicator (a)(3)

The current 1999 Guidelines for Teacher Evaluation and Professional Development encourage districts to "show a clear link between teacher evaluation and professional development and improved student

learning." Student learning is defined to include teacher and administrator assessment of student work samples, performance measures (i.e. holistic scoring of writing) as well as teacher designed tests and standardized tests (i.e. CMT and CAPT). Therefore, some districts across the state have been using student growth as one indicator in their teacher evaluation plan, but not all districts.

State Plan

The State has developed and will distribute an electronic survey to every district in the state that will report on the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers in the district and whether the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion. Please see attachment 2 for a copy of this survey.

The results of this survey will be posted by the summer 2011 on the Connecticut State Department of Education's (CSDE) State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) Website at http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314. Thereafter, this survey will be redistributed and reported upon **annually** until a newly designed, consistent evaluation system is developed and implemented over the next 3 years.

The State expects to be able to meet the following timelines to develop and implement the above plan:

- Spring 2011 – obtain survey results from all districts regarding teacher evaluation systems.
- Summer 2011 – Post results of survey at CSDE's SFSF Website at http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314.
- Spring 2012-2013 – CSDE will redistribute this survey **annually** to all LEAs and report the outcomes on CSDE's SFSF Website.

There are no obstacles to completing this plan.

(A) and (B) The CSDE will be the single agency developing, executing, and overseeing implementation of the teacher evaluation system survey.

(C) Overall Budget projected for development of a new teacher evaluation system is:

Year 1	Development and distribution of survey to all LEAs; post results on CSDE's SFSF Website	$0
Year 2-4	Distribute survey, post results on CSDE's SFSF Website	$0
Total Costs		$0

(D) The Teacher and Principal Evaluation survey will be distributed **annually** and the results of this survey will be posted **annually** on the CSDE's SFSF Website at http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314. In addition, plan updates on this indicator will be provided **twice a year** and posted on the CSDE's SFSF website.

Indicator (a)(4)

Currently, Connecticut does not have one consistent state-wide teacher evaluation system or rating scale;

each district negotiates and establishes their own criteria for the evaluation of teachers which include levels of performance. However, there is no mandated consistency from one district to the next.

State Plan

The State has developed and will distribute an electronic survey to every district in the state that will report on the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers in the district and for each LEA whose teachers receive performance rating or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage of teachers rated at each performance rating or level. Please see attachment 2 for a copy of this survey.

The results of this survey will be posted by the summer 2011 on the Connecticut State Department of Education's (CSDE) State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) Website at http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314. Thereafter, this survey will be redistributed and reported upon **annually** until a newly designed, consistent evaluation system is developed and implemented over the next 3 years.

The State expects to be able to meet the following timelines to develop and implement the above plan:

- Spring 2011 – obtain survey results from all districts regarding teacher evaluation systems.
- Summer 2011 – Post results of survey at CSDE's SFSF Website at http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314.
- Spring 2012-2013 – CSDE will redistribute this survey **annually** to all LEAs and report the outcomes on CSDE's SFSF Website.

There are no obstacles to completing this plan.

(A) and (B) The CSDE will be the single agency developing, executing, and overseeing implementation of the teacher evaluation system survey.

(C) Overall Budget projected for development of a new teacher evaluation system is:

Year 1	Development and distribution of survey to all LEAs; post results on CSDE's SFSF Website	$0
Year 2-4	Distribute survey, post results on CSDE's SFSF Website	$0
Total Costs		$0

(D) The Teacher and Principal Evaluation survey will be distributed **annually** and the results of this survey will be posted **annually** on the CSDE's SFSF Website at http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314. In addition, plan updates on this indicator will be provided **twice a year** and posted on the CSDE's SFSF website.

Indicator (a)(5)

State Plan

The State has developed and will distribute an electronic survey to every district in the state that will report on the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers in the district and whether the number and percentage of teachers rated at each performance rating or level are publicly reported for each school in the LEA. Please see attachment 2 for a copy of this survey.

The results of this survey will be posted by the summer 2011 on the Connecticut State Department of Education's (CSDE) State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) Website at http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314. Thereafter, this survey will be redistributed and reported upon **annually** until a newly designed, consistent evaluation system is developed and implemented over the next 3 years.

The State expects to be able to meet the following timelines to develop and implement the above plan:

- Spring 2011 – obtain survey results from all districts regarding teacher evaluation systems.
- Summer 2011 – Post results of survey at CSDE's SFSF Website at http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314.
- Spring 2012-2013 – CSDE will redistribute this survey **annually** to all LEAs and report the outcomes on CSDE's SFSF Website.

There are no obstacles to completing this plan.

(A) and (B) The CSDE will be the single agency developing, executing, and overseeing implementation of the teacher evaluation system survey.

(C) Overall Budget projected for development of a new teacher evaluation system is:

Year 1	Development and distribution of survey to all LEAs; post results on CSDE's SFSF Website	$0
Year 2-4	Distribute survey, post results on CSDE's SFSF Website	$0
Total Costs		$0

(D) The Teacher and Principal Evaluation survey will be distributed **annually** and the results of this survey will be posted **annually** on the CSDE's SFSF Website at http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314. In addition, plan updates on this indicator will be provided **twice a year** and posted on the CSDE's SFSF website.

Descriptor (a)(2)

The State has developed and will distribute an electronic survey to every district in the state that will report on the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals in the district and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding principal development, compensation, promotion, retention,

and removal. Please see attachment 2 for a copy of this survey.

The results of this survey will be posted by the summer 2011 on the Connecticut State Department of Education's (CSDE) State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) Website at http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314. Thereafter, this survey will be redistributed and reported upon **annually** until a newly designed, consistent evaluation system is developed and implemented over the next 3 years.

The State expects to be able to meet the following timelines to develop and implement the above plan:

- Spring 2011 – obtain survey results from all districts regarding principal evaluation systems.
- Summer 2011 – Post results of survey at CSDE's SFSF Website at http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314.
- Spring 2012-2013 – CSDE will redistribute this survey **annually** to all LEAs and report the outcomes on CSDE's SFSF Website.

There are no obstacles to completing this plan.

(A) and (B) The CSDE will be the single agency developing, executing, and overseeing implementation of the principal evaluation system survey.

(C) Overall Budget projected for development of a new principal evaluation system is:

Year 1	Development and distribution of survey to all LEAs; post results on CSDE's SFSF Website	$0
Year 2-4	Distribute survey, post results on CSDE's SFSF Website	$0
Total Costs		$0

(D) The Teacher and Principal Evaluation survey will be distributed **annually** and the results of this survey will be posted **annually** on the CSDE's SFSF Website at http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314. In addition, plan updates on this indicator will be provided **twice a year** and posted on the CSDE's SFSF website.

Indicator (a)(6)

Currently, Connecticut does not have one consistent state-wide principal evaluation system or rating scale; each district negotiates and establishes their own criteria for evaluation of principals which include levels of performance.

State Plan

The State has developed and will distribute an electronic survey to every district in the state that will report on the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals in the district and whether the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion. Please see attachment 2 for a copy of this survey.

The results of this survey will be posted by the summer 2011 on the Connecticut State Department of

Education's (CSDE) State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) Website at http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314. Thereafter, this survey will be redistributed and reported upon **annually** until a newly designed, consistent evaluation system is developed and implemented over the next 3 years.

The State expects to be able to meet the following timelines to develop and implement the above plan:

- Spring 2011 – obtain survey results from all districts regarding principal evaluation systems.
- Summer 2011 – Post results of survey at CSDE's SFSF Website at http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314.
- Spring 2012-2013 – CSDE will redistribute this survey **annually** to all LEAs and report the outcomes on CSDE's SFSF Website.

There are no obstacles to completing this plan.

(A) and (B) The CSDE will be the single agency developing, executing, and overseeing implementation of the principal evaluation system survey.

(C) Overall Budget projected for development of a new principal evaluation system is:

Year 1	Development and distribution of survey to all LEAs; post results on CSDE's SFSF Website	$0
Year 2-4	Distribute survey, post results on CSDE's SFSF Website	$0
Total Costs		$0

(D) The Teacher and Principal Evaluation survey will be distributed **annually** and the results of this survey will be posted **annually** on the CSDE's SFSF Website at http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314. In addition, plan updates on this indicator will be provided **twice a year** and posted on the CSDE's SFSF website.

Indicator (a)(7)

Currently, Connecticut does not have one consistent state-wide principal evaluation system or rating scale; each district negotiates and establishes their own criteria for evaluation of principals which include levels of performance.

State Plan

The State has developed and will distribute an electronic survey to every district in the state that will report on the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals in the district and whose principals receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage of principals rated at each performance rating or level. Please see attachment 2 for a copy of this survey.

The results of this survey will be posted by the summer 2011 on the Connecticut State Department of Education's (CSDE) State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) Website at http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314. Thereafter, this survey will be

redistributed and reported upon **annually** until a newly designed, consistent evaluation system is developed and implemented over the next 3 years.

The State expects to be able to meet the following timelines to develop and implement the above plan:

- Spring 2011 – obtain survey results from all districts regarding principal evaluation systems.
- Summer 2011 – Post results of survey at CSDE's SFSF Website at http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314.
- Spring 2012-2013 – CSDE will redistribute this survey **annually** to all LEAs and report the outcomes on CSDE's SFSF Website.

There are no obstacles to completing this plan.

(A) and (B) The CSDE will be the single agency developing, executing, and overseeing implementation of the principal evaluation system survey.

(C) Overall Budget projected for development of a new principal evaluation system is:

Year 1	Development and distribution of survey to all LEAs; post results on CSDE's SFSF Website	$0
Year 2-4	Distribute survey, post results on CSDE's SFSF Website	$0
Total Costs		$0

(D) The Teacher and Principal Evaluation survey will be distributed **annually** and the results of this survey will be posted **annually** on the CSDE's SFSF Website at http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314. In addition, plan updates on this indicator will be provided **twice a year** and posted on the CSDE's SFSF website.

Indicator (c)(4)

Yes, this has been completed within the last two years. However, the State does not make this information publicly available on a Web site.

State Plan

In 2007, Connecticut applied for and was awarded an Enhanced Assessment Grant (EAG) to conduct an accommodations validity study for students with disabilities. Connecticut is the lead state for the project. Working with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and Kentucky, Michigan and Nevada, the states conducted five studies comparing accommodated and non-accommodated test administration for students with disabilities and a matched sample of their non-disabled peers. The report is currently being written.

The following **milestones** and **timelines** are planned:

- **June 2010:** Present the findings of the study at the CCSSO National Conference on Student Assessment.
- **September 2010:** Release the study and post the document on the CSDE and ARRA websites.

A. **CSDE is responsible** and CSDE staff members are working with CCSSO to complete the report.
B. No additional support is needed
C. The research was funded through the federal **Enhanced Assessment Grant** (EAG).
D. The state will report on the progress of this plan, linking all plan updates to its ARRA SFSF Website (http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314) **twice a year**.

Indicator (c)(6)

No, this has never been completed.

State Plan

Connecticut will replicate the EAG study described in (c)(4) to conduct a parallel accommodations validity study for English language learners and secure a vendor/researcher to do so.

The following **milestones** and **timelines** are planned:

- **July 2010:** Research plan is established and vendor is secured.
- **March 2011:** Study test administration is completed and data are collected.
- **June 2011 – September 2011:** Data are analyzed and report is produced.
- **September 2011:** Release the study and post the document on the CSDE website.

A. **CSDE is responsible** for the research project and will secure a vendor to conduct the study and use the expertise of its research and psychometric staff.
B. CSDE will seek an external researcher to conduct this research.
C. The Department will allocate **$100,000 in existing state funds** for the research.
D. The state will report the plan and all plan updates **twice a year** on its ARRA SFSF Website (http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314).

Indicator (c)(10)

Yes, the State collects these data. However, the State does make the data publicly available on a website.

Plan for making the data publicly available:

Connecticut is currently collecting the data necessary to calculate the four-year adjusted cohort rate, however, the data are not publicly available as of this writing. Connecticut originally agreed to the NGA Compact graduation rate with plans to release this rate with the graduating class of 2010. The recently released Title I guidelines also called for the addition of the four-year adjusted cohort rates, and as such the process started to ensure data were in place to calculate the graduation rate earlier than anticipated. Because this is a new formula for Connecticut's graduation rate, the plan is to release these data to the LEAs to show for their district and each high school, their graduation rate for the graduating class of 2009. The state-level data were made available to the public in a press release issued March 23, 2010. After LEAs have had the opportunity to review the data and raise questions, Connecticut plans to release the data publicly during the 2010-11 school year.

The following **milestones** and **timelines** are planned:

- **March 2010:** Connecticut releases statewide graduation rates based on the NGA Compact formula.
- **June 2010:** Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) disseminates

preliminary four year adjusted cohort graduation rates for the graduating class of 2009 to the LEAs for their review, and allows time for questions and data issues to be resolved.

- **August 2010:** CSDE finalizes the school and district 2009 graduation rates.
- **Fall 2010:** Four year adjusted cohort graduation rates are made available, in order to be in alignment with the NGA requirement.
- **Summer 2011:** The four year adjusted cohort rates are incorporated into the NCLB Report Cards, as required under revised Title I regulations, and posted.

A. **CSDE is responsible** for the calculating and publishing the graduation rates.
B. No external support is needed.
C. The department will need $0 in funding to complete this work.
D. The state will report the plan and all plan updates **annually** on its ARRA SFSF Website (http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314). The graduation rates will be updated **annually** on the CSDE's website, via the NCLB Report Cards and the Connecticut Education Data and Research (CEDaR) portal. In addition, plan updates on this indicator will be provided **twice a year** and posted on the CSDE's SFSF website.

Indicator (c)(11)

State Plan

As noted in Indicator b(1), Connecticut received an SLDS grant to enhance our data interoperability with the Department of Higher Education. Another component of this project is to work together and contract with the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC). The NSC project will provide data to the SLDS regarding postsecondary student enrollment, demographics, and program information.

The following **milestones** and **timelines** are planned:

- **June 2010:** Finalize NSC contract.
- **July 2010**: Send graduate cohort (classes 2003 through 2009) data to NSC, using the State Assigned Student Identifier (SASID) as the key, receive file from NSC.
- **August 2010:** Load NSC data into the SLDS, using the SASID to link the NSC file with the SLDS data.
- **August 2010: Develop plan for data analysis and dissemination.**
- **August-October 2010:** Analyze data.
- **November 2010:** Publicly disseminate results of analyses; specifically, of the students who graduated in June 2008, the number and percentage who enrolled in postsecondary education within 16 months of graduating, at the state, LEA, and school level. A retrospective analysis will also be conducted to report this same metric for earlier graduating classes.

These milestones will be repeated yearly thereafter.

A. The **CSDE and the DHE are the responsible agencies** for completing this work.
B. No additional technical assistance is needed.
C. Budget: $24,861 is the cost of an annual subscription to the NSC. Funds from the current SLDS grant will support this for three years.
D. The state will report on the progress of this plan **twice a year**, linking the plan and all plan updates to its ARRA SFSF Website (http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314).

Potential obstacles: Match rates between the PK-12 system and the NSC are less than desirable, therefore

negatively impacting the accuracy of the results.

Indicator (c)(12)

State Plan

As noted in Indicator b(1), Connecticut received an SLDS grant to enhance our data interoperability with the Department of Higher Education. Another component of this project is to work together and contract with the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC). The NSC project will provide data to the SLDS regarding postsecondary student enrollment, demographics, and program information.

The following **milestones** and **timelines** are planned:

- **June 2010:** Finalize NSC contract
- **July 2010**: Send graduate cohort (classes 2003 through 2009) data to NSC, using the State Assigned Student Identifier (SASID) as the key, receive file from NSC
- **August 2010:** Load NSC data into the SLDS, using the SASID to link the NSC file with the SLDS data
- **August 2010: Develop plan for data analysis and dissemination**
- **August-January 2011:** Analyze data
- **February 2011:** Publicly disseminate results of analyses; specifically, of the students who graduated, and who enrolled in postsecondary education within 16 months of graduating, the number and percentage who completed at least one year's worth of college credit within two years of enrollment at the IHE. The first graduating class for which Connecticut could potentially have two years' worth of postsecondary data from NSC is the class of 2008. A retrospective analysis will also be conducted to report this same metric for earlier graduating classes.

These milestones will be repeated yearly thereafter.

Potential obstacles: Match rates between the PK-12 system and the NSC are less than desirable, therefore negatively impacting the accuracy of the results.

A. The **CSDE and the DHE are the responsible agencies** for completing this work.
B. No additional technical assistance is needed.
C. Budget: $24,861 is the cost of an annual subscription to the NSC. Funds from the current SLDS grant will support this for three years.
D. The state will report on the progress of this plan **twice a year**, linking the plan and all plan updates to its ARRA SFSF Website (http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314).

Indicators (d)(1) and (d)(2)

Yes, the State collects these data. The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

State Plan

While Connecticut collects the data necessary to determine and report the number and percentage of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that have made progress, we do not report these data because this is a new requirement. However, the assessment data in mathematics and reading/language arts are publicly available, therefore enabling an interested party to make this

determination. To comply with this reporting requirement, Connecticut will ensure that this metric is reported publicly by September 2011 via CSDE's State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) portal on the Department's Web site.

The following milestones are planned:

- June 2011: State assessment results are received;
- July 2011: Assessment results analyzed to determine those schools that are identified as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and preliminary adequate yearly progress (AYP) results shared with LEAs;
- July 2011- August 2011: LEAs review AYP results and file appeals if needed; CSDE responds to appeals;
- Mid-August 2011: Final AYP results are released, including designation of in need of improvement, corrective action, and restructuring; and
- September 2011: The average statewide school gain in the "all students" category and the average statewide school gain for each student subgroup on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics; and the number and percentage of Title I schools in need of improvement, corrective action, and restructuring that have made progress on the State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics will be reported on the CSDE Web site via the SFSF portal.

E. The **CSDE and the DHE are the responsible agencies** for completing this work.
F. No additional technical assistance is needed.
G. No additional budget is needed.
H. The state will report on the progress of this plan **twice a year**, linking the plan and all plan updates to its ARRA SFSF Website (http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314).

Indicators (d)(4) and (d)(6)

Yes, the State collects this information. However, the State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

State Plan

The CSDE has begun planning for the use of the four intervention models noted in Race to the Top (turnaround model; restart model, school closure model, or transformational model) in addition to its Connecticut Accountability for Learning Initiative (CALI) with the use of the Section 1003 (g) of the ESEA School Improvement Grant. The goal is to increase the current requirements for districts participating in CALI to address the requirements for one of the four school intervention models for the lowest performing 5 percent of schools. Part of this process was to identify those schools that are persistently lowest achieving according to the definition described in Descriptor (d)(1).

The schools eligible fall into five large urban districts. The CSDE has completed a formal overview of the requirements of the grant and met with districts individually to identify the schools in the district what will be eligible.

Timelines and activities:

- Federal application approved: April 15, 2010.
- Released application to LEAs: April 15, 2010.
- LEA Applications due to CSDE: May 14, 2010.
- Review of applications by CSDE: May –June 2010.
- Award SIG grant to LEAs: no later than July 1, 2010.
- Planning for implementation spring/summer 2010.
- Public reporting of district applications and models chosen and approved will be available via CSDE's ARRA School Improvement Web site at http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322312 – summer 2010.
- Implementation – fall 2010.

See attachment two of this application for a list identifying Connecticut's persistently lowest-achieving schools.

Indicator (d)(9) and (d)(10)

Yes, the State collects this information. However, the State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

State Plan

While Connecticut collects the data necessary to determine and report the number and percentage of charter schools that have made progress, we do not report these data because this is a new requirement. However, the assessment data in mathematics and reading/language arts are publicly available, therefore enabling an interested party to make this determination. To comply with this reporting requirement, Connecticut will ensure that this metric is reported publicly by September 2011 via CSDE's SFSF portal on the Department's Web site.

The following milestones are planned:

- June 2011: State assessment results are received;
- June 2011-July 2011: Assessment results are reviewed for accuracy;
- July 2011- August 2011: Assessment results are made publicly available;
- Mid-August 2011: Assessment results are analyzed; and
- September 2011: Number and percentage of charter schools that have made progress on the State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics are reported on the CSDE Web site via the SFSF portal.

A. The **CSDE and the DHE are the responsible agencies** for completing this work.
B. No additional technical assistance is needed.
C. No additional budget is needed.
D. The state will report on the progress of this plan **twice a year**, linking the plan and all plan updates to its ARRA SFSF Website (http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314).

Indicator (d)(12)

State Plan

To ensure the reasons for charter school closures are documented on the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) website on an annual basis, the following milestones and timelines are planned:

- The 2009-10 Charter School Operating Report (CSOR) will attest to the reasons for any charter school closure including reasons for such closures.
- The next CSOR will be issued no later than December 2010.
- There are no obstacles to implement this reporting requirement.
- The CSOR will be uploaded on an annual basis pursuant to the provision of state law to produce such a report.
- No state funds are required to implement the provision for uploading the CSOR.

Regarding the General Requirements, responses follow:

A. The CSDE is the responsible agency for developing, executing and maintaining oversight of the CSOR.
B. Technical assistance is not required to comply with this provision.
C. Budgetary considerations are not required to comply with this provision.
D. The State will publicly report the CSOR on a **twice a year** basis on the CSDE website: http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2681&q=320438.

II. INDICATOR (b)(1)

Plan Instructions

If (as indicated in Part 3A) the State does not have a statewide longitudinal data system that fully includes all 12 elements of the America COMPETES Act, as addressed in indicator **(b)(1),** please attach a plan that provides the process and timeline for developing and implementing, as soon as possible, but no later than September 30, 2011, a statewide longitudinal data system that includes all 12 elements of the America COMPETES Act, including the following information:

- The milestones that the State establishes toward developing and implementing those means;
- The date by which the State expects to reach each milestone;
- Any obstacles that may prevent the State from developing and implementing those means by September 30, 2011, including but not limited to requirements and prohibitions of State law and policy;
- The nature and frequency of reports that the State will provide to the public regarding its progress in developing and implementing those means; and
- The amount of funds the State is using or will use to develop and implement those means, and whether the funds are or will be Federal, State, or local funds.

Furthermore, the plan must satisfy the following general requirements:

(A) Describe the agency or agencies in the State responsible for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, including the institutional infrastructure and describe the capacity of the agency or agencies as they relate to each of those tasks;

(B) Describe the agency or agencies, institutions, or organizations, if any, providing technical assistance or other support in the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, and describe the nature of such technical assistance or other support;

(C) Provide the overall budget for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan; and

(D) Describe the way the State will publicly report the plan and the State's progress reports on its plan, including the nature and frequency of updated reports to the public on State actions taken under the plan and the website where the State will make the plan and progress reports publicly available (as defined in the Notice of Final Requirements, Definitions, and Approval Criteria for the SFSF Phase II).

Plan Element Verification: Please mark which elements, per the instructions in Part 1, must be addressed in your state plan:

COMPETES Element	Must be addressed in plan	Does not need to be addressed in plan
1	X	
2	X	
3	X	
4	X	
5		X
6		X
7		X
8	X	
9	X	
10		X
11	X	
12	X	

State Plan for INDICATOR (b)(1)

Element (1) A unique statewide identifier that does not permit a student to individually identified by users of the system

Response:

Yes, for P-12. Under Connecticut General Statute (CGS) 10-10a, the CSDE is required to assign public, prekindergarten through Grade 12 students a state-assigned student identification number (SASID). In 2002, Connecticut implemented the Public School Information System (PSIS) and, beginning in 2005, assigned every public school student in the state a SASID. Annually, each new student entering the state's public school system is assigned a SASID. In addition, in 2007, the statute expanded to include all preschool students who were in nonpublic school programs who received state and/or federal funds. The CSDE developed and implemented the prekindergarten information system (PKIS), which is used to collect information about 3- and 4-year-old children enrolled in nonpublic preschool programs, such as the Department of Social Services early childhood programs, Head Start and Even Start.

To date, the SASID is not carried into postsecondary educational institutions, however a plan is in place for this to be implemented by September 2011.

Plan for Element 1:

In August 2009, Connecticut was awarded a second Institute of Education Sciences (IES) State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) grant. A component of this grant work established an Interoperability System Council (ISC) to bring together constituents from the State Department of Education (SDE), the Department of Higher Education (DHE), and the Department of Labor (DOL). The overarching goal of the ISC is to establish procedures and methods for connecting the various data systems. One of the first tasks is to have the SASID incorporated into the various DHE constituents' data systems.

The following **milestones** and **timelines** are planned:

- **Summer 2010:** CSDE mandates that the SASID is included on all high school transcripts.
- **November 2010:** Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) create the data field in their respective data systems in order to prepare to receive the SASID.
- **February – March 2011:** IHEs devise system of entry of the SASID, and train personnel on the entry of the new field.
- **July 2011:** IHEs begin entering the SASIDs into their data system, using the high school transcript as the source.

A. The **CSDE and the DHE are the responsible agencies** for completing this work.
B. No additional technical assistance is needed.
C. No additional dollars are needed to implement this plan.

The state will report on the progress of this plan **twice a year**, linking the plan and all plan updates to its ARRA SFSF Website (http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314).

Element (2) Student-level enrollment, demographic, and program participation information

Response:

The PSIS, as described in Element 1, collects prekindergarten through Grade 12 enrollment data for students attending Connecticut public schools, demographic information (gender, race/ethnicity,

free/reduced-price lunch status, special education status, English language learner status, date of birth), and program information for students enrolled in the state's public schools and publicly-funded school programs. The SASID is included in every state data file collected at the individual student level (assessment, discipline, special education, etc.). The PKIS contains the same demographic information as the PSIS.

As noted in Element 1, Connecticut received an SLDS grant to enhance our data interoperability with the Department of Higher Education. Another component of this project is to work together and contract with the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC). The NSC project will provide data to the SLDS regarding postsecondary student enrollment, demographics, and program information.

Plan for Element 2:

The following **milestones** and **timelines** are planned:

- **June 2010:** Finalize NSC contract.
- **July 2010**: Send graduate cohort (classes 2003 through 2009) data to NSC, receive file from NSC.
- **August 2010:** Load NSC data into the SLDS.
- **August 2010: Develop plan for data analysis and dissemination.**
- **August-October 2010:** Analyze data.
- **November 2010:** Publicly disseminate results of analyses.

These milestones will be repeated yearly thereafter.

A. The **CSDE and the DHE are the responsible agencies** for completing this work.
B. No additional technical assistance is needed.
C. Budget: $24,861 is the cost of an annual subscription to the NSC. Funds from the current SLDS grant will support this for three years.
D. The state will report on the progress of this plan **twice a year**, linking the plan and all plan updates to its ARRA SFSF Website (http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314).

Element (3) Student-level information about the points at which students exit, transfer in, transfer out, drop out, or complete PK through postsecondary programs?

Response:

The PSIS has a register/unregister module that is real time. When a student leaves a school and/or district, the district must unregister that student and specify a reason for leaving. Districts must register new entrants into the PSIS when they arrive. This allows the State to track student transfer patterns within and across district. The register/unregister module also tracks dropouts, graduates, and students who transfer to private school or into adult education programs.

The system does not contain postsecondary education information. As already note, the CSDE received a second IES grant in August 2009 to support the development of a data interoperability framework, which will permit the sharing of data between the CSDE, the state's Department of Higher Education (DHE). The ISC, described in Element 2, has determined that the NSC will be the best source for this type of postsecondary data. As such, the same plan for Element 2 applies for Element 3.

Plan for Element 3:

The following **milestones** and **timelines** are planned:

- **June 2010:** Finalize NSC contract.
- **July 2010**: Send graduate cohort (classes 2003 through 2009) data to NSC, receive file from NSC.
- **August 2010:** Load NSC data into the SLDS.
- **August 2010: Develop plan for data analysis and dissemination.**
- **August-October 2010:** Analyze data.
- **November 2010:** Publicly disseminate results of analyses.

These milestones will be repeated yearly thereafter.

A. The **CSDE and the DHE are the responsible agencies** for completing this work.
B. No additional technical assistance is needed.
C. Budget: $24,861 is the cost of an annual subscription to the NSC. Funds from the current SLDS grant will support this for three years.
D. The state will report on the progress of this plan **twice a year**, linking the plan and all plan updates to its ARRA SFSF Website (http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314).

Element (4) Capacity to communicate with higher education data systems?

Response:

Working through the ISC, Connecticut has plans (see Element 1) to require that the SASID be a component of every high school student's transcript, which are sent to the state's colleges and universities. In turn, the state colleges and universities will be required to incorporate the SASID as a field in their student information system. This will permit higher education institutions to link back to students' high schools and allow them to link across institutions of higher education within the state. With the SASID as the key, Connecticut will be able to share data between the P-12 data system and the higher education data systems. The plan for Element 4, is virtually the same as Element 1:

Plan for Element 4:

The following **milestones** and **timelines** are planned:

- **Summer 2010:** CSDE mandates that the SASID is included on all high school transcripts.
- **November 2010:** Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) create the data field in their respective data systems in order to prepare to receive the SASID.
- **February – March 2011:** IHEs devise system of entry of the SASID, and train personnel on the entry of the new field.
- **July 2011:** IHEs begin entering the SASIDs into their data system, using the high school transcript as the source.

A. The **CSDE and the DHE are the responsible agencies** for completing this work.
B. No additional technical assistance is needed.
C. No additional dollars are needed to implement this plan.
D. The state will report on the progress of this plan **twice a year**, linking the plan and all plan updates to its ARRA SFSF Website (http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314).

Element (8) A teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students
Element (9) Student-level transcript information including courses completed and grades earned

Response:

Connecticut sees the work for elements 8 and 9 to be closely interrelated, and therefore its plan for implementing elements 8 and 9 need to be combined.

In 2008-09, the State upgraded its educator certification system and, in addition to collecting the Social Security number of each certification applicant, also assigned a unique educator identification number (EIN), The EIN will be included in the CSDE's upgraded, annual certified-staff data file of the professional staff members who work in the state's public schools and programs beginning in late 2010. Every teacher working in schools in Connecticut had a unique identifier beyond the social security number.

The next step is to link the teacher identifier with the student identifier (the SASID). One of the objectives of the IES SLDS grant awarded in August 2009 is to pilot the matching of teachers to students, *and in addition, link students to the courses in which they are enrolled*. This grant and pilot project are spread out over three years. To speed up the timeline, and expand this to all districts outside of the pilot, the following milestones and timelines are planned:

- **August 2010:** LEAs ingest the EIN into their local data system.
- **August 2010:** Business requirements document and functional specifications documents are created.
- **August-November 2010:** Districts conduct the crosswalk to match their course identification numbers with the NCES course codes. Using NCES course codes will ensure consistency across districts.
- **September 2010-December 2010:** Development of system to collect student-teacher-transcript (schedule) data from every district in Connecticut.
- **January 2011:** Pilot the collection system; teachers matched with students and their courses.
- **February-April 2011:** Training and roll-out.

A. The **CSDE is the responsible agency** for completing this work.
B. The CSDE will need the technical assistance of the Department of Information Technology (DOIT) to ensure the data security infrastructure is in place, and that districts can access the SDE portal that exists in the DOIT environment.
C. Budget.

	Budget	Source
FY 2011	$928,000	Federal IES Grant, Awarded August 2009
	$1,000,000	State Allocation
FY 2012	$3,000,000	State Allocation

D. The state will report on the progress of this plan **twice a year**, linking the plan and all plan updates to its ARRA SFSF Website (http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314).

Potential Obstacles for Elements 8 and 9

- To meet the September 2011 timeframe, the most serious potential obstacles are the lack of fiscal resources, and the lack of human resources. The budget need is articulated above. In addition to the budget need, the Department will also need 7 additional staff members (programmers, business analysts, data analysts) in order to ensure the project is complete. This staff need is immediate. In lieu of staff, the Department would need additional dollars to contract out the services needed.

$1.5 million was appropriated for FY2011 to provide fiscal and human resources relief. These funds will be used to hire durational staff and to extend the contract with the current longitudinal data system vendor.

- NCES course codes are not yet final for the elementary and middle grades. These course codes are necessary for the collection of these data from the school districts. A further delay in the release of these codes will further delay the implementation of elements 8 and 9.

Should the course codes for elementary and middle grades be significantly delayed, the CSDE will move forward with collecting non-standardized course enrollments and grades.

- Connecticut's procurement requirements may delay the commencement of the project, should it be deemed necessary to submit a RFP.

The CSDE is moving forward with the steps required to extend the contract with its current vendor; should this be approved then procurement should not be an issue.

- The Department must comply with the requirements of the Department of Information Technology. All new data projects must go through their System Development Methodology (SDM) process. Complying with the requirements, meeting dates and timelines has the potential to slow progress down.

The CSDE is going to work closely with the Department of Information Technology to stress the critical nature of this project, and therefore ensure that CSDE timelines are met.

- LEA capacity. A project of this scope will require school districts to modify their own student information systems in order to compile the data, and create files according to the specifications. If LEAs do not have the resources to have the data available by September 2011, then the project will be delayed.

The CSDE is committed to providing a significant amount of technical support to the LEAs. If needed, the CSDE will be flexible in how it collects the data for this one year until the LEAs can modify their student information systems.

Element (11) Information regarding the extent to which students transition successfully from secondary school to postsecondary education, including whether students enroll in remedial coursework

Response:

As noted throughout this indicator, as part of Connecticut's SLD grant, an Interoperability System Council (ISC) was formed. The ISC has begun embarking upon a project to analyze remediation rates of CT high school graduates. The results of this project will inform SDE and DHE about types of remediation data that are helpful to informing the system, and will be replicated yearly. This work, in conjunction with the NSC subscription, will allow for data about student transition to postsecondary

education and data regarding remedial coursework to be part of the SLDS.
The following **milestones** and **timelines** are planned:

- **June 2010:** Finalize NSC contract.
- **July 2010**: Send graduate cohort (classes 2003 through 2009) data to NSC, receive file from NSC; send request to postsecondary constituents for remediation/developmental data.
- **August 2010:** Load NSC data and remediation data into the SLDS, using the State Assigned Student Identifier as the key.
- **August 2010:** Develop plan for data analysis and dissemination.
- **August-October 2010:** Analyze data.
- **November 2010:** Publicly disseminate results of analyses.

These milestones will be repeated yearly thereafter.

A. The **CSDE and the DHE are the responsible agencies** for completing this work.
B. No additional technical assistance is needed.
C. Budget: $24,861 is the cost of an annual subscription to the NSC. Funds from the current SLDS grant will support this for three years. The state will report on the progress of this plan **twice a year**, linking the plan and all plan updates to its ARRA SFSF Website (http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314).

Element (12) Other information determined necessary to address alignment and adequate preparation for success in postsecondary education?

Response:
Constituents at both the SDE and DHE consider the data elements that are currently stored, and planned to be included in the following year, sufficient to address alignment and preparation for success in postsecondary education. For example, the system will contain scores from the grade 10 state standardized assessment, the Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT), the SAT, and Advanced Placement scores. When course enrollment and achievement is incorporated, these data elements can be analyzed together with the postsecondary remediation data to develop a profile of a student who is "ready" (based on no need for remediation). Connecticut plans to start on this type of analyses prior to September 2011, using only CAPT data.

A plan is proposed to develop a mathematics and English language arts standard for 'on-track to college and career readiness' based on the Grade 10 CAPT. In order to have a statewide on-track to college and career ready standard for all graduates of its public schools, not just those who take the SAT or AP assessments, Connecticut will execute the following plan to establish college and career standards for the CAPT, which is administered to all Grade 10 students in the state's public high schools and Grade 11 and 12 students who elect to retest in subsequent years:

1. Using National Student Clearinghouse data that it collected on 2009 first-year college students entering Connecticut's Community College System (CCCS) or Connecticut State University System (CSUS) and the CAPT mathematics and reading/writing scale scores they earned on the 2007 administration of the CAPT, an independent researcher will correlate CAPT scale score with the probability that students took a remedial course during their first semester in college. The researcher will create a report with recommendations for CAPT 'cut scores' that differentiate students who did not need remediation from those who did, and present the findings to the Interoperability Council for review. These cut scores would provide an early warning system to high schools about their students who need intervention in mathematics and language arts, prior to graduation, in order to be college- and career-ready.
2. The Interoperability Council will review the report and make recommendations to CCCS and

CSUS to admit students who score above the cut score on the CAPT to enter credit-bearing general education mathematics and English language arts during their first year in college without taking a placement test.

3. Student transcripts will indicate that the student has met Connecticut's 'college- and career-ready CAPT standard for mathematics and/or English language.'

III. INDICATOR (b)(2)

Instructions: If (as indicated in **Part 3A, Indicator (b)(2)**) the State does not provide student growth data on their current students and the students they taught in the previous year to, at a minimum, teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects, in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs, please attach a plan that provides:

The process and timeline for developing and implementing the means to provide teachers with such data by September 30, 2011, including:

- The milestones that the State establishes toward developing and implementing those means and the date by which the State expects to reach each milestone;
- Any obstacles that may prevent the State from developing and implementing those means by September 30, 2011 (including but not limited to requirements and prohibitions of State law and policy);
- The nature and frequency of reports that the State will provide to the public regarding its progress in developing and implementing those means; and
- The amount of funds the State is using or will use to develop and implement those means, and whether the funds are or will be Federal, State, or local funds.

Furthermore, the plan must satisfy the following general requirements:

(A) Identify the agency or agencies in the State responsible for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, including the institutional infrastructure and describe the capacity of the agency or agencies as they relate to each of those tasks;

(B) Identify the agency or agencies, institutions, or organizations, if any, providing technical assistance or other support in the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, and describe the nature of such technical assistance or other support;

(C) Provide the overall budget for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan; and

(D) Describe the way the State will publicly report the plan and the State's progress reports on its plan, including the nature and frequency of updated reports to the public on State actions taken under the plan and the website where the State will make the plan and progress reports publicly available (as defined in the Notice of Final Requirements, Definitions, and Approval Criteria for the SFSF Phase II).

State Plan for Indicator (b)(2)

Connecticut has the infrastructure in place for providing teachers with access to growth data for the students they taught during the previous year and their new cohort of students at the beginning of a school year. Plans for implementation with the School Improvement Grant (SIG) grant schools (lowest 5 percent) will be initiated in fall 2010.

Connecticut administers its accountability assessments in March of each school year and releases

electronic results to districts in early July. The Department provides the public access to student performance data on its CTReports public website (http://www.ctreports.com/) aggregated at the state, district and school levels, by grade and subject area over time. There are status measures (performance levels such as Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, Goal and Advanced) and vertical scale scores to measure growth across grades and years, beginning in 2006. Growth is calculated as the increase in Vertical Scale score between Year 1 and Year 2, and individual student growth can be compared with the district and state averages for the same years and consecutive grades. Data are also disaggregated within content areas by instructional strands. These data can also be disaggregated by gender, race/ethnicity, eligibility for free/reduced-price lunch, special education status and English language learner status.

While the state does not deliver student test results to individual teachers, the data structures are in place so that districts teachers within districts can access the district data files available on the secure CTReports.com website via ID/password. This allows principals and teachers to download data on the performance level and growth of the students they taught during the previous school year or are teaching during a given school year and use analytic tools to examine individual student-level data and disaggregate by teacher, team, grade and school. These analytic tools are available for district staff to use to examine the performance of their students to improve instruction and curricular programs. These data can be downloaded and merged with district-level data such as benchmark and formative assessments or curricular interventions. Assessment staff members conduct workshops on using the testing data during the school year and provide resources for teachers and parents. See the three links below.
http://www.csde.state.ct.us/public/cedar/assessment/cmt/resources/misc_cmt/2009%20Final%20Data%20Analysis%20Guide.pdf
http://www.csde.state.ct.us/public//assessment/cmt/cmt_gen4_resources.htm
http://www.csde.state.ct.us/public//assessment/cmt/cmt_gen4_resources_parents.htm

Plan:
To facilitate a match between tested students and their teachers, the state will collect the names of mathematics and language arts teachers for each student in the tested grades and include them in the electronic data files that it makes available to districts and schools, so that the teachers will be linked to their students who participated in testing and, as a result, they will receive reports within their districts for the March 2011 administration of the CMT and CAPT.

The following **milestones** and **timelines** are planned:

- **September 2010:** CSDE includes a field in its 2010 statewide testing file for each student's mathematics and language arts teacher in the district where the student tested, and pilots downloading a 'teacher report' of the teacher's previous year's students, on a voluntary basis. Using the SASIDs for their fall 2010 students, teachers pilot extracting the 2010 data for their new cohort of students.
- **January 2011:** For the tested grades, all districts provide the testing vendor the names of each student's mathematics and language arts teacher. These are incorporated as fields in the testing file.
- **March 2011:** For students new to Connecticut after the beginning of the 2010-11 school year, teacher identification data will be collected as part of the test administration process.
- **July 2011:** The testing vendor generates a 'teacher report' that mathematics and language arts teachers can access on-line for the students they taught in 2010-11.
- **September 2011:** Principals and teachers can access the performance and growth data for their new fall 2011 cohort of students from the secure password protected CTReports.com website, using the SASID assigned to each student in their classes.

A. The **CSDE is the responsible agency** for completing this work, working with its testing vendor and

district test coordinators to identify the mathematics and language arts teacher of each student tested.

B. This work will be completed in consultation with the Connecticut Department of Information Technology (DOIT) to ensure that the state's technical standards are met.

C. The matching will be completed within the scope of the testing contract funds and the new teacher reports will require **$25,000** in existing state funds annually to up-grade CTreports.com.

Year 1	$25,000
Year 2	$25,000
Year 3	$25,000
Total Costs	**$75,000**

D. The state will report on the progress of this plan **twice a year**, linking the plan and all plan updates to its ARRA SFSF Website (http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314).

IV. INDICATOR (b)(3)

Instructions: If (as indicated in **Part 3A, Indicator (b)(3)**) the State does not provide teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects with reports of individual teacher impact on student achievement, please attach a plan that provides:

The process and timeline for developing and implementing the means to provide teachers with such data, including:

- The milestones that the State establishes toward developing and implementing those means and the date by which the State expects to reach each milestone;
- Any obstacles that may prevent the State from developing and implementing those means (including but not limited to requirements and prohibitions of State law and policy);
- The nature and frequency of reports that the State will provide to the public regarding its progress in developing and implementing those means; and
- The amount of funds the State is using or will use to develop and implement those means, and whether the funds are or will be Federal, State, or local funds.

Furthermore, the plan must satisfy the following general requirements:

(A) Identify the agency or agencies in the State responsible for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, including the institutional infrastructure and describe the capacity of the agency or agencies as they relate to each of those tasks;

(B) Identify the agency or agencies, institutions, or organizations, if any, providing technical assistance or other support in the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, and describe the nature of such technical assistance or other support;

(C) Provide the overall budget for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan; and

(D) Describe the way the State will publicly report the plan and the State's progress reports on its plan, including the nature and frequency of updated reports to the public on State actions taken under the plan and the website where the State will make the plan and progress reports publicly available (as defined in the Notice of Final Requirements, Definitions, and Approval Criteria for the SFSF Phase II).

State Plan for INDICATOR (b)(3)

Currently, the assessment data are not reported in a manner that can tease apart from other intervening variables the unique individual impact of a teacher on the mathematics or language arts achievement of students in his or her classroom. However, the Department staff has been working with measurement experts from the University of Connecticut to develop growth and predictive regression models using

vertical scale scores for individual students, classrooms, schools and districts, which can be used to compare **actual** performance over time with **expected** performance, based on the previous years' performance.

State Plan

The following **milestones** and **timelines** are planned:

- **June 2010:** Connecticut adopts a model for attributing student growth to mathematics and language arts teachers.
- **August 2010:** Connecticut publishes guidelines for districts to use to appropriately interpret growth data and extract teacher impact. The CSDE sponsors a two-day conference, the 2010 Assessment Forum, which highlights enhancements to Connecticut's comprehensive assessment system including the measurement of student growth in mathematics and reading. Begin using Connecticut Growth Model to monitor and evaluate progress of the lowest 5 percent schools under USDE grant SID.
- **September 2010 – June 2011:** Connecticut provides district staff with training on the use of testing data for the purpose of improving student performance, including the use of growth data.
- **December 2010:** CSDE pilots growth reports for teachers, based on the performance of their previous year's students.

A. The **CSDE is the responsible agency** for completing this work, working with its testing vendor and district test coordinators to identify the mathematics and language arts teacher of each student tested.
B. This work will be completed in consultation with the University of Connecticut.
C. Budget: The matching will be completed within the scope of the testing contract funds and the new teacher impact reports will require **$40,000** in state funds to up-grade CTreports.com. The MOA with the University of Connecticut will need to be extended for three years at a cost of **$250,000** in existing state funds.

Year 1	$290,000
Year 2	$290,000
Year 3	$290,000
Total Costs	**$870,000**

D. The state will report on the progress of this plan **twice a year**, linking the plan and all plan updates to its ARRA SFSF Website (http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2703&Q=322314).

V. INDICATORS (c)(11) AND (c)(12)

Important note regarding this section:

In the case of new Indicators (c)(11) and (c)(12), regarding the data States will collect from IHEs, the State is required to, at a minimum, possess the ability to collect and report the data. In such circumstances, a State plan need only address the development of capacity, and not implementation and reporting for the relevant indicators.

If the State will develop and implement the means to collect and publicly report the data (i.e., the State will collect and publicly report the data) for either of these indicators by September 30, 2011, the full plan requirements for this section **do** apply. If that is the case, please report all elements of that plan in Part 3B, Section I above.

State Plan Instructions: For each of *Indicators (c)(11) and (c)(12)* for which the State is not able to fully collect or publicly report annually the required data or information (as indicated in Part 3A), please attach a plan that provides:

(1) The process and timeline for achieving the ability to implement the means to fully collect and/or publicly report (as required) the data or information by September 30, 2011, including:

- The milestones established toward developing those means;
- The date by which the State expects to reach each such milestone; and any obstacles that may prevent the State from developing those means by September 30, 2011, including but not limited to requirements and prohibitions of State law and policy;
- The nature and frequency of reports that the State will provide to the public regarding its progress in developing those means; and
- The amount of funds the State is using or will use to develop those means, and whether the funds are or will be Federal, State, or local funds.

(2) A description of the evidence that the State will provide to the Department of Education to demonstrate that it has developed the means to collect and publicly report the data for each indicator for which the State is not able to fully collect or publicly report annually the required data, by September 30, 2011.

Furthermore, the plan must satisfy the following general requirements:

(A) Identify the agency or agencies in the State responsible for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, including the institutional infrastructure and describe the capacity of the agency or agencies as they relate to each of those tasks;

(B) Identify the agency or agencies, institutions, or organizations, if any, providing technical assistance or other support in the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, and describe the nature of such technical assistance or other support;

(C) Provide the overall budget for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan; and

(D) Describe the way the State will publicly report the plan and the State's progress reports on its plan, including the nature and frequency of updated reports to the public on State actions taken under the plan and the website where the State will make the plan and progress reports publicly available (as defined in the Notice of Final Requirements, Definitions, and Approval Criteria for the SFSF Phase II).

Plan Element Verification: Please check only the boxes that apply in the following chart to indicate which elements must be addressed in this section of your state plan:

Element	Not Applicable: The State will develop and implement the means to collect and publicly report the data (Complete Plan in Section I).	Applicable: The State will develop but not implement the means to collect and publicly report the data (Complete Plan in this section).
Indicator (c)(11)	X	
Indicator (c)(12)	X	

PART 3C-- GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

Please attach the following information—

(1) Describe the processes the State employs to review and verify the required data and other information on the indicators and descriptors.

With respect to data quality, the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) has a set of validation rules that are applied to the data before they can be formally accepted from the LEAs for all data collections. The CSDE does statistical checking and produces reports for districts that identify outliers in their data, including significant changes from the previous year, as well as missing data. Districts must address their data exceptions prior to their data being officially accepted by the CSDE. The CSDE also invokes penalties under IDEA, where applicable, for those data that are not submitted by the districts in a timely and accurate fashion.

The Bureau of Student Assessment (BSA) takes several steps to review and verify the state standardized assessment results. Consultants within the BSA run parallel analyses with the psychometricians who work for the test contractor. For example, these analyses are used to verify the assignment of scale scores and the associated achievement levels. The student-level demographic data are reviewed and verified by the LEA test coordinators in order to ensure the accuracy of this information for assessment reporting and Adequate Yearly Process (AYP) subgroup reporting.

(2) Describe the processes the State employs to ensure that, consistent with 34 CFR 99.31(b), the required data and other information are not made publicly available in a manner that personally identifies students, where applicable.

The Bureau of Data Collection, Research, and Evaluation within the CSDE has a policy of suppressing data when it is determined that the number of students represented (the "n-size") is fewer than 10. For example, if a requestor was interested in dropout rates by grade and ethnicity, and two of the four Hispanic males in grade 10 dropped out, this information would not be shared with requestor. The same suppression would be applied to public dissemination on the CSDE's data Web site. These suppression rules are applied regardless if the data are aggregated at the school or district level.

The Bureau of Student Assessment within the CSDE employs an n-size of 20 for its suppression rule for any dissemination of state standardized assessment results.

Attachment 1- Data Sources for State Support of Elementary and Secondary Education and Public Institutions of Higher Education

For Fiscal Year 2006, the actual expenditure for the Education Cost Sharing (ECS) grant, the state's main formula grant to Local Education Agencies, has been used. In Fiscal Year 2009, the actual ECS expenditure was adjusted for prior year reimbursements in special education and other prior year grant overpayments. The source of data is the published Office of the State Comptroller's Annual *Comptroller's Report*. The data used for FY 2010 and FY 2011 is the appropriated entitlement for ECS, from Public Act 09-3, June Special Session, for the biennium ending on June 30, 2011, as adjusted each year for SFSF funding of $269.5 million.

A description (Office of Legislative Research, Lohman, 2007) of the ECS grant formula follows: The ECS formula has a basic three-part structure. That formula multiplies three factors: (1) a base aid ratio of each town's wealth to a designated state guaranteed wealth level (GWL), (2) the foundation, and (3) the number of each town's resident students adjusted for educational and economic need ("need students"). A per-student bonus is added for towns that are part of regional school districts.

Formula Factors

Foundation. The ECS foundation is $ 9,687. The foundation is the level of weighted per-student spending ECS grants help towns achieve.

State Guaranteed Wealth Level (GWL). The ECS formula is designed to allow towns to tax themselves to raise a portion of the foundation based on an equalized tax burden, with the state making up any difference between what a town can raise and the foundation, up to the state guaranteed wealth level. The GWL is 75% above the wealth of the median town (1. 75 times the median town wealth). A higher GWL increases the state's share of total education funding.

Base Aid Ratio and Minimum Grant. The base aid ratio (or percentage) represents the relationship between each town's wealth (measured by equalized grand list adjusted for income) and the state GWL. To avoid having towns whose wealth is higher than the GWL get no state aid, the ECS formula establishes a minimum base aid ratio. This minimum is 0.09 for most towns and 0.13 for the 20 school districts with highest concentrations of low-income students.

"Need Students. " By law, the ECS formula weights student counts for educational and economic need. It does so by increasing a town's resident student counts for students in certain categories to yield a "need student" count. These factors include:

1. Weighting for limited-English-proficient (LEP) students not participating in bilingual education programs at 15%.

2. Weighting for low-income students at 33% based on children eligible for federal Title I education aid as of each October 1.

In addition to these factors, PA 09-3, June Special Session, added $426,769 to the ECS grant for the City of Stamford for the biennium.

For Fiscal Years 2006 and 2009, the actual agency expenditures for the Institutions of Higher Education have been used. In Connecticut, these include:

1) The University of Connecticut
2) The University of Connecticut Medical Center (academic portions only)
3) Connecticut State University
4) Connecticut Community Colleges
5) Charter Oak State College

The source of the actual expenditure data is from the published Office of the State Comptroller's Annual *Comptroller's Report*. The data used for FY 2010 and FY 2011 are the aggregate appropriations, as adjusted, for these institutions from Public Act 10-179, for the biennium ending on June 30, 2011. For FY 2010 and FY 2011, the funding shown has been adjusted by budgetary reductions required in FY 2010 and FY 2011 by PA 10-179.

Funding for the University of Connecticut clinical practices and hospital are not included in these figures.

SFSF Higher Education Calculations

HOLDBACKS

	FY 2010 Enacted, PA 09-3, June Special Session	**FY 2011 Enacted, Amended by PA 10-179**
UCONN	$235,292,115	**$233,011,263**
UCHC	$108,972,138	**$109,346,347**
COSC	$2,891,168	**$2,897,633**
CTC	$159,852,596	**$158,523,261**
CSU	$163,108,416	**$162,517,232**
TOTAL	**$670,116,433**	**$666,295,736**
Less Holdbacks		
UCONN	$2,280,852	**$355,663**
UCHC	$1,237,791	**$179,533**
COSC	$43,535	**$4,366**
CTC	$1,329,335	**$241,232**
CSU	$591,184	**$246,129**
Holdbacks	*$5,482,697*	***$1,026,923***
TOTAL	**$664,633,736**	**$665,268,813**

EXPLANATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT

Source: Enacted budget- http://www.cga.ct.gov/2009/ACT/PA/2009PA-00003-R00HB-06802SS1-PA.htm

less rescissions and furloughs and UCHC funding for clinical programs

UNIT	FY 2006	SFY '08	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
UCONN	$205,807,492		$234,057,728	$233,011,263	$232,655,600
UCHC	$76,165,452		$106,012,205	$107,734,347	$109,166,814
COSC	$2,243,843		$2,712,793	$2,847,633	$2,893,267
CTC	$135,801,661		$158,737,423	$158,523,261	$158,282,029
CSU	$145,520,029		$162,935,234	$162,517,232	$162,271,103
TOTAL	**$565,538,477**		**$664,455,383**	**$664,633,736**	**$665,268,813**

Source: http://www.osc.state.ct.us/2006annual/generalfund/scheduleb3.asp

Source: http://www.osc.state.ct.us/2009annual/generalfund/scheduleb3.asp

less UCHC clinical program adjustment

Source: Enacted Budget, as amended http://www.cga.ct.gov/2010/ACT/PA/2010PA-00179-R00SB-00494-PA.htm

less rescissions and furloughs and UCHC funding for clinical programs

Teacher/Principal Evaluation System Survey

1. District Contact Information

* 1. Please enter the following contact information.

Name:

Title:

District Name:

Email Address:

Phone Number:

Teacher/Principal Evaluation System Survey

2. Teacher Evaluation System Section

Important U.S. Department of Education Definitions (repeatedly referenced in the questions below by two exclamation points(!!)):

"Qualifying Evaluation System" for teachers and principals that (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth (as defined below) as a significant factor, and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement.

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

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

"Student growth" means the change in student achievement (as defined below) for an individual student between two or more points in time. A State may also include other measures that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

"Student achievement" means—
(a) For tested grades and subjects: (1) a student's score on the State's assessments under the ESEA; and, as appropriate, (2) other measures of student learning, such as those described in paragraph (b) of this definition, provided they are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.
(b) For non-tested grades and subjects: alternative measures of student learning and performance such as student scores on pre-tests and end-of-course tests; student performance on English language proficiency assessments; and other measures of student achievement that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

Also, please note, "Teacher" means any certified professional employee below the rank of principal employed by a board of education in a position requiring a certificate issued by the State Board of Education and considered to be part of the teacher's bargaining group.

* 1. As of the 2009-2010 school year, has your district implemented a qualifying evaluation system for teachers(!!) that incorporates the definitions above?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Teacher/Principal Evaluation System Survey

* 2. Does your evaluation system for teachers include any of the following? Please check all that apply.

- ☐ Student Growth(!!): classroom level
- ☐ Classroom walk-throughs
- ☐ Formal observations
- ☐ Peer Reviews
- ☐ Student Surveys
- ☐ Parent Surveys or other parental input
- ☐ Teacher portfolio
- ☐ Student scores on state or district/school-wide assessments

Provide a brief description of the teacher evaluation system.

Teacher/Principal Evaluation System Survey

* 3. What measures does your district use to define student growth(!!), to evaluate the performance of teachers? Please check all that apply.

- ☐ District does not use student growth as a measure for teacher effectiveness
- ☐ Student score on State assessments (CMT & CAPT) (below basic, basic, proficient, goal, advanced)
- ☐ Student scores on pre-tests and end-of-year tests
- ☐ Student performance on English language proficiency assessments
- ☐ CMT vertical scales for individual students or district developed
- ☐ Benchmark assessments
- ☐ Formative assessments

Other (please specify)

Teacher/Principal Evaluation System Survey

* 4. Does your district currently use a measure of student growth(!!) as a significant factor in the evaluation of teachers?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

If yes, explain how "significant" is defined.

5

6

* 5. Is your district's teacher evaluation system designed to evaluate tenured teachers on an annual basis?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

If no, please describe how often evaluation occurs.

5

6

Teacher/Principal Evaluation System Survey

* 6. Is your district's teacher evaluation system designed to evaluate non-tenured teachers on an annual basis?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

If no, please describe how often evaluation occurs.

* 7. What are the performance ratings/levels that your district uses within your teacher evaluation system? Please list the rating/level categories.

Teacher/Principal Evaluation System Survey

* 8. For the 2008-2009 school year for your district, what is the number of teachers rated at each performance rating level and what is the percentage (provide numerator and denominator)of teachers rated at each performance rating level?

5

6

* 9. Does your district's definition of "effective teacher" align with the USDE definition referenced at the beginning of this survey(!!)?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

If no, specify how you define "effective" and "highly effective".

5

6

Teacher/Principal Evaluation System Survey

* 10. Please provide the following numeric values for the 2008-2009 school year for your district:

Total number of teachers employed	
Total number of teachers evaluated	
Percentage of mathematics teachers who were evaluated as effective(!!) or better	
Percentage of science teachers who were evaluated as effective (!!) or better	
Percentage of special education teachers who were evaluated as effective(!!) or better	
Percentage of teachers in language instruction educational programs who were evaluated as effective(!!) or better	

* 11. For those teachers who receive performance ratings, are the numbers at each performance level reported publicly for each school in your district?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

* 12. For those teachers who receive performance ratings, are the percentages at each performance level reported publicly for each school in your district?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Teacher/Principal Evaluation System Survey

13. For what purposes are your teacher evaluation system results used?

	Check all that apply
Professional development for teachers	◯
Compensating teachers	◯
Promoting teachers	◯
Retaining effective teachers	◯
Granting tenure	◯
Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers	◯
Identifying priorities for school improvement	◯

* 14. Is teacher compensation tied directly to student performance data?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If yes, please specify how your district ties teacher compensation directly to student performance data.

Teacher/Principal Evaluation System Survey

15. Does your evaluation system for teachers include the following elements (please check all that apply):

	Please check all that apply
Conducted annually	◯
Timely and constructive feedback	◯
Provide data on student growth for their students	◯
Provide data on student growth for their classes	◯
Provide data on student growth for their schools	◯

Teacher/Principal Evaluation System Survey

3. Principal Evaluation System Section

Important U.S. Department of Education Definitions (repeatedly referenced in the questions below by two exclamation points(!!)):

"Qualifying Evaluation System" for teachers and principals that (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth (as defined below) as a significant factor, and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement.

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

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

"Student growth" means the change in student achievement (as defined below) for an individual student between two or more points in time. A State may also include other measures that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

"Student achievement" means—
(a) For tested grades and subjects: (1) a student's score on the State's assessments under the ESEA; and, as appropriate, (2) other measures of student learning, such as those described in paragraph (b) of this definition, provided they are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.
(b) For non-tested grades and subjects: alternative measures of student learning and performance such as student scores on pre-tests and end-of-course tests; student performance on English language proficiency assessments; and other measures of student achievement that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

* 1. As of the 2009-2010 school year, has your district implemented a qualifying evaluation system for principals(!!)?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Teacher/Principal Evaluation System Survey

* 2. Does your evaluation system for principals include any of the following? Please check all that apply.

- ☐ Student Growth(!!): school-level
- ☐ Formal observations
- ☐ Peer Reviews
- ☐ Student Surveys
- ☐ Parent Surveys or other parental input
- ☐ Administrator portfolio
- ☐ Progress on school improvement plan
- ☐ Student scores on state or district/school-wide assessments

Provide a brief description of the principal evaluation system.

Teacher/Principal Evaluation System Survey

* 3. What measures does you district use to define student growth(!!), to evaluate the performance of principals?

- ☐ District does not use student growth* as a measure for teacher effectiveness
- ☐ Student score on State assessments (CMT & CAPT) (below basic, basic, proficient, goal, advanced)
- ☐ Student scores on pre-tests and end-of-year tests
- ☐ Student performance on English language proficiency assessments
- ☐ CMT vertical scales for individual students or district developed
- ☐ Benchmark assessments
- ☐ Formative assessments

Other (please specify)

Teacher/Principal Evaluation System Survey

* 4. Does your district currently use a measure of student growth(!!) as a significant factor in the evaluation of principals?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If yes, explain how "significant" is defined.

5

6

* 5. Please provide the following numeric values for the 2008-2009 school year for your district:

Total number of principals employed

Total number of principals evaluated

* 6. What are the performance ratings/levels that your district uses within your evaluation system for principals? Please list the rating/level categories.

5

6

Teacher/Principal Evaluation System Survey

* 7. For the 2008-2009 school year for your district, what is the number of principals rated at each performance rating level and what is the percentage (provide numerator and denominator)of principals rated at each performance rating level?

8. Does your evaluation system for principals include the following elements (please check all that apply):

	Please check all that apply
Conducted annually	◯
Timely and constructive feedback	◯
Provide data on student growth for their students	◯
Provide data on student growth for their classes	◯
Provide data on student growth for their schools	◯

* 9. For those principals who receive performance ratings, are the numbers at each performance level reported publicly for each school in your district?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

* 10. For those principals who receive performance ratings, are percentages at each performance level reported publicly for each school in your district?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Teacher/Principal Evaluation System Survey

* 11. Does your district's definition of "effective principal" align with the USDE definition referenced at the beginning of this survey(!!)?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

If no, specify how you define "effective principal."

5

6

12. For what purposes are your principal evaluation system results used?

	Check all that apply
Professional development for principals	◯
Compensating principals	◯
Promoting principals	◯
Retaining effective principals	◯
Removing ineffective principals	◯
Identifying priorities for school improvement	◯

Teacher/Principal Evaluation System Survey

* 13. Is principal compensation tied directly to student performance data?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] If yes, please specify.

Teacher/Principal Evaluation System Survey

4. Other Data Requested

* 1. Does your district currently utilize any of the following types of student data systems? Check all that apply.

- [ ] Vendor solution
- [ ] Custom built
- [ ] Vendor solution with significant customization
- [ ] Spreadsheet or paper-based
- [ ] None

Other (please specify)