# 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: |
|---|---|
| Kerri L. Briggs | 441 4th Street, NW Suite 350N<br>Washington, DC 20001 |

State Contact for the Education Stabilization Fund

Name: Dr. Kerri L. Briggs

Position and Office: State Superintendent, Office of the State Superintendent of Education

Contact's Mailing Address: 441 4th Street, NW Suite 350N, Washington, DC 20001

Telephone: 202-727-7874

Fax: 202-727-2019

E-mail address: kerri.briggs@dc.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: |
|---|---|
| Adrian Fenty, Mayor | 202-727-3636 |
| Signature of Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor:<br>X _____ | Date:<br>1/11/10 |

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: |
|---|---|
| Kerri Briggs | (202) 727-6436 |
| Signature of the Chief State School Officer:<br>X _____ | Date:<br>11 Jan 10 |

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.[1]
- 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*.

[1] 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** | **$743,285,940-Actual** |
| **FY 2009** | **$849,502,051-Proposed** |
| **FY 2010*** | **$762,847,647-Proposed** |
| **FY 2011*** | **Data not available at this time.** |

(* 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** | **$61,266,493** |
| **FY 2009** | **$62,070,000** |
| **FY 2010*** | **$62,070,000** |
| **FY 2011*** | **Data not available at this time.** |

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

3. **Additional Submission Requirements**: In an attachment to the application –

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

The level of State support for elementary and secondary education for FY 06 is based on actual expenditures in that fiscal year. In FY 09 and FY 10, the level of State support is based on approved budget figures for elementary and secondary education. Expenditures for FY09 will not be finalized until February of 2010. The FY09 and FY10 budgets for the District of Columbia are available at budget.dc.gov.

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

The level of State support for IHEs for FY 06 is based on actual expenditures in that fiscal year. In FY 09 and FY 10, the level of State support is based on approved budget figures for IHEs. Expenditures for FY09 will not be finalized until February of 2010. The FY09 and FY10 budgets for the District of Columbia are available at budget.dc.gov.

## 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): Adrian Fenty, Mayor | |
|---|---|
| Signature: | Date: 1/11/10 |

<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.

# 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] http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/2007-2008%20HQT%20Report%20Card%20Data(vf).pdf

**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://seo.dev.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view.asp?a=1222&Q=564028&PM=1

[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]

The current OSSE Teacher Equity Plan (OTEP) is in the approval process and will be uploaded to the OSSE website once final approval is obtained. The most recently published version of the Revised State HQT Plan (10.13.08) did not include an update to the SEA HQT Equity Plan that was originally developed in February 2007. OSSE has revised that plan to become the OSSE Teacher Equity Plan (OTEP). The OTEP is one component of the proposed Comprehensive Teacher Plan that includes programs and initiatives on Highly Qualified Teachers and Paraprofessionals, proposed Teaching Standards, Teacher Evaluation Systems and Professional Development Standards, the Teacher Equity Plan and Program Monitoring.

➔ http://seo.dev.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view.asp?a=1222&Q=564028&PM=1

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]

http://seo.dev.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view.asp?a=1222&Q=564028&PM=1

➔ [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.

**See Appendix A**

| 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.

**See Appendix B**

**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.

**See Appendix B**

| 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.

**See Appendix C**

| 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.

**See Appendix D**

| 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.

**See Appendix E**

| 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.

**See Appendix F**

**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.

**See Appendix F**

| 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.

**See Appendix G**

| 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.

**See Appendix H**

## 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.

**See Appendix I**

(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.

**See Appendix I**

(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.

**See Appendix I**

4) The capacity to communicate with higher education data systems? NO

☐ 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.

**See Appendix I**

(5) An audit system assessing data quality, validity, and reliability? NO

☐ 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.

**See Appendix I**

**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? NO

☐ 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.

**See Appendix I**

(7) Information on students not tested, by grade and subject? NO

☐ 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.

**See Appendix I**

(8) A teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students? NO

☐ 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.

**See Appendix I**

(9) Student-level transcript information, including on courses completed and grades earned? NO

☐ 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.

**See Appendix I**

(10) Student-level college readiness test scores? NO

☐ 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.

**See Appendix I**

**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? NO

☐ 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.

**See Appendix I**

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

☐ Yes. NO
☒ 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.

**See Appendix I**

| **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.

**See Appendix J**

| 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.

**See Appendix K**

## 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] http://seo.dev.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view.asp?a=1222&Q=564028&PM=1

**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://seo.dev.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view.asp?a=1222&Q=564028&PM=1

[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]

[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://seo.dev.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view.asp?a=1222&Q=564028&PM=1

[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://seo.dev.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view.asp?a=1222&Q=564028&PM=1

[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] http://seo.dev.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view.asp?a=1222&Q=564028&PM=1

[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://seo.dev.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view.asp?a=1222&Q=564028&PM=1

[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://seo.dev.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view.asp?a=1222&Q=564028&PM=1

[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]
http://seo.dev.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view.asp?a=1222&Q=564028&PM=1

[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]
http://seo.dev.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view.asp?a=1222&Q=564028&PM=1

[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://seo.dev.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view.asp?a=1222&Q=564028&PM=1

[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://seo.dev.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view.asp?a=1222&Q=564028&PM=1

[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.

**See Appendix L**

**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.nclb.osse.dc.gov/

| 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.

**See Appendix M**

| 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.

**See Appendix N**

| 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.

**See Appendix O**

## 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]
http://seo.dev.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view.asp?a=1222&Q=564028&PM=1

[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]
http://seo.dev.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view.asp?a=1222&Q=564028&PM=1

➔ [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.

OSSE's definition of the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the District of Columbia, uses a formula that assigns points to every school in the District based on their standing with the following three elements: current year improvement status; overall growth in the percentage of students scoring proficient or above in the school from 2007 to 2009 in both reading/language arts and mathematics; and whether the percentage of students overall in the school scoring proficient or above is more than half the distance from the annual measurable objective (AMO) over a two- or three-year period in both reading/language arts and mathematics. OSSE added the points assigned to each school based on these data elements and ranked schools based on total points. In addition, any school with a graduation rate below 60 percent in each of the two most recent years is identified as a persistently lowest-achieving 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] Click here to enter text.

[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://seo.dev.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view.asp?a=1222&Q=564028&PM=1

[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. | Race to the Top |
|---|---|---|

**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.

**See Appendix Q**

| 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://seo.dev.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view.asp?a=1222&Q=564028&PM=1

[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]
. http://seo.dev.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view.asp?a=1222&Q=564028&PM=1

[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]
. http://seo.dev.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view.asp?a=1222&Q=564028&PM=1

➔ [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] http://seo.dev.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view.asp?a=1222&Q=564028&PM=1

**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 information is collected and publicly available:[3]
http://seo.dev.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view.asp?a=1222&Q=564028&PM=1

[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]
http://seo.dev.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view.asp?a=1222&Q=564028&PM=1

[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]
http://seo.dev.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view.asp?a=1222&Q=564028&PM=1

[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] 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)(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.

**See Appendix R**

| 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] 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)(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.

**See Appendix S**

# SFSF Phase II State Plan

# Appendix A

**Indicator: (a)(2)**

**State Plan Author:** Valida Walker

**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:

**Part 1: Action Plan**

Describe 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:

Acronym Key:

Agencies

| | |
|---|---|
| OSSE | Office of the State Superintendent of Education |
| MACC | Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center |
| DC SBOE | DC State Board of Education |
| PCSB | Public Charter School Board |
| DCPS | District of Columbia Public Schools |
| LEA | Local Education Agency |

OSSE Departments

| | |
|---|---|
| ELSEC | Division of Elementary and Secondary Education |
| OELA | Office of Educator Licensing and Accreditation |
| TAL | Teaching and Learning |
| OAA | Office of Assessment and Accountability |
| OCIO | Office of the Chief Information Officer |
| OCTO | Office of the Chief Technology Officer |

OSSE Programs

| | |
|---|---|
| OCTP | OSSE Comprehensive Teacher Plan |
| OTEP | OSSE Teacher Equity Plan |
| ELIS | Educator Licensure Information System |
| EQAS | Educator Quality Assessment System |
| SLED | State Longitudinal Education Data warehouse |
| EER | Employed Educator Report |

External Programs

| | |
|---|---|
| CAPPS | District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) Human Resources and Payroll System |
| STARS | Student Tracking and Reporting System |

Vendors

QAS Quality Assessment Systems

| # | Milestone | Due Date | Responsible Office | Potential Obstacles | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, Local) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Submit Revised OSSE Teacher Equity Plan (OTEP) to OSSE leadership for approval. | January 2010 | OSSE ELSEC; OELA; TAL | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 2 | Inform LEAs of plans to implement a proposed OSSE Comprehensive Teacher Plan (OCTP), including teaching standards, teacher evaluation processes and professional development standards. | March 2010 | OSSE ELSEC; OELA; TAL | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 3 | Analyze 2008-2009 teacher quality, experience and distribution data collected by Employed Educator Report (EER). | March 2010 | OSSE ELSEC; OELA; TAL MACC; | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 4 | Publish 2008-2009 teacher quality, experience and distribution data on the OSSE website as a Teacher Equity Summary Analysis. | March 2010 | OSSE ELSEC; OELA; TAL; OCIO | Failure to finalize analysis of 2008-2009 teacher equity distribution data. | N/A | N/A |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | Notify all LEAs of their Teacher Equity standing including teacher experience and distribution data. | March 2010 | OSSE ELSEC; OELA; TAL; | Failure to finalize analysis of 2008-2009 teacher equity distribution data. | N/A | N/A |
| 6 | Initiate build out of EQAS functionality to include interface to ELIS, SLED and other external systems of record including CAPPS, STARS and systems being used by Charter LEAs. | March 2010 | OSSE ELSEC; OELA; TAL; MACC; OCTO; OCIO; OAA; SLED; QAS | Failure to get approval for contract with existing funding in spending plan for 2009-2010 | QAS $265K<br><br>MACC $60K | FED Title II Part A |
| 7 | Provide LEAs with guidance and technical assistance on the proposed OCTP and OTEP | April 2010 | OSSE ELSEC; OELA; TAL; MACC; OCTO; OCIO; OAA; DC SBOE; | Failure to develop components for teacher standards, a teacher evaluation protocol that is congruent with existing teacher evaluation protocols and a synchronous professional development agenda as part of the OCTP and get DC SBOE approval | N/A | N/A |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | Develop pilot project cohort consisting of LEAs that need improvement in Teacher Equity and Highly Qualified Teacher percentages. | June 2010 | OSSE ELSEC; OELA; TAL; MACC; Office of Assessment and Accountability; DC SBOE | Failure to obtain SBOE approval for OSSE Comprehensive Teacher Plan and OSSE Teacher Equity Plan. | See item #7 | FED Title II Part A |
| 9 | Inform LEAs that are identified as part of the pilot project for the OSSE Comprehensive Teacher Plan that they must develop annual LEA Teacher Equity Plans for submission by September 2010. | June 2010 | OSSE ELSEC; OELA; TAL; MACC; Office of Assessment and Accountability | Failure to obtain SBOE approval for OSSE Comprehensive Teacher Plan and OSSE Teacher Equity Plan. | See Item #7 | FED Title II Part A |
| 10 | Publically announce initiation of the pilot project OSSE Comprehensive Teacher Plan and publish on OSSE website | June 2010 | OSSE ELSEC; OELA; TAL; OCTO; OCIO; DC SBOE | Failure to obtain SBOE approval for OSSE Comprehensive Teacher Plan and OSSE Teacher Equity Plan. | N/A | N/A |
| 11 | Collect, review and evaluate Teacher Equity Plans submitted by LEAs identified as part of the pilot project | September 2010 | OSSE ELSEC; OELA; TAL; MACC | Failure to obtain SBOE approval for OSSE Comprehensive Teacher Plan and OSSE Teacher Equity Plan. | See Item #7 | FED Title II Part A |
| 12 | Analyze 2009-2010 teacher quality, experience, distribution and evaluation data collected by Educator Quality Assessment System (EQAS). | September 2010 | OSSE ELSEC; OELA; TAL; OCTO; MACC | Failure to implement EQAS. Failure to obtain SBOE approval for OSSE Comprehensive Teacher Plan and OSSE | See Item #7 | FED Title II Part A |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Teacher Equity Plan. | | |
| 13 | Provide additional data elements to OELA to be included in EQAS data collection for 2010-2011 | December 2010 (Adjust to meet EQAS data collection timeline for 2010-2011) | OSSE ELSEC; OELA; TAL; MACC; OCTO; Office of Assessment and Accountability; DC SBOE; SLED; QAS | Failure to implement EQAS. Failure to obtain SBOE approval for OSSE Comprehensive Teacher Plan and OSSE Teacher Equity Plan. | See Item #7 | FED Title II Part A |
| 14 | Implement Comprehensive Teacher Plan on a statewide basis | January 2011 (Adjust to meet EQAS data collection timeline for 2010-2011) | OSSE ELSEC; OELA; TAL; MACC; OCTO; Office of Assessment and Accountability; DC SBOE; SLED; QAS | Failure to implement EQAS. Failure to obtain SBOE approval for OSSE Comprehensive Teacher Plan and OSSE Teacher Equity Plan. | See Item #7 | FED Title II Part A |

**Part 2: 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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement | Capacity |
|---|---|---|
| OSSE ELSEC | Elementary and Secondary Education Division includes the Office of Teaching and Learning , Office of Assessment and Accountability, The School support Services Office, the Office of Educator Licensure and Accreditation, the Office of Grants Management and Program Coordination and the office of Community Learning. These offices are jointly responsible for program activities that will develop, execute and monitor the program. ELSEC will need to increase capacity through use of a contractor or by offering an internship. | ELSEC currently has 31 employees. ELSEC will require the addition of at least one position through direct hiring, a contract with an outside organization or by offering an internship opportunity. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| OSSE TAL | Office of Teaching and Learning provides program support for Title I, Title II and Title III funds. | TAL develops programs implements and monitors programs all schools in all LEAS in the state. There are 8 people in the department who administer programs for 57 LEAs on nearly 300 campuses. |
| OSSE OELA | OELA is the primary office responsible for collecting and disseminating educator quality data. OELA brings program and data collection requirement expertise to the project. OELA has collected statewide educator quality data since 2002 and therefore has significant institutional knowledge of educator quality reporting requirements. | OELA has 8 employees who manage the state licensure process for all teachers, principals, and other educational service providers who are required to be state certified. This office also manages the state teacher preparation program accreditation for all IHE's |
| OSSE OCTO | OCIO and OCTO are the primary offices responsible for technology and website updating. OCTO brings technological expertise to the project. OCTO will be instrumental in making sure that EQAS integrates smoothly with other existing data collection and data warehouse systems. | OCTO is the citywide office that manages all significant technological builds and serves as the gatekeeper on these projects to avoid duplication of effort among various agencies, as well as provide information on the city's infrastructure and ability to meet agency technology needs. |
| OSSE OCIO | OCIO will be instrumental in publishing data and maintaining web interface for public access to the report card. The Teacher Equity Plan data analysis will be made public through the web page. | OCIO is the OSSE office that maintains the OSSE web site, intranet and web portals for report card and other publicly distributed information. |
| OSSE OAA | This office manages the DC CAS assessment and curriculum standards. This is the office that will monitor the teacher standards, teacher evaluation protocols and the professional development agendas that make up the OCTP | Office of Assessment and Accountability will provide information vital to the development of the OSSE Comprehensive Teacher Plan. |
| MACC | The Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center at GWU provides research and analytic | MACC has participated in the revision of the Teacher |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | support. | Equity Plan and will be available to assist with identification of teacher standards, alignment and synchronization of the existing teacher evaluation systems and setting the professional development agendas as well as analysis of LEA Teacher Equity Plans once they come in from the 2009-2010 pilot project. |
| QAS | Quality Assessment Systems is the developer for the Educator Quality Assessment System (EQAS) which is a comprehensive, seamless data management system that collects and links all the Teacher Quality , Teacher Equity , Teacher Evaluation, Teacher Standards, professional development data in a web-based environment. It assigns business work flow systems to build OSSE capacity in managing the reporting timelines and official state policies using approved procedures.<br><br>QAS has already completed Phase IA of the project. Phase IB and 2A funding has already been identified in ARRA funding. If that funding is not approved, OSSE has already identified funding using FED Title II Part A funds as indicated in Part I Line #7 of this template. See attached budget breakdown on EQAS Project Overview | QAS will provide support to develop, upgrade and adjust the EQAS System for implementation of the Comprehensive Teacher Plan. |
| DC SBOE | DC State Board of Education | The SBOE will review, evaluate and decide on approval of the Comprehensive Teacher Plan |

**(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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement |
|---|---|
| QAS | Will build educator quality web-based reporting system. Quality Assessment Systems is the developer for the Educator Quality Assessment System (EQAS) which is a comprehensive, seamless data management system that collects and links all the Teacher Quality , Teacher Equity , Teacher Evaluation, Teacher Standards, professional development data in a web-based environment. It assigns business work flow systems to build OSSE capacity in managing the reporting timelines and official state policies using approved procedures.<br><br>QAS has already completed Phase IA of the project. Phase IB and 2A funding has already been identified in ARRA funding. If that funding is not approved, OSSE has already identified funding using FED Title II Part A funds as indicated in Part I Line #7 of this template. |
| The Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center at GWU provides research and analytic support. | MACC has participated in the revision of the Teacher Equity Plan and will be available to assist with identification of Teacher Standard, Teacher Evaluation Systems, Professional Development Standards and analysis of LEA Teacher Equity Plans as well. The MACC is one of the Regional centers coordinated by the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality (TQ Center). The TQ Center consists of a partnership with Learning Point Associates, and its partner organizations, ETS, and Vanderbilt University, that entered into a five-year cooperative agreement with the U.S. Department of Education to operate the teacher quality content center. The MACC has worked with OSSE, DCPS and the PCSB |

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

| Item/ Category | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, or Local) |
|---|---|---|
| **Phase IB**<br>Interface to External System (ELIS)<br>Content Consulting, Code Modification<br>Training and Documentation<br>Pilot the Phase 1(A+B) Management System | <br>$20,700<br><br>$13,800<br><br>$4,600<br>$3,450 | FED Title II Part A State Activities funds. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Final Acceptance, Phase 1B<br>Travel and Expense<br><br>**<u>Phase 2A</u>**<br>Additional Requirements Analysis to Create ELIS System functionality in EQAS, including Process Maps/Swim Lanes<br>Content Consulting, Code Modification<br>Automated Report Generation<br>Pilot the Phase 2A Management System<br><br>**<u>Phase 2B</u>**<br>Interface to External Systems of Record: SLED, CAPPS, STARS, Charter LEAs<br>Training and Documentation for all Stakeholders, DCPS and Charter LEAs<br>Content, Business Rules, Workflow Setup, Forms Generation for Educator Effectiveness and Professional Development process management.<br>Pilot the Phase 2B Management System<br>Final Acceptance<br>Travel and Expense | $1,150<br>$7,500<br><br><br>$48,300<br><br><br><br>$72,450<br><br>$23,000<br><br>$23,000<br><br><br>$82,800<br><br><br>$$46,000<br><br><br>$96,600<br><br><br><br><br><br>$23,000<br><br>$4,600<br>$42,000 | |
| Provide ongoing support with data analysis and research assistance with pilot project cohort for implementation of the Comprehensive Teacher Plan, Teacher Equity Plan. MACC consultant will provide this support until OSSE builds capacity with direct hire or internship hire. | 480 hours x $125.00 = $60,000 | FED Title II Part A State Activities funds |

**(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).

| **Method(s) for Publicly Reporting the Plan and the State's Progress Reports on its Plans** | **Means** | **Frequency** (i.e. quarterly, semi-annually, specific dates) | **Website Address** |
|---|---|---|---|
| ELSEC will provide implementation updates. | The ELSEC website will include an Educator Quality portal to provide one location where all stakeholders may visit to review progress, respond to surveys (such as a survey on common evaluation rating language), and offer other feedback on the project. | Quarterly | OSSE Website http://osse.dc.gov |
| ELSEC will publish data and data analysis on the OSSE website | The website will contain a link to the Teacher Equity Summary Analysis | Annually | OSSE Website http://osse.dc.gov |
| | | | |

**Part 3: Plan Element Verification**

Please fill out the following chart to indicate whether your state plan addresses how the State will collect and/or publicly report data.

| **Element** | **Collection (check if applies)** | **Public Reporting (check if applies)** |
|---|---|---|
| Indicator (a)(2) | X | X |

# SFSF Phase II State Plan

# Appendix B

**Descriptor (a) (1):**

**State Plan Author:** Erika Lomax

**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:

**Part 1: Action Plan**

Describe 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 publically report (as required) the data or information, including:

| # | Milestone | Due Date | Responsible Office | Potential Obstacles | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, Local) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Inform LEAs of plans to collect teacher evaluation data via the Employed Educator Report (EER)* for SY 2009-10 | January 2010 | Office of Educator Licensure and Accreditation (OELA) at OSSE | N/A | None | N/A |
| 2 | Assess current LEA ability to provide responses to the required descriptor | January 2010 | OELA at OSSE | N/A | None | N/A |
| 3 | Release web-based EER system (To be referred to as TQAS/EQAS herein) inclusive of teacher evaluation data requests (SY 2009-10 will serve as pilot year for the collection of evaluation related data) | April 2010 | OELA at OSSE; Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCTO) | OELA budget would need to be appropriately loaded to establish procurement authority for needed services to create a web-based data collection tool | See budget breakout | Local |
| 4 | Preliminary TQAS/EQAS | June 2010 | OELA at OSSE | Compliance Issues for LEAs | None | N/A |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | information due from LEAs | | | that do not submit their data. | | |
| 5 | TQAS/EQAS validation to be conducted by OSSE | July 2010 | OELA at OSSE | None | None | N/A |
| 6 | Final TQAS/EQAS data due from LEAs (to permit the inclusion of year-end DC-CAS results in evaluation responses) | August 2010 | OELA at OSSE | Compliance issues for LEAs that do not submit | None | N/A |
| 7 | Make necessary adjustments to the TQAS/EQAS based on feedback received during the 2009-10 reporting year | October 2010 | OELA at OSSE | None | See budget breakout | Local |
| 8 | Release SY 2010-11 TQAS/EQAS | November 2010 | OELA at OSSE | None | None | N/A |
| 9 | Preliminary TQAS/EQAS information due from LEAs | June 2011 | OELA at OSSE | Compliance issues for LEAs that do not submit | None | N/A |
| 10 | TQAS/EQAS validation to be conducted by OSSE | July 2011 | OELA at OSSE | None | None | N/A |
| 11 | Final TQAS/EQAS data due from LEAs (to permit the inclusion of year-end DC-CAS results in evaluation responses) | August 2011 | OELA at OSSE | Compliance issues for LEAs that do not submit | None | N/A |
| 12 | Publically report TQAS/EQAS results inclusive of teacher/principal evaluation data | September | OELA at OSSE; OCTO | None | None | N/A |

*OSSE currently collects educator quality data via the annual Employed Educator Report (EER) that serves as the foundation for collecting highly qualified teacher data, as well as data on other school-based instructional staff including school administrators, service providers and paraprofessionals. The EER provides the state with educator experience, licensure, assignment and qualification data to name a few. We are in the process of

moving the EER from an Excel spreadsheet to a web-based environment (referred to as the Teacher Quality Assessment System (TQAS)/Educator Quality Assessment System (EQAS)) in an effort to reduce collection burden on LEAs and reporting burden on OSSE staff. Since the EER (soon to be the TQAS/EQAS) is the known vehicle to LEAs for the collection of educator quality data, OSSE plans to include the descriptors and indicators above in the 2008-09 EER collection process.

The vision for evaluation is to catalyze development of strong systems for human capital management, taking into account the starting point of each LEA. For example, DCPS is considered a leading district in the realm of teacher evaluation as a result of its IMPACT system, a system which uses student growth data for teacher evaluation and human capital decisions, and its Teaching and Learning Framework, a rubric-based framework that outlines teacher competencies for effective planning, teaching, and improvement. IMPACT is a system for evaluation that combines teacher performance based on student growth with performance on aspects of the Teaching and Learning Framework and other indicators to generate a score for effectiveness.

On the other hand, most charter LEAs, in contrast, are at a different point in their evolution. In addition to building student-level data systems, Charter LEAs need support in developing evaluations linked to a newly defined growth measure and in building robust systems for managing their workforce. As a result, the Performance Management Framework (PMF) of the Public Charter School Board was introduced in January 2009 as a pilot and is currently being rolled out. The PMF was designed to create a consistent measure of quality performance of teacher and principals across charter schools.

OSSE currently publically reports highly qualified teacher data, and teacher and principal licensure data via a state website at http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/. The specific link for educator quality data is http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/2007-2008%20HQT%20Report%20Card%20Data(vf).pdf. We will use the same process to publically report responses to the descriptors and indicators outlined above. Based on the two performance evaluation systems, the information that is generated and reported into the TQAS/EQAS will provide more promising data that can better inform human capital decisions regarding teacher or principal development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal.

**Part 2: General Requirements**

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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement | Capacity |
|---|---|---|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| OSSE/OELA | OELA is the primary office responsible for collecting and disseminating educator quality data. | OELA brings program and data collection requirement expertise to the project while OCTO brings technological expertise to the project. OELA has collected statewide educator quality data since 2002 and therefore has significant institutional knowledge of educator quality reporting requirements. |
| OSSE/Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) and OCTO | OCIO and OCTO are the primary offices responsible for technology applications and website updating. | OCTO is the citywide office that manages all significant technological builds and serves as the gatekeeper on these projects to avoid duplication of effort among various agencies, as well as provides information on the city's infrastructure and ability to meet agency technology needs. |

**(A)** 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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement |
|---|---|
| Vendor to be selected | Will build the TQAS/EQAS reporting system. |

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

| Item/ Category | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, or Local) |
|---|---|---|
| Creation of TQAS/EQAS | Qty Rate x mo. Cost | Based on competitive federal funding award |
| Project Manager | 1 $125 x 8 = $220,000 | |
| Business Analyst | 2 $100 x 7 = $224,000 | |
| Solution Architect | 1 $130 x 8 = $166,400 | |
| Database Administrator | 1 $ 95 x 5 = $ 76,000 | |
| Technical Writer | 1 $ 75 x 6 = $ 72,000 | |
| Software Developer | 2 $ 95 x 3 = $ 91,200 | |
| OCM Specialist | 1 $100 x 5 = $ 80,000 | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Integration Developer | 1 $115 x 3 = $ 55,200 | |
| | | In the event federal funding is not secured, OSSE has budgeted estimated local funds of $265,000 towards the first year of system development. This reflects a substantial funding issue if federal funds are not awarded. |

**(C)** Describe the way the State will publically 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).

Per the ESEA report card requirements for states, LEAs and schools, OSSE currently publically reports highly qualified teacher data, and teacher and principal licensure data via a state website at http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/. The specific link for educator quality data is http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/2007-2008%20HQT%20Report%20Card%20Data(vf).pdf.

| **Method(s) for Publicly Reporting the Plan and the State's Progress Reports on its Plans** | **Means** | **Frequency** (i.e. quarterly, semi-annually, specific dates) | **Website Address** |
|---|---|---|---|
| OELA from OSSE will provide implementation updates. | The OELA website will include a separate Educator Quality page to provide one location where all stakeholders may review progress, respond to surveys (such as a survey on common evaluation rating language), and offer other feedback on the project. | Quarterly | http://www.osse.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view,a,1224,q,562481.asp |

**Part 3: Plan Element Verification**

Please fill out the following chart to indicate whether your state plan addresses how the State will collect and/or publicly report data.

| Element | Collection (check if applies) | Public Reporting (check if applies) |
|---|---|---|
| Descriptor (a) (1) | X | X |

# SFSF Phase II State Plan

# Appendix C

**Indicator: (a)(3)**

**State Plan Author:** Erika Lomax

**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 publically report annually the required data or information (as indicated in Part 3A), please attach a plan that provides:

**Part 1: Action Plan**

Describe 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 publically report (as required) the data or information, including:

The vision for evaluation is to catalyze development of strong systems for human capital management, taking into account the starting point of each LEA. For example, DCPS is considered a leading district in the realm of teacher evaluation as a result of its IMPACT system, **a *system which uses student growth data for teacher evaluation and human capital decisions***, and its Teaching and Learning Framework, a rubric-based framework that outlines teacher competencies for effective planning, teaching, and improvement.

On the other hand, most charter LEAs, in contrast, are at a different point in their evolution. In addition to building student-level data systems, Charter LEAs need support in developing ***evaluations linked to a newly defined growth measure*** and in building robust systems for managing their workforce. As a result, the Performance Management Framework (PMF) of the Public Charter School Board was introduced in January 2009 as a pilot and is currently being rolled out. The PMF was designed to create a consistent measure of quality performance of teacher and principals across charter schools.

OSSE currently publically reports highly qualified teacher data, and teacher and principal licensure data via a state website at http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/. The specific link for educator quality data is http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/2007-2008%20HQT%20Report%20Card%20Data(vf).pdf. We will use the same process to publically report responses to the descriptors and indicators outlined above.

The following timeline provides a schedule for the development of the data collection system (TQAS/EQAS*):

| # | Milestone | Due Date | Responsible Office | Potential Obstacles | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, Local) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Inform LEAs of plans to collect principal evaluation data via the Employed Educator Report (EER)* for SY 2009-10 | January 2010 | Office of Educator Licensure and Accreditation (OELA) at OSSE | N/A | None | N/A |
| 2 | Assess current LEA ability to provide responses to the required descriptor | January 2010 | OELA at OSSE | N/A | None | N/A |
| 3 | Release web-based EER system (To be referred to as TQAS/EQAS herein) inclusive of principal evaluation data requests (SY 2009-10 will serve as pilot year for the collection of evaluation related data) | April 2010 | OELA at OSSE; Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCTO) | OELA budget would need to be appropriately loaded to establish procurement authority for needed services to create a web-based data collection tool | See budget breakout | Local |
| 4 | Preliminary TQAS/EQAS information due from LEAs | June 2010 | OELA at OSSE | Compliance Issues for LEAs that do not submit their data. | None | N/A |
| 5 | TQAS/EQAS validation to be conducted by OSSE | July 2010 | OELA at OSSE | None | None | N/A |
| 6 | Final TQAS/EQAS data due from LEAs (to permit the inclusion of year-end DC-CAS results in evaluation responses) | August 2010 | OELA at OSSE | Compliance issues for LEAs that do not submit | None | N/A |
| 7 | Make necessary adjustments to the TQAS/EQAS based on feedback | October 2010 | OELA at OSSE | None | See budget breakout | Local |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | received during the 2009-10 reporting year | | | | | |
| 8 | Release SY 2010-11 TQAS/EQAS | November 2010 | OELA at OSSE | None | None | N/A |
| 9 | Preliminary TQAS/EQAS information due from LEAs | June 2011 | OELA at OSSE | Compliance issues for LEAs that do not submit | None | N/A |
| 10 | TQAS/EQAS validation to be conducted by OSSE | July 2011 | OELA at OSSE | None | None | N/A |
| 11 | Final TQAS/EQAS data due from LEAs (to permit the inclusion of year-end DC-CAS results in evaluation responses) | August 2011 | OELA at OSSE | Compliance issues for LEAs that do not submit | None | N/A |
| 12 | Publically report TQAS/EQAS results inclusive of teacher/principal evaluation data | September | OELA at OSSE; OCTO | None | None | N/A |

*OSSE currently collects educator quality data via the annual Employed Educator Report (EER) that serves as the foundation for collecting highly qualified teacher data, as well as data on other school-based instructional staff including school administrators, service providers and paraprofessionals. The EER provides the state with educator experience, licensure, assignment, and qualification data to name a few. We are in the process of moving the EER from an Excel spreadsheet to a web-based environment (referred to as the Teacher Quality Assessment System (TQAS)/Educator Quality Assessment System (EQAS)) in an effort to reduce collection burden on LEAs and reporting burden on OSSE staff. Since the EER (soon to be the TQAS/EQAS) is the known vehicle to LEAs for the collection of educator quality data, OSSE plans to include the descriptors and indicators above in the 2008-09 EER collection process.

**Part 2: General Requirements (***Insert full sentence descriptions in tables)*

**(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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement | Capacity |
|---|---|---|
| OSSE/OELA | OELA is the primary office responsible for collecting and disseminating educator | OELA brings program and data collection requirement |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | quality data. | expertise to the project while OCTO brings technological expertise to the project. OELA has collected statewide educator quality data since 2002 and therefore has significant institutional knowledge of educator quality reporting requirements. |
| OSSE/Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) and OCTO | OCIO and OCTO are the primary offices responsible for technology and website updating. | OCTO is the citywide office that manages all significant technological builds and serves as the gatekeeper on these projects to avoid duplication of effort among various agencies, as well as provide information on the city's infrastructure and ability to meet agency technology needs. |

**(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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement |
|---|---|
| Vendor to be selected | Will build educator quality web-based reporting system. |

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

| Item/ Category | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, or Local) |
|---|---|---|
| Creation of TQAS/EQAS<br>Project Manager<br>Business Analyst<br>Solution Architect<br>Database Administrator<br>Technical Writer<br>Software Developer<br>OCM Specialist<br>Integration Developer | Qty Rate x mo. Cost<br>1 $125 x 8 = $220,000<br>2 $100 x 7 = $224,000<br>1 $130 x 8 = $166,400<br>1 $ 95 x 5 = $ 76,000<br>1 $ 75 x 6 = $ 72,000<br>2 $ 95 x 3 = $ 91,200<br>1 $100 x 5 = $ 80,000<br>1 $115 x 3 = $ 55,200 | Based on competitive federal funding award |
| | | In the event federal funding is |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | not secured, OSSE has budgeted estimated local funds of $265,000 towards the first year of system development. This reflects a substantial funding issue if federal funds are not awarded. |

**(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).

Per the ESEA report card requirements for states, LEAs and schools, OSSE currently publically reports highly qualified teacher data, and teacher and principal licensure data via a state website at http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/. The specific link for educator quality data is http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/2007-2008%20HQT%20Report%20Card%20Data(vf).pdf. As a result of the TQAS/EQAS, included in this data collection will be the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level and publically reported for each school in the LEA.

| **Method(s) for Publicly Reporting the Plan and the State's Progress Reports on its Plans** | **Means** | **Frequency** (i.e. quarterly, semi-annually, specific dates) | **Website Address** |
|---|---|---|---|
| OELA will provide implementation updates. | The OELA website will include an Educator Quality to provide one location where all stakeholders may visit to review progress, respond to surveys (such as a survey on common evaluation rating language), and offer other feedback on the project. | Quarterly | http://www.osse.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view,a,1224,q,562481.asp |

**Part 3: Plan Element Verification**

Please fill out the following chart to indicate whether your state plan addresses how the State will collect and/or publicly report data.

| Element | Collection (check if applies) | Public Reporting (check if applies) |
|---|---|---|
| **Indicator (a) (3)** | X | X |

# SFSF Phase II State Plan

# Appendix D

**Indicator: (a)(4)**

**State Plan Author:** Erika Lomax

**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 publically report annually the required data or information (as indicated in Part 3A), please attach a plan that provides:

**Part 1: Action Plan**

Describe 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 vision for evaluation is to catalyze development of strong systems for human capital management, taking into account the starting point of each LEA. For example, DCPS is considered a leading district in the realm of teacher/principal evaluation as a result of its IMPACT system, a system which uses student growth data for teacher/principal evaluation and human capital decisions, and its Teaching and Learning Framework, a rubric-based framework that outlines teacher competencies for effective planning, teaching, and improvement. IMPACT is a system for evaluation that combines teacher performance based on student growth with performance on aspects of the Teaching and Learning Framework and other indicators to generate a score for effectiveness.

On the other hand, most charter LEAs, in contrast, are at a different point in their evolution. In addition to building student-level data systems, Charter LEAs need support in developing evaluations linked to a newly defined growth measure and in building robust systems for managing their workforce. As a result, the Performance Management Framework (PMF) of the Public Charter School Board was introduced in January 2009 as a pilot and is currently being rolled out. The PMF was designed to create a consistent measure of quality performance of teacher and principals across charter schools.

OSSE currently publically reports highly qualified teacher data, and teacher and principal licensure data via a state website at http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/. The specific link for educator quality data is http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/2007-2008%20HQT%20Report%20Card%20Data(vf).pdf. We will use the same process to publically report responses to the descriptors and indicators outlined above. Through this data collection system 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 will be reported herein.

The following timeline provides a schedule for the development of the data collection system (TQAS/EQAS*):

| # | Milestone | Due Date | Responsible Office | Potential Obstacles | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, Local) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Inform LEAs of plans to collect teacher evaluation data via the Employed Educator Report (EER)* for SY 2009-10 | January 2010 | Office of Educator Licensure and Accreditation (OELA) at OSSE | N/A | None | N/A |
| 2 | Assess current LEA ability to provide responses to the required descriptor | January 2010 | OELA at OSSE | N/A | None | N/A |
| 3 | Release web-based EER system (To be referred to as TQAS/EQAS herein) inclusive of teacher evaluation data requests (SY 2009-10 will serve as pilot year for the collection of evaluation related data) | April 2010 | OELA at OSSE; Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCTO) | OELA budget would need to be appropriately loaded to establish procurement authority for needed services to create a web-based data collection tool | See budget breakout | Local |
| 4 | Preliminary TQAS/EQAS information due from LEAs | June 2010 | OELA at OSSE | Compliance Issues for LEAs that do not submit their data. | None | N/A |
| 5 | TQAS/EQAS validation to be conducted by OSSE | July 2010 | OELA at OSSE | None | None | N/A |
| 6 | Final TQAS/EQAS data due from LEAs (to permit the inclusion of | August 2010 | OELA at OSSE | Compliance issues for LEAs that do not submit | None | N/A |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | year-end DC-CAS results in evaluation responses) | | | | | |
| 7 | Make necessary adjustments to the TQAS/EQAS based on feedback received during the 2009-10 reporting year | October 2010 | OELA at OSSE | None | See budget breakout | Local |
| 8 | Release SY 2010-11 TQAS/EQAS | November 2010 | OELA at OSSE | None | None | N/A |
| 9 | Preliminary TQAS/EQAS information due from LEAs | June 2011 | OELA at OSSE | Compliance issues for LEAs that do not submit | None | N/A |
| 10 | TQAS/EQAS validation to be conducted by OSSE | July 2011 | OELA at OSSE | None | None | N/A |
| 11 | Final TQAS/EQAS data due from LEAs (to permit the inclusion of year-end DC-CAS results in evaluation responses) | August 2011 | OELA at OSSE | Compliance issues for LEAs that do not submit | None | N/A |
| 12 | Publically report TQAS/EQAS results inclusive of teacher/principal evaluation data | September | OELA at OSSE; OCTO | None | None | N/A |

*OSSE currently collects educator quality data via the annual Employed Educator Report (EER) that serves as the foundation for collecting highly qualified teacher data, as well as data on other school-based instructional staff including school administrators, service providers and paraprofessionals. The EER provides the state with educator experience, licensure, assignment and qualification data to name a few. We are in the process of moving the EER from an Excel spreadsheet to a web-based environment (referred to as the Teacher Quality Assessment System (TQAS)/Educator Quality Assessment System (EQAS)) in an effort to reduce collection burden on LEAs and reporting burden on OSSE staff. Since the EER (soon to be the TQAS/EQAS) is the known vehicle to LEAs for the collection of educator quality data, OSSE plans to include the descriptors and indicators above in the 2008-09 EER collection process.

**Part 2: General Requirements**

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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement | Capacity |
|---|---|---|
| OSSE/OELA | OELA is the primary office responsible for collecting and disseminating educator quality data. | OELA brings program and data collection requirement expertise to the project while OCTO brings technological expertise to the project. OELA has collected statewide educator quality data since 2002 and therefore has significant institutional knowledge of educator quality reporting requirements. |
| OSSE/Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) and OCTO | OCIO and OCTO are the primary offices responsible for technology and website updating. | OCTO is the citywide office that manages all significant technological builds and serves as the gatekeeper on these projects to avoid duplication of effort among various agencies, as well as provide information on the city's infrastructure and ability to meet agency technology needs. |

**(A)** 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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement |
|---|---|
| Vendor to be selected | Will build educator quality web-based reporting system. |

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

| Item/ Category | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, |
|---|---|---|

| | | | | State, or Local) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Creation of TQAS/EQAS | Qty | Rate x mo. | Cost | Based on competitive federal funding award |
| Project Manager | 1 | $125 x 8 = | $220,000 | |
| Business Analyst | 2 | $100 x 7 = | $224,000 | |
| Solution Architect | 1 | $130 x 8 = | $166,400 | |
| Database Administrator | 1 | $ 95 x 5 = | $ 76,000 | |
| Technical Writer | 1 | $ 75 x 6 = | $ 72,000 | |
| Software Developer | 2 | $ 95 x 3 = | $ 91,200 | |
| OCM Specialist | 1 | $100 x 5 = | $ 80,000 | |
| Integration Developer | 1 | $115 x 3 = | $ 55,200 | |
| | | | | In the event federal funding is not secured, OSSE has budgeted estimated local funds of $265,000 towards the first year of system development. This reflects a substantial funding issue if federal funds are not awarded. |

**(C)** 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).

Per the ESEA report card requirements for states, LEAs and schools, OSSE currently publically reports highly qualified teacher data, and teacher and principal licensure data via a state website at http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/. The specific link for educator quality data is http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/2007-2008%20HQT%20Report%20Card%20Data(vf).pdf. As a result of the TQAS/EQAS, included in this data collection will be the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level.

| **Method(s) for Publicly Reporting the Plan and the State's Progress Reports on its Plans** | **Means** | **Frequency** (i.e. quarterly, semi-annually, specific dates) | **Website Address** |
|---|---|---|---|
| OELA will provide implementation updates. | The OELA website will include an Educator Quality to provide one location | Quarterly | http://www.osse.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view,a,1224,q,562481.asp |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | where all stakeholders may visit to review progress, respond to surveys (such as a survey on common evaluation rating language), and offer other feedback on the project. | | |

**Part 3: Plan Element Verification**

Please fill out the following chart to indicate whether your state plan addresses how the State will collect and/or publicly report data.

| Element | Collection (check if applies) | Public Reporting (check if applies) |
|---|---|---|
| **Indicator (a) (4)** | X | X |

# SFSF Phase II State Plan

# Appendix E

**Indicator: (a)(5)**

**State Plan Author:** Erika Lomax

**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:

**Part 1: Action Plan**

Describe 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 vision for evaluation is to catalyze development of strong systems for human capital management, taking into account the starting point of each LEA. For example, DCPS is considered a leading district in the realm of teacher/principal evaluation as a result of its IMPACT system, a system which uses student growth data for teacher/principal evaluation and human capital decisions, and its Teaching and Learning Framework, a rubric-based framework that outlines teacher competencies for effective planning, teaching, and improvement. IMPACT is a system for evaluation that combines teacher performance based on student growth with performance on aspects of the Teaching and Learning Framework and other indicators to generate a score for effectiveness.

On the other hand, most charter LEAs, in contrast, are at a different point in their evolution. In addition to building student-level data systems, Charter LEAs need support in developing evaluations linked to a newly defined growth measure and in building robust systems for managing their workforce. As a result, the Performance Management Framework (PMF) of the Public Charter School Board was introduced in January 2009 as a pilot and is currently being rolled out. The PMF was designed to create a consistent measure of quality performance of teacher and principals across charter schools.

OSSE currently publically reports highly qualified teacher data, and teacher and principal licensure data via a state website at http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/. The specific link for educator quality data is http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/2007-2008%20HQT%20Report%20Card%20Data(vf).pdf. We will use the same process to publically report responses to the descriptors and indicators outlined above. Through this data collection system 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 will be publically reported for each school in the LEA.

The following timeline provides a schedule for the development of the data collection system for this plan (TQAS/EQAS*):

| # | Milestone | Due Date | Responsible Office | Potential Obstacles | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, Local) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Inform LEAs of plans to collect principal evaluation data via the Employed Educator Report (EER)* for SY 2009-10 | January 2010 | Office of Educator Licensure and Accreditation (OELA) at OSSE | N/A | None | N/A |
| 2 | Assess current LEA ability to provide responses to the required descriptor | January 2010 | OELA at OSSE | N/A | None | N/A |
| 3 | Release web-based EER system (To be referred to as TQAS/EQAS herein) inclusive of principal evaluation data requests (SY 2009-10 will serve as pilot year for the collection of evaluation related data) | April 2010 | OELA at OSSE; Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCTO) | OELA budget would need to be appropriately loaded to establish procurement authority for needed services to create a web-based data collection tool | See budget breakout | Local |
| 4 | Preliminary TQAS/EQAS information due from LEAs | June 2010 | OELA at OSSE | Compliance Issues for LEAs that do not submit their data. | None | N/A |
| 5 | TQAS/EQAS validation to be conducted by OSSE | July 2010 | OELA at OSSE | None | None | N/A |
| 6 | Final TQAS/EQAS data due from LEAs (to permit the inclusion of year-end | August 2010 | OELA at OSSE | Compliance issues for LEAs that do not submit | None | N/A |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | DC-CAS results in evaluation responses) | | | | | |
| 7 | Make necessary adjustments to the TQAS/EQAS based on feedback received during the 2009-10 reporting year | October 2010 | OELA at OSSE | None | See budget breakout | Local |
| 8 | Release SY 2010-11 TQAS/EQAS | November 2010 | OELA at OSSE | None | None | N/A |
| 9 | Preliminary TQAS/EQAS information due from LEAs | June 2011 | OELA at OSSE | Compliance issues for LEAs that do not submit | None | N/A |
| 10 | TQAS/EQAS validation to be conducted by OSSE | July 2011 | OELA at OSSE | None | None | N/A |
| 11 | Final TQAS/EQAS data due from LEAs (to permit the inclusion of year-end DC-CAS results in evaluation responses) | August 2011 | OELA at OSSE | Compliance issues for LEAs that do not submit | None | N/A |
| 12 | Publically report TQAS/EQAS results inclusive of teacher/principal evaluation data | September | OELA at OSSE; OCTO | None | None | N/A |

*OSSE currently collects educator quality data via the annual Employed Educator Report (EER) that serves as the foundation for collecting highly qualified teacher data, as well as data on other school-based instructional staff including school administrators, service providers and paraprofessionals. The EER provides the state with educator experience, licensure, assignment and qualification data to name a few. We are in the process of moving the EER from an Excel spreadsheet to a web-based environment (referred to as the Teacher Quality Assessment System (TQAS)/Educator Quality Assessment System (EQAS)) in an effort to reduce collection burden on LEAs and reporting burden on OSSE staff. Since the EER (soon to be the TQAS/EQAS) is the known vehicle to LEAs for the collection of educator quality data, OSSE plans to include the descriptors and indicators above in the 2008-09 EER collection process.

**Part 2: 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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement | Capacity |
|---|---|---|
| OSSE/OELA | OELA is the primary office responsible for collecting and disseminating educator quality data. | OELA brings program and data collection requirement expertise to the project while OCTO brings technological expertise to the project. OELA has collected statewide educator quality data since 2002 and therefore has significant institutional knowledge of educator quality reporting requirements. |
| OSSE/Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) and OCTO | OCIO and OCTO are the primary offices responsible for technology and website updating. | OCTO is the citywide office that manages all significant technological builds and serves as the gatekeeper on these projects to avoid duplication of effort among various agencies, as well as provide information on the city's infrastructure and ability to meet agency technology needs. |

**(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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement |
|---|---|
| Vendor to be selected | Will build educator quality web-based reporting system. |

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

| Item/ Category | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, or Local) |
|---|---|---|
| Creation of TQAS/EQAS<br>Project Manager<br>Business Analyst<br>Solution Architect<br>Database Administrator<br>Technical Writer<br>Software Developer<br>OCM Specialist<br>Integration Developer | Qty Rate x mo. Cost<br>1 $125 x 8 = $220,000<br>2 $100 x 7 = $224,000<br>1 $130 x 8 = $166,400<br>1 $ 95 x 5 = $ 76,000<br>1 $ 75 x 6 = $ 72,000<br>2 $ 95 x 3 = $ 91,200<br>1 $100 x 5 = $ 80,000<br>1 $115 x 3 = $ 55,200 | Based on competitive federal funding award |
| | | In the event federal funding is not secured, OSSE has budgeted estimated local funds of $265,000 towards the first year of system development. This reflects a substantial funding issue if federal funds are not awarded. |

**(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).

Per the ESEA report card requirements for states, LEAs and schools, OSSE currently publically reports highly qualified teacher data, and teacher and principal licensure data via a state website at http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/. The specific link for educator quality data is http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/2007-2008%20HQT%20Report%20Card%20Data(vf).pdf. As a result of the TQAS/EQAS, included in this data collection will be the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level and publically reported for each school in the LEA.

| Method(s) for Publicly Reporting the Plan and the State's Progress Reports on its Plans | Means | Frequency (i.e. quarterly, semi-annually, specific dates) | Website Address |
|---|---|---|---|
| OELA will provide implementation updates. | The OELA website will include an Educator Quality to | Quarterly | http://www.osse.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view,a,1224,q,562481.asp |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | provide one location where all stakeholders may visit to review progress, respond to surveys (such as a survey on common evaluation rating language), and offer other feedback on the project. | | |

**Part 3: Plan Element Verification (applicable for assurances A, C (except C11 & C12), and D)**

Please fill out the following chart to indicate whether your state plan addresses how the State will collect and/or publicly report data.

| Element | Collection (check if applies) | Public Reporting (check if applies) |
|---|---|---|
| **Indicator (a) (5)** | X | X |

# SFSF Phase II State Plan

# Appendix F

**Descriptor: (a)(2)**

**State Plan Author:** Erika Lomax

**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:

**Part 1: Action Plan**

Describe 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 publically report (as required) the data or information, including:

The vision for evaluation is to catalyze development of strong systems for human capital management, taking into account the starting point of each LEA. For example, DCPS is considered a leading district in the realm of teacher/principal evaluation as a result of its IMPACT system, a system which uses student growth data for teacher/principal evaluation and human capital decisions, and its Teaching and Learning Framework, a rubric-based framework that outlines teacher competencies for effective planning, teaching, and improvement. IMPACT is a system for evaluation that combines teacher performance based on student growth with performance on aspects of the Teaching and Learning Framework and other indicators to generate a score for effectiveness.

On the other hand, most charter LEAs, in contrast, are at a different point in their evolution. In addition to building student-level data systems, Charter LEAs need support in developing evaluations linked to a newly defined growth measure and in building robust systems for managing their workforce. As a result, the Performance Management Framework (PMF) of the Public Charter School Board was introduced in January 2009 as a pilot and is currently being rolled out. The PMF was designed to create a consistent measure of quality performance of teacher and principals across charter schools.

OSSE currently publically reports highly qualified teacher data, and teacher and principal licensure data via a state website at http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/. The specific link for educator quality data is http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/2007-2008%20HQT%20Report%20Card%20Data(vf).pdf. We will use the same process to publically report responses to the descriptors and indicators outlined above. **Based on the two performance evaluation systems, the information that is generated and reported into the TQAS/EQAS* will provide more promising data that can better inform human capital decisions regarding teacher or principal development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal.**

The following timeline provides a schedule for the development of the data collection system (TQAS/EQAS)*:

| # | Milestone | Due Date | Responsible Office | Potential Obstacles | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, Local) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Inform LEAs of plans to collect principal evaluation data via the Employed Educator Report (EER)* for SY 2009-10 | January 2010 | Office of Educator Licensure and Accreditation (OELA) at OSSE | N/A | None | N/A |
| 2 | Assess current LEA ability to provide responses to the required descriptor | January 2010 | OELA at OSSE | N/A | None | N/A |
| 3 | Release web-based EER system (To be referred to as TQAS/EQAS herein) inclusive of principal evaluation data requests (SY 2009-10 will serve as pilot year for the collection of evaluation related data) | April 2010 | OELA at OSSE; Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCTO) | OELA budget would need to be appropriately loaded to establish procurement authority for needed services to create a web-based data collection tool | See budget breakout | Local |
| 4 | Preliminary TQAS/EQAS information due from LEAs | June 2010 | OELA at OSSE | Compliance Issues for LEAs that do not submit their data. | None | N/A |
| 5 | TQAS/EQAS validation to be conducted by OSSE | July 2010 | OELA at OSSE | None | None | N/A |
| 6 | Final TQAS/EQAS data due from LEAs (to permit the inclusion of year-end DC-CAS results in evaluation responses) | August 2010 | OELA at OSSE | Compliance issues for LEAs that do not submit | None | N/A |
| 7 | Make necessary adjustments to the TQAS/EQAS based on feedback | October 2010 | OELA at OSSE | None | See budget breakout | Local |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | received during the 2009-10 reporting year | | | | | |
| 8 | Release SY 2010-11 TQAS/EQAS | November 2010 | OELA at OSSE | None | None | N/A |
| 9 | Preliminary TQAS/EQAS information due from LEAs | June 2011 | OELA at OSSE | Compliance issues for LEAs that do not submit | None | N/A |
| 10 | TQAS/EQAS validation to be conducted by OSSE | July 2011 | OELA at OSSE | None | None | N/A |
| 11 | Final TQAS/EQAS data due from LEAs (to permit the inclusion of year-end DC-CAS results in evaluation responses) | August 2011 | OELA at OSSE | Compliance issues for LEAs that do not submit | None | N/A |
| 12 | Publically report TQAS/EQAS results inclusive of teacher/principal evaluation data | September | OELA at OSSE; OCTO | None | None | N/A |

*OSSE currently collects educator quality data via the annual Employed Educator Report (EER) that serves as the foundation for collecting highly qualified teacher data, as well as data on other school-based instructional staff including school administrators, service providers and paraprofessionals. The EER provides the state with educator experience, licensure, assignment and qualification data to name a few. We are in the process of moving the EER from an Excel spreadsheet to a web-based environment (referred to as the Teacher Quality Assessment System (TQAS)/Educator Quality Assessment System (EQAS)) in an effort to reduce collection burden on LEAs and reporting burden on OSSE staff. Since the EER (soon to be the TQAS/EQAS) is the known vehicle to LEAs for the collection of educator quality data, OSSE plans to include the descriptors and indicators above in the 2008-09 EER collection process.

**Part 2: General Requirements**

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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement | Capacity |
|---|---|---|
| OSSE/OELA | OELA is the primary office responsible for collecting and disseminating educator quality data. | OELA brings program and data collection requirement expertise to the project while OCTO brings technological |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | expertise to the project. OELA has collected statewide educator quality data since 2002 and therefore has significant institutional knowledge of educator quality reporting requirements. |
| OSSE/Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) and OCTO | OCIO and OCTO are the primary offices responsible for technology and website updating. | OCTO is the citywide office that manages all significant technological builds and serves as the gatekeeper on these projects to avoid duplication of effort among various agencies, as well as provide information on the city's infrastructure and ability to meet agency technology needs. |

**(A)** 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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement |
|---|---|
| Vendor to be selected | Will build educator quality web-based reporting system. |

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

| Item/ Category | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, or Local) |
|---|---|---|
| Creation of TQAS/EQAS<br>Project Manager<br>Business Analyst<br>Solution Architect<br>Database Administrator<br>Technical Writer<br>Software Developer<br>OCM Specialist<br>Integration Developer | Qty Rate x mo. Cost<br>1 $125 x 8 = $220,000<br>2 $100 x 7 = $224,000<br>1 $130 x 8 = $166,400<br>1 $ 95 x 5 = $ 76,000<br>1 $ 75 x 6 = $ 72,000<br>2 $ 95 x 3 = $ 91,200<br>1 $100 x 5 = $ 80,000<br>1 $115 x 3 = $ 55,200 | Based on competitive federal funding award |
| | | In the event federal funding is not secured, OSSE has budgeted estimated local |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | funds of $265,000 towards the first year of system development. This reflects a substantial funding issue if federal funds are not awarded. |

**(C)** 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).

Per the ESEA report card requirements for states, LEAs and schools, OSSE currently publically reports highly qualified teacher data, and teacher and principal licensure data via a state website at http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/. The specific link for educator quality data is http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/2007-2008%20HQT%20Report%20Card%20Data(vf).pdf.

| **Method(s) for Publicly Reporting the Plan and the State's Progress Reports on its Plans** | **Means** | **Frequency** (i.e. quarterly, semi-annually, specific dates) | **Website Address** |
|---|---|---|---|
| OELA will provide implementation updates. | The OELA website will include an Educator Quality to provide one location where all stakeholders may visit to review progress, respond to surveys (such as a survey on common evaluation rating language), and offer other feedback on the project. | Quarterly | http://www.osse.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view,a,1224,q,562481.asp |

**Part 3: Plan Element Verification**

Please fill out the following chart to indicate whether your state plan addresses how the State will collect and/or publicly report data.

| Element | Collection (check if applies) | Public Reporting (check if applies) |
|---|---|---|
| **Descriptor (a) (2)** | X | X |

# SFSF Phase II State Plan

# Appendix G

**Indicator: (a)(6)**

**State Plan Author:** Erika Lomax

**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:

**Part 1: Action Plan**

Describe 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 vision for evaluation is to catalyze development of strong systems for human capital management, taking into account the starting point of each LEA. For example, DCPS is considered a leading district in the realm of teacher evaluation as a result of its IMPACT system, ***a system which uses student growth data for teacher/principal evaluation and human capital decisions***, and its Teaching and Learning Framework, a rubric-based framework that outlines teacher competencies for effective planning, teaching, and improvement.

On the other hand, most charter LEAs, in contrast, are at a different point in their evolution. In addition to building student-level data systems, Charter LEAs need support in developing ***evaluations linked to a newly defined growth measure*** and in building robust systems for managing their workforce. As a result, the Performance Management Framework (PMF) of the Public Charter School Board was introduced in January 2009 as a pilot and is currently being rolled out. The PMF was designed to create a consistent measure of quality performance of teacher and principals across charter schools.

OSSE currently publically reports highly qualified teacher data, and teacher and principal licensure data via a state website at http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/. The specific link for educator quality data is http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/2007-2008%20HQT%20Report%20Card%20Data(vf).pdf. We will use the same process to publically report responses to the descriptors and indicators outlined above.

The following timeline provides a schedule for the development of the data collection system (TQAS/EQAS*):

| # | Milestone | Due Date | Responsible Office | Potential Obstacles | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, Local) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Inform LEAs of plans to collect principal evaluation data via the Employed Educator Report (EER)* for SY 2009-10 | January 2010 | Office of Educator Licensure and Accreditation (OELA) at OSSE | N/A | None | N/A |
| 2 | Assess current LEA ability to provide responses to the required descriptor | January 2010 | OELA at OSSE | N/A | None | N/A |
| 3 | Release web-based EER system (To be referred to as TQAS/EQAS herein) inclusive of principal evaluation data requests (SY 2009-10 will serve as pilot year for the collection of evaluation related data) | April 2010 | OELA at OSSE; Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCTO) | OELA budget would need to be appropriately loaded to establish procurement authority for needed services to create a web-based data collection tool | See budget breakout | Local |
| 4 | Preliminary TQAS/EQAS information due from LEAs | June 2010 | OELA at OSSE | Compliance Issues for LEAs that do not submit their data. | None | N/A |
| 5 | TQAS/EQAS validation to be conducted by OSSE | July 2010 | OELA at OSSE | None | None | N/A |
| 6 | Final TQAS/EQAS data due from LEAs (to permit the inclusion of year-end DC-CAS results in evaluation responses) | August 2010 | OELA at OSSE | Compliance issues for LEAs that do not submit | None | N/A |
| 7 | Make necessary adjustments to the | October 2010 | OELA at OSSE | None | See budget | Local |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | TQAS/EQAS based on feedback received during the 2009-10 reporting year | | | | breakout | |
| 8 | Release SY 2010-11 TQAS/EQAS | November 2010 | OELA at OSSE | None | None | N/A |
| 9 | Preliminary TQAS/EQAS information due from LEAs | June 2011 | OELA at OSSE | Compliance issues for LEAs that do not submit | None | N/A |
| 10 | TQAS/EQAS validation to be conducted by OSSE | July 2011 | OELA at OSSE | None | None | N/A |
| 11 | Final TQAS/EQAS data due from LEAs (to permit the inclusion of year-end DC-CAS results in evaluation responses) | August 2011 | OELA at OSSE | Compliance issues for LEAs that do not submit | None | N/A |
| 12 | Publically report TQAS/EQAS results inclusive of teacher/principal evaluation data | September | OELA at OSSE; OCTO | None | None | N/A |

*OSSE currently collects educator quality data via the annual Employed Educator Report (EER) that serves as the foundation for collecting highly qualified teacher data, as well as data on other school-based instructional staff including school administrators, service providers and paraprofessionals. The EER provides the state with educator experience, licensure, assignment and qualification data to name a few. We are in the process of moving the EER from an Excel spreadsheet to a web-based environment (referred to as the Teacher Quality Assessment System (TQAS)/Educator Quality Assessment System (EQAS)) in an effort to reduce collection burden on LEAs and reporting burden on OSSE staff. Since the EER (soon to be the TQAS/EQAS) is the known vehicle to LEAs for the collection of educator quality data, OSSE plans to include the descriptors and indicators above in the 2008-09 EER collection process.

**Part 2: 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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement | Capacity |
|---|---|---|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| OSSE/OELA | OELA is the primary office responsible for collecting and disseminating educator quality data. | OELA brings program and data collection requirement expertise to the project while OCTO brings technological expertise to the project. OELA has collected statewide educator quality data since 2002 and therefore has significant institutional knowledge of educator quality reporting requirements. |
| OSSE/Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) and OCTO | OCIO and OCTO are the primary offices responsible for technology and website updating. | OCTO is the citywide office that manages all significant technological builds and serves as the gatekeeper on these projects to avoid duplication of effort among various agencies, as well as provide information on the city's infrastructure and ability to meet agency technology needs. |

**(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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement |
|---|---|
| Vendor to be selected | Will build educator quality web-based reporting system. |

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

| Item/ Category | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, or Local) |
|---|---|---|
| Creation of TQAS/EQAS | Qty Rate x mo. Cost | Based on competitive federal funding award |
| Project Manager | 1 $125 x 8 = $220,000 | |
| Business Analyst | 2 $100 x 7 = $224,000 | |
| Solution Architect | 1 $130 x 8 = $166,400 | |
| Database Administrator | 1 $ 95 x 5 = $ 76,000 | |
| Technical Writer | 1 $ 75 x 6 = $ 72,000 | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Software Developer<br>OCM Specialist<br>Integration Developer | 2 $ 95 x 3 = $ 91,200<br>1 $100 x 5 = $ 80,000<br>1 $115 x 3 = $ 55,200 | |
| | | In the event federal funding is not secured, OSSE has budgeted estimated local funds of $265,000 towards the first year of system development. This reflects a substantial funding issue if federal funds are not awarded. |

**(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).

Per the ESEA report card requirements for states, LEAs and schools, OSSE currently publically reports highly qualified teacher data, and teacher and principal licensure data via a state website at http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/. The specific link for educator quality data is http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/2007-2008%20HQT%20Report%20Card%20Data(vf).pdf. As a result of the TQAS/EQAS, included in this data collection will be the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level and publically reported for each school in the LEA.

| **Method(s) for Publicly Reporting the Plan and the State's Progress Reports on its Plans** | **Means** | **Frequency** (i.e. quarterly, semi-annually, specific dates) | **Website Address** |
|---|---|---|---|
| OELA will provide implementation updates. | The OELA website will include an Educator Quality to provide one location where all stakeholders may visit to review progress, respond to surveys (such as a survey on common evaluation rating | Quarterly | http://www.osse.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view,a,1224,q,562481.asp |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | language), and offer other feedback on the project. | | |

**Part 3: Plan Element Verification**

Please fill out the following chart to indicate whether your state plan addresses how the State will collect and/or publicly report data.

| Element | Collection (check if applies) | Public Reporting (check if applies) |
|---|---|---|
| **Indicator (a)(6)** | X | X |

# SFSF Phase II State Plan

# Appendix H

**Indicator: (a)(7)**

**State Plan Author:** Erika Lomax

**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:

**Part 1: Action Plan**

Describe 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 vision for evaluation is to catalyze development of strong systems for human capital management, taking into account the starting point of each LEA. For example, DCPS is considered a leading district in the realm of teacher/principal evaluation as a result of its IMPACT system, a system which uses student growth data for teacher/principal evaluation and human capital decisions, and its Teaching and Learning Framework, a rubric-based framework that outlines teacher competencies for effective planning, teaching, and improvement. IMPACT is a system for evaluation that combines teacher performance based on student growth with performance on aspects of the Teaching and Learning Framework and other indicators to generate a score for effectiveness.

On the other hand, most charter LEAs, in contrast, are at a different point in their evolution. In addition to building student-level data systems, Charter LEAs need support in developing evaluations linked to a newly defined growth measure and in building robust systems for managing their workforce. As a result, the Performance Management Framework (PMF) of the Public Charter School Board was introduced in January 2009 as a pilot and is currently being rolled out. The PMF was designed to create a consistent measure of quality performance of teacher and principals across charter schools.

OSSE currently publically reports highly qualified teacher data, and teacher and principal licensure data via a state website at http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/. The specific link for educator quality data is http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/2007-2008%20HQT%20Report%20Card%20Data(vf).pdf. We will use the same process to publically report responses to the descriptors and indicators outlined above. Through this data collection system each LEA in the State whose teachers/principals 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 will be reported herein.

The following timeline provides a schedule for the development of the data collection system (TQAS/EQAS*):

| # | Milestone | Due Date | Responsible Office | Potential Obstacles | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, Local) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Inform LEAs of plans to collect principal evaluation data via the Employed Educator Report (EER)* for SY 2009-10 | January 2010 | Office of Educator Licensure and Accreditation (OELA) at OSSE | N/A | None | N/A |
| 2 | Assess current LEA ability to provide responses to the required descriptor | January 2010 | OELA at OSSE | N/A | None | N/A |
| 3 | Release web-based EER system (To be referred to as TQAS/EQAS herein) inclusive of principal evaluation data requests (SY 2009-10 will serve as pilot year for the collection of evaluation related data) | April 2010 | OELA at OSSE; Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCTO) | OELA budget would need to be appropriately loaded to establish procurement authority for needed services to create a web-based data collection tool | See budget breakout | Local |
| 4 | Preliminary TQAS/EQAS information due from LEAs | June 2010 | OELA at OSSE | Compliance Issues for LEAs that do not submit their data. | None | N/A |
| 5 | TQAS/EQAS validation to be conducted by OSSE | July 2010 | OELA at OSSE | None | None | N/A |
| 6 | Final TQAS/EQAS data due from LEAs (to permit the inclusion of year-end DC-CAS results in evaluation responses) | August 2010 | OELA at OSSE | Compliance issues for LEAs that do not submit | None | N/A |
| 7 | Make necessary adjustments to the TQAS/EQAS based on feedback | October 2010 | OELA at OSSE | None | See budget breakout | Local |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | received during the 2009-10 reporting year | | | | | |
| 8 | Release SY 2010-11 TQAS/EQAS | November 2010 | OELA at OSSE | None | None | N/A |
| 9 | Preliminary TQAS/EQAS information due from LEAs | June 2011 | OELA at OSSE | Compliance issues for LEAs that do not submit | None | N/A |
| 10 | TQAS/EQAS validation to be conducted by OSSE | July 2011 | OELA at OSSE | None | None | N/A |
| 11 | Final TQAS/EQAS data due from LEAs (to permit the inclusion of year-end DC-CAS results in evaluation responses) | August 2011 | OELA at OSSE | Compliance issues for LEAs that do not submit | None | N/A |
| 12 | Publically report TQAS/EQAS results inclusive of teacher/principal evaluation data | September | OELA at OSSE; OCTO | None | None | N/A |

*OSSE currently collects educator quality data via the annual Employed Educator Report (EER) that serves as the foundation for collecting highly qualified teacher data, as well as data on other school-based instructional staff including school administrators, service providers and paraprofessionals. The EER provides the state with educator experience, licensure, assignment and qualification data to name a few. We are in the process of moving the EER from an Excel spreadsheet to a web-based environment (referred to as the Teacher Quality Assessment System (TQAS)/Educator Quality Assessment System (EQAS)) in an effort to reduce collection burden on LEAs and reporting burden on OSSE staff. Since the EER (soon to be the TQAS/EQAS) is the known vehicle to LEAs for the collection of educator quality data, OSSE plans to include the descriptors and indicators above in the 2008-09 EER collection process.

**Part 2: General Requirements**

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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement | Capacity |
|---|---|---|
| OSSE/OELA | OELA is the primary office responsible for collecting and disseminating educator quality data. | OELA brings program and data collection requirement expertise to the project while OCTO brings technological |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | expertise to the project. OELA has collected statewide educator quality data since 2002 and therefore has significant institutional knowledge of educator quality reporting requirements. |
| OSSE/Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) and OCTO | OCIO and OCTO are the primary offices responsible for technology and website updating. | OCTO is the citywide office that manages all significant technological builds and serves as the gatekeeper on these projects to avoid duplication of effort among various agencies, as well as provide information on the city's infrastructure and ability to meet agency technology needs. |

**(A)** 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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement |
|---|---|
| Vendor to be selected | Will build educator quality web-based reporting system. |

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

| Item/ Category | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, or Local) |
|---|---|---|
| Creation of TQAS/EQAS<br>Project Manager<br>Business Analyst<br>Solution Architect<br>Database Administrator<br>Technical Writer<br>Software Developer<br>OCM Specialist<br>Integration Developer | Qty Rate x mo. Cost<br>1 $125 x 8 = $220,000<br>2 $100 x 7 = $224,000<br>1 $130 x 8 = $166,400<br>1 $ 95 x 5 = $ 76,000<br>1 $ 75 x 6 = $ 72,000<br>2 $ 95 x 3 = $ 91,200<br>1 $100 x 5 = $ 80,000<br>1 $115 x 3 = $ 55,200 | Based on competitive federal funding award |
| | | In the event federal funding is not secured, OSSE has budgeted |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | estimated local funds of $265,000 towards the first year of system development. This reflects a substantial funding issue if federal funds are not awarded. |

**(C)** 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).

Per the ESEA report card requirements for states, LEAs and schools, OSSE currently publically reports highly qualified teacher data, and teacher and principal licensure data via a state website at http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/. The specific link for educator quality data is http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/2007-2008%20HQT%20Report%20Card%20Data(vf).pdf. As a result of the TQAS/EQAS, included in this data collection will be the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of principals rated at each performance rating or level.

| **Method(s) for Publicly Reporting the Plan and the State's Progress Reports on its Plans** | **Means** | **Frequency** (i.e. quarterly, semi-annually, specific dates) | **Website Address** |
|---|---|---|---|
| OELA will provide implementation updates. | The OELA website will include an Educator Quality to provide one location where all stakeholders may visit to review progress, respond to surveys (such as a survey on common evaluation rating language), and offer other feedback on the project. | Quarterly | http://www.osse.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view,a,1224,q,562481.asp |

**Part 3: Plan Element Verification**

Please fill out the following chart to indicate whether your state plan addresses how the State will collect and/or publicly report data.

| Element | Collection (check if applies) | Public Reporting (check if applies) |
|---|---|---|
| **Indicator (a) (7)** | X | X |

# SFSF Phase II State Plan

# Appendix I

**Indicator: (b)(1)**

**State Plan Author:** Gretchen Guffy

**State 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:

**Overview of SLED**

In August 2007, the DC Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) was awarded funds to build and implement a Longitudinal Data System (LDS) to support informed decision making and continuous improvement at all levels of the education system. Since then, OSSE has used these funds to begin building a Statewide Longitudinal Education Data warehouse (SLED) that ultimately will incorporate all required capabilities and key elements of a LDS as outlined by the America COMPETES Act. OSSE has also requested additional funds, via the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009, to build on the original 2007 LDS project plan to support the creation, enhancement and/or linkage of systems within the OSSE's SLED. The creation and/or expansion of each of these systems within the SLED enables DC to create a comprehensive system that promotes the generation and use of accurate and timely data; simplifies the processes used by OSSE to make data transparent to all stakeholders; facilitates research to improve student achievement and close achievement gaps; and encourages sophisticated and informed decision-making at all levels of the education system.

**Part 1: Action Plan**

Describe the process and timeline for achieving the ability to implement the means to fully collect and/or publicly report (as required) the date or information by September 30, 2011

| # | Milestone | Due Date | Responsible Office | Potential Obstacles* | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, Local) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | *Completion of USIs and enrollment for the 2009/10 school year* | *June 2010* | *Office of the State Superintendent of Education* | | | *Federal (2007 LDS Grant), State and Local* |
| 2 | *USIs and Enrollment for 2008/09 – 2010/11 data* | December 2010 | *Office of the State Superintendent of Education* | | | |
| 2 | *Assessments and Graduation Status* | December 2010 | *Office of the State Superintendent of Education* | | | *Federal (2007 LEDS Grant) State and Local* |
| 3 | *Attendance, Courses, Schedules, Safety and Discipline, Grades/GPA* | June 2012 | *Office of the State Superintendent of Education* | | | *State and Local* |
| 4 | *Early Childhood and Adult Education USIs, College Enrollment and Persistence, Electronic Transcript* | December 2012 | *Office of the State Superintendent of Education* | | | *State and Local* |
| 5 | *Teacher Data (Early Childhood Provider Performance, Kindergarten Readiness Assessment, Out of School Time* | June 2013 | *Office of the State Superintendent of Education* | | | *State and Local* |

**Part 2: Evidence**

**Describe 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.**

Although OSSE has made advancements in developing the Statewide Longitudinal Education Data warehouse (SLED), a significant amount of work remains to be done in order to achieve the long-term goals of the 2007 grant and the mission of the LDS program. Unfortunately, vendor issues necessitated that OSSE terminate the contract with its prime vendor in September 2009. Consequently, the project's progress has been significantly interrupted. After terminating the contract, OSSE procured an external assessment of the SLED including an analysis of the current technology platform and architecture, capabilities and functionality of the system, and the overall program direction.

Despite these temporary set backs, the District is committed to moving forward with the SLED project and the assessment of the SLED's current functionality, architecture and infrastructure will help inform the direction of the project moving forward. OSSE expects to receive the final recommendations later this month and will be briefing stakeholders on the recommended next steps and path forward. The aforementioned anticipated SLED release dates have been set and by the final release, all twelve America COMPETES elements will be integrated into the SLED.

Also critical to the success of SLED is the concurrent development and implementation of a data governance strategy. OSSE is working on defining and implementing a strategy to establish the correct organizational structure, staffing, scope, roles and responsibilities around data management at the state level. This strategy will include documenting and implementing business rules and controls around the receipt, tracking, analysis and reporting of OSSE data and bring cross-functional teams together to identify data needs and conduct a gap analysis.

The ultimate goals are:
(1) Instill a culture that views data as an asset.

(2) Apply the principles of data quality, data management, business process management, and risk management to our work.

(3) Produce data that can be used to inform decision making and education reform in the District.

**Part 3: 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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement | Capacity |
|---|---|---|
| Office of the State Superintendent of Education | Oversee and manage funding, development and roll out of SLED within the Office of the Chief of Staff, Office of the State Superintendent of Education. | The SLED team includes a Program Director, a Data Quality Manager, the Chief Information Officer, a Project Manager, an Organizational Change Management Lead, a Data and Integration Specialist, two Subject Matter Experts and a Database Manager.* |
| District of Columbia Public Schools | Provide feedback and input on policy decisions related to SLED and serve on the SLED Education Working Group team (a team that meets on a weekly basis to discuss policy concerns and issues) and the Data Quality Coalition (an executive level team that meets once a month to make policy decisions regarding SLED). | Advisors that represent and work for DC Public Schools. |
| Public Charter School Board | Provide feedback and input on policy decisions related to SLED and serve on the SLED Education Working Group team (a team that meets on a weekly basis to discuss policy concerns and issues) and the Data Quality Coalition (an executive level team that meets once a month to make policy decisions regarding SLED). | Advisors that represent and have experience with charter schools in the District. |

**Gretchen Guffy, SLED Program Director, 100% Effort**
Ms. Guffy has over 10 years of experience working in public education and managing policy initiatives. Ms. Guffy's particular interest is in using data at the school level to create strategies to improve student achievement; thorough experience developing and implementing tools such as district data dashboards and school scorecards to help drive decision-making. As the SLED Program Director, Ms. Guffy directs all liaison activities with users and works to create SLED support and buy-in from internal and external constituents. She is responsible for planning, monitoring and maintaining the personnel management functions as well as for managing SLED's overall scope, time, cost and quality. Ms. Guffy manages the security and data governance policy and facilitates integration and communication across the SLED team, internal and external party stakeholders.

**Nancy Sharkey, Ed.D., Data Quality Manager, 100% Effort**

Ms. Sharkey received her Ed.D in administration, planning, and social policy (research concentration) from the Harvard University Graduate School of Education. While at Harvard, she designed and led a workshop which guided teachers and administrators on using data for instructional improvement. The workshop, attended by Boston Public Schools personnel and Harvard University graduate students, provided the foundation for Data Wise: A Step-by-Step Guide to Using Assessment Results to Improve Teaching and Learning (Boudett, City, and Murnane, Editors, 2005). While at Harvard, Ms. Sharkey also worked intensively with the staff of a Boston-area high school to help teachers and administrators collect and interpret formative assessment data, and was part of a research team that explored how and why teachers and principals use student assessment data to inform instruction and how districts can support data-driven classroom instruction. In addition to Ms. Sharkey's work at Harvard, she has been a research associate at the Urban Institute and a sixth-grade math and science teacher. As SLED's Data Quality Manager, Ms. Sharkey is responsible for identifying and training OSSE data stewards. She oversees the data management committee, which consists of program area personnel with data and reporting responsibilities, and maintains a data collection and reporting calendar. Ms. Sharkey also facilitates collaboration between program areas and technology regarding data quality.

**Tom Fontenot, OSSE Chief Information Officer, 15% Effort**
Mr. Fontenot is an experienced IT manager with over eighteen years of extensive technology engineering and management experience supporting mission-critical information technology initiatives. As OSSE's Chief Information Officer, Mr. Fontenot is responsible for establishing a governance structure for the organizations' data and applications as well as a multi-year strategic plan for the use of technology and information assets for the organization. He directs the development, implementation and support of an information and technology architecture for the OSSE and directs a skilled staff to support the organization's data and technology.

**Dwight Franklin, 100% Effort, Project Manager**
Mr. Franklin is a seasoned project manager with over fourteen years of experience managing large-scale technology projects in both the public and private sector. Mr. Franklin has a thorough knowledge of education process reengineering and the technology systems within school and LEA organizations in the District. As the SLED Project Manager, Mr. Franklin manages the design, development, quality assurance and implementation of the SLED functionality and oversees the development, tasks and strategies for creating and maintaining education data categories, elements and dictionary definitions for the SLED. He ensures that District Government IT standards and web development processes are followed and keeps the SLED Director informed on actions that can impact project schedule, costs, or quality of deliverables.

**Bryan Kirk, 100% Effort, OSSE Education Subject Matter Expert (SME)**
Mr. Kirk is a seasoned professional who has served for over eight years as a key team member on various education and technology related projects for the District. Mr. Kirk has expertise in project management, full Software Development Life Cycles (SDLC) implementations, data quality and analysis practices, project communications and training and is knowledgeable of the District's enterprise architecture and technologies. As a SLED education subject matter expert, Mr. Kirk is providing program-level analysis of SLED efforts, developing high-level and detailed functional requirements, and supporting the project management team in meeting program objects and the development team in implementing system requirements.

**Roopa Kadiyala, 100% Effort, OSSE Education Subject Matter Expert**
Ms. Kadiyala has ten years of IT experience including over six years as a Business Analyst for multiple full life-cycle implementations for the DC Office of State Superintendent of Education. She has expertise in developing detailed design requirements, documenting business process, system design, data collection, data mapping, analysis, developing data dictionaries, developing CFDA NUMBER: 84.384 December 30 3, 2009 test cases, test scripts and performing testing. Ms. Kadiyala has a thorough understanding of State and LEA applications such as DC OneApp, Nutrition Services Application and Claims Processing Systems. In addition, she has a detailed understanding of state and federal reporting requirements such as EDFacts, Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR), USDA Reports and HEFS Performance Reports.

**Tami Martin, 100% Effort, Organizational Change Management Lead**
Ms. Martin is a seasoned organizational change management (OCM) professional and technology trainer. Ms. Martin has over 12 years of experience in both project manager and OCM manager roles supporting the deployment of large-scale enterprise technology solutions in the public and private sector. As the SLED Organizational Change Management Lead, Ms. Martin is responsible for identifying the human and organizational risks associated with the implementation of SLED and developing initiatives to drive organizational change and minimize risk. She also manages and executes the OCM plan that includes training and communication plans. Ms. Martin also is responsible for designing and developing instructor-led and eLearning training programs for end-users.

**Carl Kullback, 100%, Effort Data and Integration Specialist**
Mr. Kullback has over 15 years of experience designing and developing data models, including physical and logical models of data systems, data marts, staging areas and source systems; extracting data from disparate sources, transforming it to fit operational needs and loading the data into a database for reporting and analysis; developing data analysis algorithms and reports, communicating logical and physical database designs. As the SLED Unique Student Identifier and Direct Certification match merge algorithm Subject Matter Expert, he provides technical guidance and direction in defining project/system level information technology and data architecture strategy.

**Sreejiith Nambiar, Database Administrator, 75% Effort**
Mr. Nambiar has over 14 years experience as an Oracle database administrator/architect. Mr. Nambiar has supported various IT projects as a system planner, application architect, and system integrator in both the public and private sector. As the SLED Database Administrator, Mr. Nambiar manages the security features and assurances through control of changes made to hardware, software, firmware, and documentation throughout the life cycle of the SLED. He also designs, builds and modifies database structures and tables to support the process/data needs of end-users. He is responsible for establishing and managing a network for both the SLED production and development environment.

**(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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement |
|---|---|
| Office of the Chief Technology Office, District of Columbia Government. | Provide feedback and input on critical technical issues relating to all OSSE information technology systems, including SLED. |

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

*Unavailable at this time.*

**(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).

| **Method(s) for Publicly Reporting the Plan and the State's Progress Reports on its Plans** | **Means** | **Frequency** (i.e. quarterly, semi-annually, specific dates) | **Website Address** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Quarterly updates on the OSSE website | online | *Quarterly* | *http://osse.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view,a,1222,q,561228,seoNav_GID,1507,seoNav,%7C31195%7C,,,.asp* |

**Part 3: 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 | |

# SFSF Phase II State Plan

# Appendix J

**Indicator: (b)(2)**

**State Plan Author:** Patrick Rooney

**State Plan Instructions**:

If (as indicated in **Part 3A, Indicator (b)(2)**) 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.

**Part 1: Action Plan**

Describe the process and timeline for achieving the ability to implement the means to fully collect and/or publicly report (as required) the date or information by September 30, 2011

| # | Milestone | Due Date | Responsible Office | Potential Obstacles | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, Local) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | *SLED: Completion of uniform student identifiers and enrollment for the current year. Elements integrated:*<br>• Unique statewide student identifier (complete);<br>• Student-level enrollment, demographic and program participation information (complete); and<br>• Student-level information about the points at which students exit, transfer in, transfer out, drop | *June 2010* | *OSSE/SLED team* | *OSSE needs to award a new contract to continue the work on SLED after terminating the previous contract in September 2009* | *TBD* (see below)* | *TBD* (see below)* |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | out or complete P-16 education programs. | | | | | |
| 2 | Assessments and Graduation Status<br>***Element(s) Integrated***<br>• Yearly test records of individual students. | December 2011 | *OSSE/SLED team* | *OSSE needs to award a new contract to continue the work on SLED after terminating the previous contract in September 2009* | | |
| 3 | Attendance, Courses, Schedules, Safety and Discipline, Grades/Grade Point Average<br>***Element(s) Integrated:***<br>• Information on students not tested by grade and subject;<br>• State data audit system assessing data quality, validity and reliability; and<br>• Student-level transcript information, including information on courses completed and grades earned. | June 2012 | *OSSE/SLED team* | *OSSE needs to award a new contract to continue the work on SLED after terminating the previous contract in September 2009* | | |
| 4 | Early Childhood and Adult Education USIs, College Enrollment and Persistence, Electronic Transcript<br>***Element(s) Integrated:***<br>• Student-level college readiness scores;<br>• Capacity to communicate with higher education data systems; and<br>• Information regarding the extent to which students transition successfully from secondary school to | December 2012 | *OSSE/SLED team* | *OSSE needs to award a new contract to continue the work on SLED after terminating the previous contract in September 2009* | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | postsecondary education, including whether students enroll in remedial coursework. | | | | | |
| 5 | Teacher Data (Early Childhood Provider Performance, Kindergarten Readiness Assessment, Out of School Time<br>***Element(s) Integrated:***<br>• A teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students;.<br>• Other information determined necessary to address alignment and adequate preparation for success in postsecondary education. | June 2013 | *OSSE/SLED team* | *OSSE needs to award a new contract to continue the work on SLED after terminating the previous contract in September 2009* | | |
| 6 | Guidance to LEAs on roster validation/data review | Fall 2012-summer 2013 | OSSE (sharing best practices and lessons learned by LEAs) | NA | NA | NA |
| 7 | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | | |

* Due to problems with the original contractor and the termination of that contract in September 2009, OSSE is unable to provide specificity regarding the cost or source of funds for activities related to SLED at this time. OSSE is conducting internal reviews of the current capacity of SLED and has engaged an external IT firm to provide recommendations to OSSE. Once that information is received, OSSE will issue a new request for applications for a new contractor and develop a new budget.

**Part 2: Evidence**

Describe 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.

DC can submit screen shots of work completed on the state longitudinal education data (SLED) warehouse to ED as major elements are achieved. As OSSE currently has a 2007 grant from IES to develop SLED, evidence of the development of SLED will already be supplied to ED. OSSE has been in communication with IES regarding the fact that its previous contract for the development of SLED was terminated in September 2009.

As a result, OSSE will not have a fully functioning SLED in place until 2013. Without a fully functioning SLED, OSSE will not be able to provide individual student-level growth data linked to each teacher by September 30, 2011.

It's important to note that several LEAs are already implementing a teacher evaluation systems based on student-level growth data, notably DCPS, which accounts for two-thirds of DC's public school students.

It is also important to note that while OSSE depends on data that will be available in SLED to determine individual teacher impact on student achievement, OSSE has plans to develop a teacher effectiveness metric and will leverage the data governance structure currently being developed. Specifically, OSSE is working on defining and implementing a strategy to establish the correct organizational structure, staffing, scope, roles and responsibilities around data management and use at the state level. This strategy will include documenting and defining metrics and implementing business rules and controls around the receipt, tracking, analysis and reporting of OSSE data and bring cross-functional teams together to identify data needs and conduct a gap analysis. The ultimate goals are:

1. Instill a culture that views data as an asset.

2. Apply the principles of data quality, data management, business process management, and risk management to our work.

3. Produce data that can be used to inform decision making and education reform in the District.

In addition, please know that OSSE is submitting a Race to the Top application by January 19, 2009. This application will leverage the funds made available by ED in Race to the Top to use the system in place in DCPS and several charter school LEAs to provide student-level growth data on which teacher evaluations will be based. Essentially, if DC receives one of these competitive grants, OSSE will contract out the work to manually link students to teachers and validate teacher rosters to accomplish this task. Without Race to the Top funds, however, OSSE cannot support this work at this time.

**Part 3: 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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement | Capacity |
|---|---|---|
| OSSE | Leading the project to create the state longitudinal education data (SLED) warehouse. | In November 2009, OSSE hired a SLED Director to oversee development of SLED. The director is revising roles of OSSE staff to better take advantage of resources. Most importantly, the director will oversee and manage the new contract for the development of SLED |
| Office of Chief Technology Officer (OCTO) | As the agency responsible for all data- and web-based products in DC, OCTO will host SLED and will provide technical guidance and assistance regarding DC-specific requirements and capabilities. | Providing this guidance is OCTO's chief role in DC. |
| LEAs | The LEAs will have to undertake roster validation and data checks to ensure the students are being properly assigned to teachers. | LEAs will need training and assistance from OSSE, particularly for small charter LEAs, to undertake this work. DCPS and some of the larger LEAs are already doing this work. |
| | | |
| | | |

**(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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement |
|---|---|
| OCTO | As described above in 3(A), OCTO is the agency responsible for all data- and web-based products in DC, OCTO will host SLED and will provide technical guidance and assistance regarding DC-specific requirements and capabilities. |
| Gartner, Inc. | Gartner is an IT analysis firm which is currently finalizing a study to |

| | |
|---|---|
| | assess the current SLED functionality, architecture, and infrastructure. This study will inform the direction of the project moving forward. |
| Data governance team | This cross-agency team consisting of the Executive Office of the Mayor, OSSE, DC Public Schools, Public Charter School Board, and OCTO, will meet quarterly to review the activities in the most recent quarter and resolve data issues as they develop. |
| TBD | OSSE issued a request for applications in December 2009 for a contractor to provide oversight and guidance on data governance issues to ensure proper internal controls are in place to develop and manage SLED. This contract is expected to be awarded in February 2009. |
| | |

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

| Item/ Category | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, or Local) |
|---|---|---|
| Federal grant from IES | $5.7 million | *Federal – IES SLDS grant* |

* Due to problems with the original contractor and the termination of that contract in September 2009, OSSE is unable to provide specificity regarding the cost or source of funds for activities related to SLED at this time. OSSE is conducting internal reviews of the current capacity of SLED and has engaged an external IT firm to provide recommendations to OSSE. Once that information is received, OSSE will issue a new request for applications for a new contractor and develop a new budget.

**(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).

| **Method(s) for Publicly Reporting the Plan and the State's Progress Reports on its Plans** | **Means** | **Frequency** (i.e. quarterly, semi-annually, specific dates) | **Website Address** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Guidance on roster validation | Guidance document (& best practices) | Draft version; final version | *Division of Elementary and Secondary (http://www.osse.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view,a,1274,q,563447.asp)* |

# SFSF Phase II State Plan

# Appendix K

**Indicator: (b)(3)**

**State Plan Author**: Patrick Rooney

**State Plan 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.

**Part 1: Action Plan**

Describe the process and timeline for achieving the ability to implement the means to fully collect and/or publicly report (as required) the date or information by September 30, 2011

| # | Milestone | Due Date | Responsible Office | Potential Obstacles | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, Local) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | *SLED: Completion of uniform student identifiers and enrollment for the current year. Elements integrated:*<br>• Unique statewide student identifier (complete);<br>• Student-level enrollment, demographic and program participation information (complete); and<br>• Student-level information about the points at which students exit, transfer in, transfer out, drop out or complete P-16 education programs. | *June 2010* | *OSSE/SLED team* | *OSSE needs to award a new contract to continue the work on SLED after terminating the previous contract in September 2009* | *TBD* (see below)* | *TBD* (see below)* |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | Assessments and Graduation Status<br>***Element(s) Integrated***<br>• Yearly test records of individual students. | December 2011 | *OSSE/SLED team* | *OSSE needs to award a new contract to continue the work on SLED after terminating the previous contract in September 2009* | | |
| 3 | Attendance, Courses, Schedules, Safety and Discipline, Grades/Grade Point Average<br>***Element(s) Integrated:***<br>• Information on students not tested by grade and subject;<br>• State data audit system assessing data quality, validity and reliability; and<br>• Student-level transcript information, including information on courses completed and grades earned. | June 2012 | *OSSE/SLED team* | *OSSE needs to award a new contract to continue the work on SLED after terminating the previous contract in September 2009* | | |
| 4 | Early Childhood and Adult Education USIs, College Enrollment and Persistence, Electronic Transcript<br>***Element(s) Integrated:***<br>• Student-level college readiness scores;<br>• Capacity to communicate with higher education data systems; and<br>• Information regarding the extent to which students transition successfully from secondary school to postsecondary education, including | December 2012 | *OSSE/SLED team* | *OSSE needs to award a new contract to continue the work on SLED after terminating the previous contract in September 2009* | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | whether students enroll in remedial coursework. | | | | | |
| 5 | Teacher Data (Early Childhood Provider Performance, Kindergarten Readiness Assessment, Out of School Time<br>***Element(s) Integrated:***<br>• A teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students;.<br>• Other information determined necessary to address alignment and adequate preparation for success in postsecondary education. | June 2013 | *OSSE/SLED team* | *OSSE needs to award a new contract to continue the work on SLED after terminating the previous contract in September 2009* | | |
| 6 | Guidance to LEAs on roster validation/data review | Fall 2012-summer 2013 | OSSE (sharing best practices and lessons learned by LEAs) | NA | NA | NA |
| 7 | Convene panel of OSSE and stakeholders to discuss methods to evaluate teacher impact | Fall 2010 (and on-going, as necessary) | OSSE | NA | NA | NA |

* Due to problems with the original contractor and the termination of that contract in September 2009, OSSE is unable to provide specificity regarding the cost or source of funds for activities related to SLED at this time. OSSE is conducting internal reviews of the current capacity of SLED and has engaged an external IT firm to provide recommendations to OSSE. Once that information is received, OSSE will issue a new request for applications for a new contractor and develop a new budget.

**Part 2: Evidence**

Describe 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.

DC can submit screen shots of work completed on the state longitudinal education data (SLED) warehouse to ED as major elements are achieved. As OSSE currently has a 2007 grant from IES

to develop SLED, evidence of the development of SLED will already be supplied to ED. OSSE has been in communication with IES regarding the fact that its previous contract for the development of SLED was terminated in September 2009.

It's important to note that several LEAs are already implementing a teacher evaluation systems based on student-level growth data, notably DCPS, which accounts for two-thirds of DC's public school students.

It is also important to note that while OSSE depends on data that will be available in SLED to determine individual teacher impact on student achievement, OSSE has plans to develop a teacher effectiveness metric and will leverage the data governance structure currently being developed. Specifically, OSSE is working on defining and implementing a strategy to establish the correct organizational structure, staffing, scope, roles and responsibilities around data management and use at the state level. This strategy will include documenting and defining metrics and implementing business rules and controls around the receipt, tracking, analysis and reporting of OSSE data and bring cross-functional teams together to identify data needs and conduct a gap analysis. The ultimate goals are:

1. Instill a culture that views data as an asset.
2. Apply the principles of data quality, data management, business process management, and risk management to our work.
3. Produce data that can be used to inform decision making and education reform in the District.

In addition, please know that OSSE is submitting a Race to the Top application by January 19, 2009. This application will leverage the funds made available by ED in Race to the Top to use the system in place in DCPS and several charter school LEAs to provide student-level growth data on which teacher evaluations will be based. Essentially, if DC receives one of these competitive grants, OSSE will contract out the work to manually link students to teachers and validate teacher rosters to accomplish this task. Without Race to the Top funds, however, OSSE cannot support this work at this time.

**Part 3: General Requirements**

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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement | Capacity |
|---|---|---|
| OSSE | Leading the project to create the state longitudinal education data (SLED) warehouse. | In November 2009, OSSE hired a SLED Director to oversee development of SLED. The director is revising roles of OSSE staff to better take advantage of resources. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | Most importantly, the director will oversee and manage the new contract for the development of SLED |
| Office of Chief Technology Officer (OCTO) | As the agency responsible for all data- and web-based products in DC, OCTO will host SLED and will provide technical guidance and assistance regarding DC-specific requirements and capabilities. | Providing this guidance is OCTO's chief role in DC. |
| LEAs | The LEAs will have to undertake roster validation and data checks to ensure the students are being properly assigned to teachers. LEAs will also participate in the stakeholder meetings described above. | LEAs will need training and assistance from OSSE, particularly for small charter LEAs, to undertake this work. DCPS and some of the larger LEAs are already doing this work. |

**(A)** 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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement |
|---|---|
| OCTO | As described above in 3(A), OCTO is the agency responsible for all data- and web-based products in DC, OCTO will host SLED and will provide technical guidance and assistance regarding DC-specific requirements and capabilities. |
| Gartner, Inc. | Gartner is an IT analysis firm which is currently finalizing a study to assess the current SLED functionality, architecture, and infrastructure. This study will inform the direction of the project moving forward. |
| Data governance team | This cross-agency team consisting of the Executive Office of the Mayor, OSSE, DC Public Schools, Public Charter School Board, and OCTO, will meet quarterly to review the activities in the most recent quarter and resolve data issues as they develop. |
| TBD | OSSE issued a request for applications in December 2009 for a contractor to provide oversight and guidance on data governance issues to ensure proper internal controls are in place to develop and manage SLED. This contract is expected to be awarded in February 2009. |

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

| Item/ Category | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, or Local) |
|---|---|---|
| Federal grant from IES | $5.7 million | *Federal – IES SLDS grant* |

* Due to problems with the original contractor and the termination of that contract in September 2009, OSSE is unable to provide specificity regarding the cost or source of funds for activities related to SLED at this time. OSSE is conducting internal reviews of the current capacity of SLED and has engaged an external IT firm to provide recommendations to OSSE. Once that information is received, OSSE will issue a new request for applications for a new contractor and develop a new budget.

**(C)** 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).

| **Method(s) for Publicly Reporting the Plan and the State's Progress Reports on its Plans** | **Means** | **Frequency** (i.e. quarterly, semi-annually, specific dates) | **Website Address** |
|---|---|---|---|
| The results of the stakeholder meetings regarding the method for evaluating teacher impact will be reported on the OSSE website | Brief report | *Following the completion of the working group's work* | *Division of Elementary and Secondary (http://www.osse.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view,a,1274,q,563447.asp)* |
| Guidance on roster validation | Guidance document (& best practices) | Draft version; final version | *Division of Elementary and Secondary (http://www.osse.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view,a,1274,q,563447.asp)* |

# SFSF Phase II State Plan

# Appendix L

**Indicator: (c)(9)**

**State Plan Author:** Elizabeth Cohen

**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:

**Part 1: Action Plan**

Describe 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:

| # | Milestone | Due Date | Responsible Office | Potential Obstacles | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, Local) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Develop program for production of revised report cards | June 1, 2010 | Elementary and Secondary | Obtaining financial resources; staff resource constraints. | $50,000 | Local funding (Assessment and Accountability budget) |
| 2 | Data collection for school year 2008-2009 complete | January 31, 2010 | Elementary and Secondary | | n/a | |
| 3 | New report cards produced | June 1, 2011? | Elementary and Secondary | | $10,000 | Local funding (Assessment and Accountability budget) |

**Part 2: General Requirements**

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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement | Capacity |
|---|---|---|
| OSSE | Develop, produce report cards | Staff are collecting data, manipulating data, working with external resources to |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | build report card production capabilities. |

**(A)** 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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement |
|---|---|
| N/A | |

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

| Item/ Category | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, or Local) |
|---|---|---|
| Technical development of report card program; including software programming to produce report cards. | $50,000 | Local |
| Production/printing | $10,000 | |

**(C)** 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).

| Method(s) for Publicly Reporting the Plan and the State's Progress Reports on its Plans | Means | Frequency (i.e. quarterly, semi-annually, specific dates) | Website Address |
|---|---|---|---|
| Report on osse.dc.gov and nclb.osse.dc.gov | | Post announcement regarding new report cards by February 1, 2010 | Osse.dc.gov; nclb.osse.dc.gov |

**Part 3: Plan Element Verification**

Please fill out the following chart to indicate whether your state plan addresses how the State will collect and/or publicly report data.

| Element | Collection (check if applies) | Public Reporting (check if applies) |
|---|---|---|
| *Indicator c9* | *X* | *X* |

# SFSF Phase II State Plan

# Appendix M

**Indicator: (c) (10)**

**State Plan Author:** Elizabeth Cohen

**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:

**Part 1: Action Plan**

Describe 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:

| # | Milestone | Due Date | Responsible Office | Potential Obstacles | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, Local) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Establish rules and policies around cohort definition and transfers set | October 1, 2010 | Elementary and Secondary | | N/A | |
| 2 | Final data collection | August 31, 2011 | Elementary and Secondary | The lack of a fully functioning SLED would pose challenges. | N/A | |
| 3 | Preliminary cohort rates for verification by LEA | September 15, 2011 | Elementary and Secondary | OSSE may need to manually produce cohort rates because of issues with SLED, which will impact data quality. | N/A | |
| 4 | Production of final cohort graduation rates for LEAs and schools | September 30, 2011 | Elementary and Secondary | Again, if OSSE is manually producing cohort rates because of issues with | N/A | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | SLED, additional time may be required to produce final cohort graduation rates in order to address data questions or data quality issues that arise. | | |

**Part 2: 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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement | Capacity |
|---|---|---|
| OSSE | Set policies around graduation rate, collect data from LEAs, calculate graduation rate. | Staff will draft and implement policies; staff will collect data from LEAs; staff will calculate graduation rate; staff will work with LEAs to validate graduation rate. |

**(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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement |
|---|---|
| N/A | |

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

| Item/ Category | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, or Local) |
|---|---|---|
| N/A | | |

**(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).

| **Method(s) for Publicly Reporting the Plan and the State's Progress Reports on its Plans** | **Means** | **Frequency** (i.e. quarterly, semi-annually, specific dates) | **Website Address** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Incorporate cohort graduation rate in state accountability workbook | | Move to cohort based graduation rate by 2011 already posted in state accountability workbook | Osse.dc.gov; |
| Post state-issued guidance relating to decision rules, etc. | | Ongoing, as decision rules are finalized | Osse.dc.gov |

**Part 3: Plan Element Verification**

Please fill out the following chart to indicate whether your state plan addresses how the State will collect and/or publicly report data.

| **Element** | **Collection (check if applies)** | **Public Reporting (check if applies)** |
|---|---|---|
| *Indicator c10* | *X* | *X* |

# SFSF Phase II State Plan

# Appendix N

**Indicator: (c )(11)**

**State Plan Author:** Rehva Jones

**State Plan Instructions:** For each assurance indicator or descriptor under education reform areas C 11 and C12 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:

**Part 1: Action Plan**

Describe the process and timeline for achieving the ability to implement the means to fully collect and/or publicly report (as required) the date or information by September 30, 2011

| # | Milestone | Due Date | Responsible Office | Potential Obstacles | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, Local) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Additional questions added to the DC OneApp for SY 2011-2012 | Nov. 2010 | HEFS&P2 / OCIO | NA | $20,000 | State |
| 2 | DC STARS, OLAMS and SEDS data uploaded to DC OneApp | Dec. 2010 | HEFS & P2 / OCIO | The data quality is less than optimal as there are many instances where students are issued multiple student numbers or students appear in more than one system with different schools indicated as the school of attendance. Extensive efforts to sanitize the data would have to be | $50,000 | Local |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | undertaken.<br><br>In absence of a fully technological solution, the migration of these data may involve manual data entry. | | |
| 3 | Additional statuses(such as…"not applied", "enrolled at a non-eligible DCTAG school", "transfer pending," "gap in enrollment") added to DC OneApp | Nov. 2010 | HEFS & P2 / OCIO | NA | $10,000 | State |
| 4 | Automated processes to upload data from the National Student Clearinghouse are developed | June 2010 | HEFS & P2 / OCIO | In absence of a fully technological solution, the migration of these data may involve manual data entry. | $10,000 | State |
| 5 | Initial reporting simulation completed by January 2011 | Jan 2011 | HEFS & P2 / OCIO | Above mentioned enhancements to the DC OneApp or data migration is not achieved. | $0 | |

**Part 2: Evidence**

Describe 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.

The OSSE has been collecting various data on college enrollment and persistence for the past ten years. In July 2009, the agency completed a comprehensive study of college graduation rates for its largest funding program, the DC Tuition Assistance Grant program. The agency has developed solid relationships with the National Student Clearinghouse as well as premier public research institutions to undergird its efforts to collect and analyze college enrollment data. Collecting data to report on

indicators C11 and C12 are the next steps towards the agency's efforts to obtain information on students currently not participating in state grant programs.

The State will publicly report its progress on the implementation of this plan not less than three times a year. A dashboard for the plan will be developed and placed on the OSSE website.

**Part 3: General Requirements**

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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement | Capacity |
|---|---|---|
| Office of the State Superintendent for Education | The OSSE's department of Higher Education Financial Services & Preparatory Programs has full responsibility to ensure the State's capacity to develop and implement reporting requirements for indicators C11 and C12.<br><br>This department will work in partnership with the OSSE's IT department for technical support. | The OSSE's department of Higher Education Financial Services and Preparatory Programs' (HEFS & P2) possesses the capacity to implement the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund program's State Plan through 1) the expansive and supportive network of strategic partnerships with institutions of higher education across the country, LEA's, college access professionals, independent researchers and national and community-based organizations; 2) the comprehensiveness and adaptability of its award-winning longitudinal data system, the DC OneApp; and, 3 ) the deep knowledge and expertise of its staff in higher education, project management and information technology.<br><br>Over the past decade, OSSE's HEFS & P2 has developed and nurtured strong partnerships with nearly 400 colleges and universities around the country that participate in the OSSE's higher education |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | grant programs. The DC Tuition Assistance Grant program (DCTAG) has disbursed quarter of million dollars over the last ten years to these select institutions. While such funding does provide leverage for OSSE, the strength of the collaboration lies within the shared priority of ensuring students succeed in higher learning. As these institutions fulfill the data collection and reporting criteria of their program participation agreements with the OSSE, they will be central in the collection and validation of data the State will use to meet the requirements for reporting indicators C11 and C12. |

**(A)** 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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement |
|---|---|
| NA | |

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

| Item/ Category | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, or Local) |
|---|---|---|
| | | *(If Federal please specify Grant name, if Local please specify FY year funds allocated)* |
| IT Development, QA and Implementation | $107,500 | Local – No possible funding identified at this time. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| National Student Clearinghouse Membership | $2,500 | State – FY10 |
| Personnel | $100,000 | Local –No possible funding identified at this time. |

**(C)** 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).

| **Method(s) for Publicly Reporting the Plan and the State's Progress Reports on its Plans** | **Means** | **Frequency** (i.e. quarterly, semi-annually, specific dates) | **Website Address** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Via Web | Dashboard updates | *Quarterly* | *OSSE.dc.gov* |
| | | | |
| | | | |

**Part 3: 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** |

# SFSF Phase II State Plan

# Appendix O

**Indicator: (c )(12)**

**State Plan Author:** Rehva Jones

**State Plan Instructions:** For each assurance indicator or descriptor under education reform areas C 11 and C12 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:

**Part 1: Action Plan**

Describe the process and timeline for achieving the ability to implement the means to fully collect and/or publicly report (as required) the date or information by September 30, 2011

| # | Milestone | Due Date | Responsible Office | Potential Obstacles | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, Local) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Additional questions added to the DC OneApp for SY 2011-2012 | Nov. 2010 | HEFS&P2 / OCIO | NA | $20,000 | State |
| 2 | DC STARS, OLAMS and SEDS data uploaded to DC OneApp | Dec. 2010 | HEFS & P2 / OCIO | The data quality is less than optimal as there are many instances where students are issued multiple student numbers or students appear in more than one system with different schools indicated as the school of attendance. Extensive efforts to sanitize the data would have to be | $50,000 | Local |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | undertaken.<br><br>In absence of a fully technological solution, the migration of these data may involve manual data entry. | | |
| 3 | Additional statuses(such as…"not applied", "enrolled at a non-eligible DCTAG school", "transfer pending," "gap in enrollment") added to DC OneApp | Nov. 2010 | HEFS & P2 / OCIO | NA | $10,000 | State |
| 4 | Automated processes to upload data from the National Student Clearinghouse are developed | June 2010 | HEFS & P2 / OCIO | In absence of a fully technological solution, the migration of these data may involve manual data entry. | $10,000 | State |
| 5 | Initial reporting simulation completed by January 2011 | Jan 2011 | HEFS & P2 / OCIO | Above mentioned enhancements to the DC OneApp or data migration is not achieved. | $0 | |

**Part 2: Evidence**

Describe 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.

The OSSE has been collecting various data on college enrollment and persistence for the past ten years. In July 2009, the agency completed a comprehensive study of college graduation rates for its largest funding program, the DC Tuition Assistance Grant program. The agency has developed solid relationships with the National Student Clearinghouse as well as premier public research institutions to undergird its efforts to collect and analyze college enrollment data. Collecting data to report on

indicators C11 and C12 are the next steps towards the agency's efforts to obtain information on students currently not participating in state grant programs.

The State will publicly report its progress on the implementation of this plan not less than three times a year. A dashboard for the plan will be developed and placed on the OSSE website.

**Part 3: General Requirements**

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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement | Capacity |
|---|---|---|
| Office of the State Superintendent for Education | The OSSE's department of Higher Education Financial Services & Preparatory Programs has full responsibility to ensure the State's capacity to develop and implement reporting requirements for indicators C11 and C12.<br><br>This department will work in partnership with the OSSE's IT department for technical support. | The OSSE's department of Higher Education Financial Services and Preparatory Programs' (HEFS & P2) possesses the capacity to implement the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund program's State Plan through 1) the expansive and supportive network of strategic partnerships with institutions of higher educations across the country, LEA's, college access professionals, independent researchers and national and community-based organizations; 2) the comprehensiveness and adaptability of its award-winning longitudinal data system, the DC OneApp; and, 3 ) the deep knowledge and expertise of its staff in higher education, project management and information technology.<br><br>Over the past decade, OSSE's HEFS & P2 has developed and nurtured strong partnerships with nearly 400 colleges and universities around the country that participate in |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | the OSSE's higher education grant programs. The DC Tuition Assistance Grant program (DCTAG) has disbursed quarter of million dollars over the last ten years to these select institutions. While such funding does provide leverage for OSSE, the strength of the collaboration lies within the shared priority of ensuring students succeed in higher learning. As these institutions fulfill the data collection and reporting criteria of their program participation agreements with the OSSE, they will be central in the collection and validation of data the State will use to meet the requirements for reporting indicators C11 and C12. |

**(A)** 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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement |
|---|---|
| NA | |

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

| Item/ Category | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, or Local) |
|---|---|---|
| IT Development, QA and Implementation | $107,500 | Local – No possible funding has been identified at this time. |
| National Student | $2,500 | State – FY10 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Clearinghouse Membership | | |
| Personnel | $100,000 | Local- No possible funding has been identified at this time. |

**(C)** 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).

| **Method(s) for Publicly Reporting the Plan and the State's Progress Reports on its Plans** | **Means** | **Frequency** (i.e. quarterly, semi-annually, specific dates) | **Website Address** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Via Web | Dashboard updates | *Quarterly* | *OSSE.dc.gov* |

**Part 3: 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)(12) | | **X** |

# SFSF Phase II State Plan

# Appendix P

**Indicator: (d)(4)**

**State Plan Author:** Patrick Rooney

**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:

**Part 1: Action Plan**

Describe 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:

| # | Milestone | Due Date | Responsible Office | Potential Obstacles | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, Local) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Draft definition of the persistently lowest achieving | January 5, 2010 | *OSSE/Chief of Staff* | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* |
| 2 | Submit draft for review and comment by LEAs | January 8, 2010 | *OSSE/Chief of Staff* | *Short timelines for comment* | *NA* | *NA* |
| 3 | Receive comments from LEAs | January 13, 2010 | *OSSE/Chief of Staff* | *Short timelines for comment* | *NA* | *NA* |
| 4 | Revise based on LEA feedback | January 19, 2010 | *OSSE/Chief of Staff* | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* |
| 5 | Publish criteria on OSSE website along with the list of schools in this category based on 2009 DC CAS results and whether they implemented one of the four reform strategies | March 1, 2010 | *OSSE/Chief of Staff* | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* |
| 6 | Create process to | Annually, | OSSE/Division of | *NA* | *NA* | *NA* |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | annually calculate this list using the definition and identify these schools along with the release of AYP data each summer | beginning August 2010 | El/Sec | | | |

**Part 2: General Requirements**

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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement | Capacity |
|---|---|---|
| OSSE | Tasked with annually calculating and publicly disseminating list. | Simple task that can be run using excel using set formula. |
| LEAs (depends upon the LEAs that include the persistently lowest achieving schools) | LEA will be responsible for identifying the reform strategy that will be used for each of the schools on the list | Will be part of the school's improvement plan |

**(A)** 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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement |
|---|---|
| NA | NA |

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

| Item/ Category | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, or Local) |
|---|---|---|
| Develop and disseminate list | NA | NA |
| Actual budget that will be required for each of the reform strategies depends upon the strategy undertaken | Unknown | Federal, state, and local, most likely |

**(C)** 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).

| **Method(s) for Publicly Reporting the Plan and the State's Progress Reports on its Plans** | **Means** | **Frequency** (i.e. quarterly, semi-annually, specific dates) | **Website Address** |
|---|---|---|---|
| The list will be provided in the weekly LEA newsletter when it is released and will also be posted on the OSSE website | E-list serve and posting on OSSE site | *Annual* | *http://www.osse.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view,a,1274,q,561249.asp* *and* http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/ |

**Part 3: Plan Element Verification**

Please fill out the following chart to indicate whether your state plan addresses how the State will collect and/or publicly report data.

| **Element** | **Collection (check if applies)** | **Public Reporting (check if applies)** |
|---|---|---|
| *Indicator D4* | *X* | *X* |

# SFSF Phase II State Plan

# Appendix Q

**Indicator: (d)(11)**

**State Plan Authors:** Stephanie Cheng and Stefan Huh

**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:

**Part 1: Action Plan**

Describe 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:

| # | Milestone | Due Date | Responsible Office | Potential Obstacles | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, Local) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Research the city's financial systems to determine a list of schools that received per-pupil funding for the last five years that are no longer operating | January 1, 2010 | OPCSFS | No obstacles | No costs associated | NA |
| 2 | Contact authorizing agencies and charter advocacy organizations and request the number and identify of charter schools that were closed and/or not reauthorized to operate within each of the last five years | January 31, 2010 | OPCSFS | Identifying who to contact for this information for schools closed by the DC Board of Education, who relinquished its chartering authority in November 2006 | No costs associated | NA |
| 3 | Receive from the chartering authorities closure information | March 30, 2010 | OPCSFS | Receiving information from the DC Board of Education, since it is no longer | No costs associated | NA |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | operating | | |
| 4 | Publicly report this information on the OSSE's website | April 15, 2010 | OPCSFS | No obstacles | No costs associated | NA |
| 5 | Create a Memorandum of Understanding with the Public Charter School Board to receive this information on an annual basis | May 30, 2010 | OPCSFS | The Public Charter School Board must agree to this Memorandum of Understanding | No costs associated | NA |
| 6 | Publicly report this information on the OSSE's website annually | By May annually | OPCSFS | No obstacles | No costs associated | NA |

**Part 2: General Requirements**

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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement | Capacity |
|---|---|---|
| The Office of Public Charter School Financing and Support (OPCSFS), within the Office of the State Superintendent of Education, will be responsible for the development, execution and oversight of indicator d(11). | The Office of Public Charter School Financing and Support has the skills necessary to develop and execute the milestones listed in the state plan. | The Office of Public Charter School Financing and Support currently manages the federal Title V Part B Charter Schools Program grant, as well as the congressionally appropriated funds to the District of Columbia public charter schools. The OPCSFS works closely with the chartering authority, the Public Charter School Board, as well as the charter schools. |

**(A)** 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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| The Office of Public Charter School Financing and Support (OPCSFS), within the Office of the State Superintendent of Education, will be responsible for the development, execution and oversight of indicator d(11). | The OPCSFS will be reaching out to the Public Charter School Board to attain information on school closures. Because one of the chartering authorities is no longer operating, the OPCSFS will also reach out to District of Columbia charter advocacy organizations for their help in determining school closures. |

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

| Item/ Category | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, or Local) |
|---|---|---|
| There are no costs associated with the development, execution and oversight of the plan. | NA | NA |

**(C)** 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).

| Method(s) for Publicly Reporting the Plan and the State's Progress Reports on its Plans | Means | Frequency (i.e. quarterly, semi-annually, specific dates) | Website Address |
|---|---|---|---|
| The state plans to provide the information on school closures to the public on its website. | The state will post this information on its website | *The state will post the first update by May 30th, 2010. The state will update this information annually* | www.osse.dc.gov |

**Part 3: Plan Element Verification**

Please fill out the following chart to indicate whether your state plan addresses how the State will collect and/or publicly report data.

| Element | Collection (check if applies) | Public Reporting (check if applies) |
|---|---|---|
| *Indicator D11* | *X* | *X* |

# SFSF Phase II State Plan

# Appendix R

**Indicator: (d)(12)**

**State Plan Authors:** Stephanie Cheng and Stefan Huh

**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:

**Part 1: Action Plan**

Describe 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:

| # | Milestone | Due Date | Responsible Office | Potential Obstacles | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, Local) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Research the city's financial systems to determine a list of schools that received per-pupil funding for the last five years that are no longer operating | January 1, 2010 | OPCSFS | No obstacles | No costs associated | NA |
| 2 | Contact authorizing agencies and charter advocacy organizations and request whether the closure of the public charter school was for financial, enrollment, academic, or other reasons | January 31, 2010 | OPCSFS | Identifying who to contact for this information for schools closed by the DC Board of Education, who relinquished its chartering authority in November 2006. | No costs associated | NA |
| 3 | Receive from the chartering authorities closure information | March 30, 2010 | OPCSFS | Receiving information from the DC Board of Education, since | No costs associated | NA |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | it is no longer operating | | |
| 4 | Publicly report this information on the OSSE's website | April 15, 2010 | OPCSFS | No obstacles | No costs associated | NA |
| 5 | Create a Memorandum of Understanding with the Public Charter School Board to receive this information on an annual basis | May 30, 2010 | OPCSFS | The Public Charter School Board must agree to this Memorandum of Understanding | No costs associated | NA |
| 6 | Publicly report this information on the OSSE's website annually | By May annually | OPCSFS | No obstacles | No costs associated | NA |
| 7 | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | | |

**Part 2: General Requirements**

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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement | Capacity |
|---|---|---|
| The Office of Public Charter School Financing and Support (OPCSFS), within the Office of the State Superintendent of Education, will be responsible for the development, execution and oversight of indicator d(12). | The Office of Public Charter School Financing and Support has the skills necessary to develop and execute the milestones listed in the state plan. | The Office of Public Charter School Financing and Support currently manages the federal Title V Part B Charter Schools Program grant, as well as the congressionally appropriated funds to the District of Columbia public charter schools. The OPCSFS works closely with the chartering authority, the Public Charter School Board, as well as the charter schools. |

**(A)** 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.

| Agency | Description of Agency's Involvement |
|---|---|
| The Office of Public Charter School Financing and Support (OPCSFS), within the Office of the State Superintendent of Education, will be responsible for the development, execution and oversight of indicator d(12). | The OPCSFS will be reaching out to the Public Charter School Board to attain information on school closures. Because one of the chartering authorities is no longer operating, the OPCSFS will also reach out to District of Columbia charter advocacy organizations for their help in determining school closures. |

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

| Item/ Category | Cost | Funding Source (Federal, State, or Local) |
|---|---|---|
| There are no costs associated with the development, execution and oversight of the plan. | NA | NA |

**(C)** 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).

| Method(s) for Publicly Reporting the Plan and the State's Progress Reports on its Plans | Means | Frequency (i.e. quarterly, semi-annually, specific dates) | Website Address |
|---|---|---|---|
| The state plans to provide the information on school closures to the public on its website. | The state will post this information on its website | *The state will post the first update by May 30th, 2010. The state will update this information annually* | www.osse.dc.gov |

**Part 3: Plan Element Verification**

Please fill out the following chart to indicate whether your state plan addresses how the State will collect and/or publicly report data.

| Element | Collection (check if applies) | Public Reporting (check if applies) |
|---|---|---|
| *Indicator D12* | *X* | *X* |