

Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) Survey Analysis Descriptive Statistics

AUTHOR Julia Bloom-Weltman AEM Corporation PROGRAM OFFICER Kristen King National Center for Education Statistics

Statistics in Brief publications present descriptive data in tabular formats to provide useful information to a broad audience, including members of the general public. They address simple and topical issues and questions. They do not investigate more complex hypotheses, account for inter-relationships among variables, or support causal inferences. We encourage readers who are interested in more complex questions and in-depth analysis to explore other NCES resources, including publications, online data tools, and public- and restricted-use datasets. See <u>nces.ed.gov</u> and references noted in the body of this document for more information.

As a whole, Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems

(SLDS) grant-funded projects represent one of the most developed and systemic K–12 education data projects in U.S. history. In the past two decades, state education agencies (SEAs) have expanded the scope of their data systems to include more disparate domains of data while also increasing the utility of those data and expanding the level of detail at which the data are stored. These changes work to improve the collective capacity of SEAs and education stakeholders to implement effective policies, conduct meaningful research, and inform decisions up and down the educational system.

Improvements can be best understood when we consider states' and territories' data capacity prior to the creation of the SLDS Program under the Education Sciences Reform Act (ESRA) of 2002.¹ Prior to 2009, only 12 states had the ability to link K–12 and postsecondary datasets.² Early on, many states also struggled to connect teacher and student data.

¹The portion of ESRA pertaining to the SLDS Program is Section 208 of P.L. 107-279, retrieved July 7, 2019, from <u>http://ies.ed.gov/pdf/PL107-279.pdf</u>.

²Data Quality Campaign. (2010). *DQC 2009–10 Annual Survey Results* (ERIC ED543124). Retrieved July 7, 2019, from <u>https://eric.ed.gov/?q=data+quality+campaign</u> <u>+annual+survey&ff1=souData+Quality+\Campaign &pg=2&id=ED543124</u>.

This Statistics in Brief was prepared for the National Center for Education Statistics under Contract No. ED-IES-11-O-0017 with AEM Corporation. Mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.



Since its inception in 2005, the SLDS Program has awarded state and territory education agencies competitive grants to enable the implementation, enhancement, or improved use of longitudinal data systems. In total, departments of education from 47 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, and the U.S. Virgin Islands were awarded grants for up to \$20 million. As the SLDS Program continues to grow and evolve how it fosters K-12 data systems, it is important to understand and measure how states' and territories' capacity to maintain and use SLDSs has changed.

The SLDS Survey was created to inventory systems and assess the

present data capacity of states and territories. The survey is particularly concerned with measuring their abilities to automatically link data across sectors in SLDSs. To that end, the SLDS Survey asks whether the capacity for those linkages currently has a status of operational, in progress (in the process of becoming operational), planned, or not planned. "Operational" was defined in the survey as an element or capability that is fully functional and available for its intended users.

DATA, MEASURES, AND METHODS

The SLDS Survey asks all states and territories to provide information about the types of data that are included in their SLDSs; how they use SLDS data to inform policy; and the capacity of their SLDSs for automated linking of K-12, teacher, postsecondary, workforce, Perkins career and technical education (CTE), and early childhood data. This report presents aggregate summary statistics of SLDS capacity based only on the responses received. Because a "not answered" category is included in each description, all percentages are derived from the 46 state and territory respondents. A response was considered "not answered" if it was missing. For more information about the data, measures, and methods used in this brief, please see the Methodology and Technical Notes section at the end of the report.

STUDY QUESTIONS AND KEY FINDINGS



What K–12 data elements are included in the Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDSs)?

Data elements available

 in SLDSs include student
 demographics, grade level,
 school enrollment and
 completion, attendance,
 and statewide assessment
 data (figure 1). K–12 student
 data are operational in
 96 percent of state and
 territory respondents' SLDSs.

What is the capacity for linking K–12 SLDS student data to other data? How are the data linked? What data elements are linked?

- At least 70 percent of states and territories reported having automated infrastructure to link K–12 student data to K–12 teacher data, postsecondary data, Perkins CTE data, and early childhood data. Half reported having automated links to workforce data (figure 2).
- Data are linked to K–12 student data in different ways depending on the sector, including by an assigned unique identifier or a Social Security number (figure 3). The data elements linked to K–12 student data also vary depending on the data sector (figures 4–8).

3

How do states and territories use data for reporting and decisionmaking?

- States and territories most
 commonly reported using
 K–12 student data for
 feedback reports for high
 schools and for state reports
 for the legislature (figure 9).
- States and territories also reported using K–12 teacher data, postsecondary data, workforce data, Perkins CTE data, and early childhood data for state reports for the legislature, federal reports (such as EDFacts), curricular decisions, feedback reports, and policy updates (figures 10–14).

What K–12 data elements are included in the Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDSs)?

K-12 student data are operational in 96 percent of SLDSs. States and territories reported on the current operational status for 23 different K-12 student data elements managed by their SLDSs (see figure 1). The K-12 student data elements that were most commonly reported to be operational by states and territories are student demographics (91 percent), grade level (91 percent), school enrollment and completion (89 percent), transfer status (85 percent), diploma and certificate receipt (85 percent), statewide summative assessment scores (83 percent), attendance (80 percent), and drop out history (80 percent).

Other commonly operational student-level data elements include information about instate dual enrollment (78 percent); homelessness status (76 percent); other program participation, such as free and reduced-price lunch, Title I, English language learners, and special education (76 percent); course enrollment (74 percent); course completion (67 percent); discipline (65 percent); college-readiness assessment scores (65 percent); migrant status (65 percent); virtual school/learning enrollment or participation (65 percent); assessments for students not tested by grade or subject (61 percent); and Advanced Placement (AP) scores (52 percent).

Less widely operational K–12 student data elements include out-of-state dual enrollment (41 percent) and kindergarten entry assessment scores (39 percent). The SLDS Survey revealed that statewide and local benchmark assessments are the selected data elements with the lowest degree of current operational status, at 26 percent and 22 percent of states and territories, respectively. In addition, 46 percent of states and territories do not plan to include statewide benchmark assessments in their SLDSs, and 65 percent of states and territories do not plan to include local benchmark assessments in their SLDSs. Detailed percentage distributions of the operational status of each K–12 student data element asked about in the survey as reported by states and territories can be seen in figure 1.

FIGURE 1.

Percentage of states and territories with selected K–12 student data elements included in the SLDS, by operational status: 2017

Data element	
Demographics	91 4 4
Grade level	91 4 4
School enrollment and completion	89 7 4
Transfer in/out	85 7 7 7
Diploma/certificate	85 4 4 7
Assessments: Statewide summative/end of course	83 4 774
Attendance	80 9 7 4
Drop out history	80 4 9 4
In-state postsecondary/dual enrollment	78 7 7 4 4
Homelessness status	76 11 7 4
Other program participation ¹	76 9 7 7
Course enrollment	74 11 29 4
Course completion	67 13 411/7
Discipline	65 11 7 13 4
Assessments: College-readiness test scores (SAT, PSAT)	65 11 7 11/ 7
Migrant status	65 11 4 //15//4
Virtual school/learning enrollment or participation	65 9 715 9
Assessments: Information on students not tested by grade and subject	61 4 11 //17// 7
Assessments: AP scores	52 11 13 //17// 7
Out-of-state postsecondary/dual enrollment	4 13 /////33///// 9
Assessments: Kindergarten entry	39 9 24 ////24////4
Assessments: Statewide benchmark or interim	26 9 13 /////46/////7
Assessments: Local benchmark or interim	22 7 7 4
(20 40 60 80 100
	Percent
Operational In progress	Planned 🔽 Not planned 🔲 Not answered

¹ "Other program participation" includes participation in free and reduced-price lunch, Title I, English language learners, and special education programs.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. AP refers to Advanced Placement.

What is the capacity for linking K–12 SLDS student data to other data? How are the data linked? What data elements are linked?

Half or more of states and territories reported that automated infrastructure is in place to link K–12 student data to other data, depending on data sector. At least 70 percent of states and territories responded that automated infrastructure is operational to link K–12 student data to K–12 teacher data, postsecondary data, Perkins CTE data, and early childhood data, while 50 percent reported that this infrastructure is in place for workforce data. Detailed information about linkages of K–12 student data to each data type can be seen in figure 2.

HOW DATA ARE LINKED TO K-12 STUDENT DATA

K–12 student data are linked with data from other sectors in different ways. For K–12 teacher data, 72 percent of states and territories reported having operational linkages to K–12 student data through course assignments. Sixty-seven percent of states and territories reported using a statewide unique teacher identification number to link K–12 student data to K–12 teacher data. An assigned unique identifier is the most commonly reported method of connecting K–12 student data to postsecondary data

FIGURE 2.

Percentage of states and territories with other sector data linked to K-12 student data: 2017



NOTE: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. CTE refers to career and technical education. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) Survey, Summer 2017.

(63 percent), Perkins CTE data (70 percent), and early childhood data (59 percent). The method of linking workforce data to K–12 student data with the greatest degree of operational status is an element match process (41 percent). Figure 3 shows each of the ways that K–12 student data are linked to teacher, postsecondary, workforce, Perkins CTE, and early childhood data.

FIGURE 3.

Percentage of states and territories with direct K–12 student data links to other data sectors, by linking method and operational status: 2017



NOTE: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding.

WHAT DATA ELEMENTS ARE LINKED TO K-12 STUDENT DATA?

States and territories use their crosssector data linkages to connect K–12 student data with a variety of other data types. As shown in figure 4, the most common teacher data elements with operational links to K–12 student data include course assignments (63 percent), teacher years of experience (59 percent), and certificate type and highly qualified status (both at 57 percent).

FIGURE 4.

Percentage of states and territories with selected K–12 teacher data elements directly linked to K–12 student data, by operational status: 2017



NOTE: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. The abbreviation alt-cert refers to alternative certification.

Postsecondary data with the greatest level of operational linkages to K–12 student data are period of enrollment (65 percent), prior postsecondary institutions attended (63 percent), course remediation (63 percent), and progress toward completing program or degree (63 percent), as seen in figure 5.

FIGURE 5.

Percentage of states and territories with selected postsecondary data elements directly linked to K–12 student data, by operational status: 2017



NOTE: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding.

The most common workforce data elements that states and territories report as operationally linked to K–12 student data include current earnings (48 percent), historical earnings (46 percent), employer county (37 percent), unemployment insurance (35 percent), and employer ID (33 percent), as seen in figure 6.

FIGURE 6.

Percentage of states and territories with selected workforce data elements directly linked to K-12 student data, by operational status: 2017



NOTE: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding.

The most common Perkins CTE data elements with operational links to K–12 student data include participation (70 percent) and program area or program of study (70 percent), as shown in figure 7.

FIGURE 7.

Percentage of states and territories with selected Perkins CTE data elements directly linked to K–12 student data, by operational status: 2017



The most common early childhood data element that states and territories report as operationally linked to K–12 student data is student demographic information (61 percent), as shown in figure 8.

FIGURE 8.

Percentage of states and territories with selected early childhood data elements directly linked to K–12 student data, by operational status: 2017



NOTE: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding.

How do states and territories use data for reporting and decisionmaking?

K-12 STUDENT DATA USE

States and territories reported that they use data managed by their SLDSs in different ways (figure 9). The two most commonly reported uses of K-12 student data are for feedback reports for high schools—including graduation rates, SAT scores, and other achievement characteristics-and for state reports for the legislature, both reported to be operational by 70 percent of states and territories. Other commonly reported operational uses of K–12 student data are for policy updates and changes (63 percent), state reports on agency law and policy (63 percent), resources for community members and the public (61 percent), state reports on research agendas and strategic plans (61 percent), feedback reports on remediation rates (52 percent), and state reports on board goals and priorities (52 percent).

Fifty percent of states and territories reported that these data are operational and in use for feedback reports for middle schools, and 46 percent of states and territories reported that they use K-12 student data for feedback reports for elementary schools. In addition, 50 percent of states and territories reported that K-12 student data are operational and in use for funding decisions, for direct certification for participation in the National School Lunch Program, and as a resource for parents. Forty-eight percent of states and territories reported that these data are operational and in use for data skills and use training for educators, and 46 percent reported that they

FIGURE 9.

Percentage of states and territories with selected uses for K-12 student data, by operational status: 2017

Data use	L				
Feedback reports: High schools	70	15 4 7 4			
State reports: Legislature	70 7 9 11				
Policy updates/changes	63	13 4 15 4			
State reports: Agency law/policy	63 9 4 ///20/				
Resources for community members, public	61	15 11 9 4			
State reports: Research	61	15 7 13 4			
Feedback reports: Remediation rates	52	15 9 /17 7			
State reports: Board goals/priorities	52	13 7 //20// 9			
Resources for parents	50	20 7 /20 4			
Feedback reports: Middle schools	50	17 9 //17 // 7			
National School Lunch Program	50	7 7 ////33 ////4			
Funding decisions	50	4 17 /24 /4			
Data skills and use training for educators	48	11 7 ////30 //// 4			
Instructional support	46	24 7 //20 // 4			
Feedback reports: Elementary schools	46	20 9 //20 7			
Program/intervention needs	46	15 13 //22 // 4			
Feedback reports: K–12 access/equity	37	22 11 //22 9			
Early warning systems	33 22	2 22 //20//4			
Educator preparation program feedback	33 15	15 ///30 /// 7			
Educator placements/transfers	33 4 13	46///46			
State-level collected courses aligned in SCED	28 15	15 7			
Curricular alignment decisions/materials	26 11 11	46 7			
Community/partnership collaboration	24 11 15	46			
Professional learning needs for staff	22 11 11	4			
Horizontal and vertical alignment planning	17 17 11	4			
Feedback reports: Other	11 4 4	43			
Other	2	67			
(0 20 40	60 80 100 Percent			
Operational	In progress Planned	Not planned Not answered			

use these data both for instructional support and for program and intervention needs. Less commonly reported operational uses of data are for curricular alignment decisions (26 percent), community or partnership collaboration (24 percent), and professional learning needs for staff (22 percent). Detailed information about the operational status of each type of K–12 student data use can be seen in figure 9.

K–12 TEACHER DATA USE

The most common operational uses of K-12 teacher data are for federal reports on EDFacts (57 percent) and state reports for the legislature (50 percent). Other commonly reported operational uses of K-12 teacher data include state reports on research agendas and strategic plans (46 percent), board or agency goals (46 percent), and law or policy requirements (43 percent). Among the least commonly reported operational uses of K–12 teacher data are for talent management, human resources, and merit pay (all 15 percent). Detailed information about the operational status of each type of K-12 teacher data use can be seen in figure 10.

FIGURE 10.

Percentage of states and territories with selected uses for K–12 teacher data, by operational status: 2017



NOTE: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding.

POSTSECONDARY DATA USE

The most commonly reported use of postsecondary data is for feedback reports for high schools, reported as operational by 65 percent of states and territories. States and territories also reported that postsecondary data are frequently used for feedback reports for community college and 4-year postsecondary institution outcomes (both at 59 percent). Other common operational uses of postsecondary data are for state reports on research agendas and strategic plans (57 percent), for the legislature (57 percent), or on board or agency goals (54 percent). Among the least commonly reported operational uses of postsecondary data are instructional support (13 percent), professional learning needs for staff (13 percent), human resources (7 percent), and talent management (4 percent). In addition, 50 percent or more of states and territories reported that they do not plan to use postsecondary data for these four purposes. Detailed information about the operational status of each type of postsecondary data use can be seen in figure 11.

FIGURE 11.

Percentage of states and territories with selected uses for postsecondary data, by operational status: 2017

Data use	L				
Feedback reports: High schools		65		13 11	9 2
Feedback reports: Community college outcomes (e.g., degree attained, graduation rates)	59			11	17/2
Feedback reports: 4-year postsecondary institution outcomes		59	9	9	22///2
State reports: Research agenda/strategic plans		57	11	11	20//2
State reports: Legislature		57	79	26	2
State reports: Board/agency goals/priorities		54	9 7	28	2
Feedback reports: Employment	5	50	11 2	20	2
Federal reports: Perkins CTE (non-ED <i>Facts</i>)	4	8	11 17	2	2///2
State reports: Law/policy requirements	4	8	11 7	/28//	7
Cross-sector collaboration/partnerships	40	5	13 13	26	2
Making policy/guidance updates	40	5	9 9	35	2
Resources for parents/community (e.g., parent dashboards, consumer score cards)	41		17 17	////22	2////2
Federal report: Other federal reports	26	2 15	41		15
Funding decisions	24	11 11	4	8	7
Data skills and use training for staff	24	9 13		52	2
Federal reports: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS)	24	7 9	54/		7
Horizontal and vertical alignment planning	17 1	3 11	57		2
Curricular decisions (teacher prep/ professional development)	15 11	13	59		2
Instructional support (e.g., dashboards for professors/administrators)	13 13	11	57		7
Professional learning needs for staff	13 4 9		27///		2
Human resources	7 4 2		83		4
Talent management	4 7 4		83		2
Other	22	50		46	
(0 20	40	60	80	100
		Perc	ent		
Operational	In progress	🔲 Planned 🛛 🛛	Not planned	🗆 Not a	nswered

WORKFORCE DATA USE

The most common operational uses of workforce data reported by states and territories are for state reports on research agendas and strategic plans (50 percent), community college feedback reports on transfer and employment outcomes (46 percent), state reports on board and agency goals and priorities (43 percent), and state reports for the legislature (43 percent). Other common operational uses of workforce data include state reports on workforce and economic development (41 percent); feedback reports on college-going and employment at the district level (41 percent); and feedback reports on transfer, continuing education, or employment for 4-year postsecondary institutions (41 percent). The use of workforce data for funding decisions was less commonly reported (operational for 15 percent of states and territories), and 59 percent of states and territories reported that they do not plan to use workforce data for that purpose in the future. Detailed information about the operational status of each type of workforce data use can be seen in figure 12.

FIGURE 12.

Percentage of states and territories with selected uses for workforce data, by operational status: 2017

Data use	1				
State reports: Research agenda/strategic plans		50	9 1	1 ///28	2
Feedback reports: Community colleges' transfer and employment outcomes	4	5	7 15	33	
State reports: Board/agency goals/priorities	43		7 11	35	4
State reports: Legislature	43		7 11	33	7
State reports: Workforce/ economic development programs	41		11 11	33	4
Feedback reports: District-level college-going and employment outcomes	41	į	7 22	30	
Feedback reports: 4-year postsecondary institutions' transfer or continuing education and employment outcomes	41		7 20	33	
Feedback reports: Regional-level college-going and employment outcomes	39		13 7	39	2
Feedback reports: Perkins CTE programs	37	13	3 20	30	
Federal reports	37	11	7	41	4
Cross-sector collaboration/discussion	33	17	13	35	2
State reports: Law/policy requirements	33	7	11	43	7
Feedback reports: Industry need/saturation	30	15	15	37	2
Feedback reports: Adult education programs' college-going and employment outcomes	28	13	20	37	2
Funding decisions	15 11	11		59	4
Other	2 2	52///		39	
	0 20	40	60	80	100
		I	Percent		
Operational	In progress	🔲 Planned	🛛 Not planr	ned 🗌 Not a	nswered

PERKINS CTE DATA USE

The most commonly reported operational uses of Perkins CTE data are for feedback reports on completers (57 percent), feedback reports for high schools (54 percent), federal reports on Perkins CTE (52 percent), and state reports on board or agency goals and priorities (43 percent). Other common uses of these data are for feedback reports for postsecondary institutions (operational for 41 percent of states and territories), state reports on research agendas and strategic plans (operational for 41 percent of states and territories), and state reports for the legislature (operational for 37 percent of states and territories). Less commonly reported operational uses of Perkins CTE data include curricular and material decisions (9 percent), professional learning needs for staff (9 percent), horizontal and vertical alignment planning (7 percent), human resources (4 percent), and talent management (2 percent). Detailed information about the operational status of each type of Perkins CTE data use can be seen in figure 13.

FIGURE 13.

Percentage of states and territories with selected uses for Perkins CTE data, by operational status: 2017

Data use	
Feedback reports: Completers	57 4 7 ////28////4
Feedback reports: High schools	54 7 9 ///24/// 7
Federal reports: Perkins CTE (non-ED <i>Facts</i>)	52 4 13 ////26////4
State reports: Board/ agency goals/priorities	43 2 9 /////35///// 11
Feedback reports: Postsecondary institutions	41 7 7 /////37//// 9
State reports: Research agenda/strategic plans	41 4 15 ////28//// 11
State reports: Legislature	37 4 9 //////////////////////////////////
State reports: Law/ policy requirements	33 4 11 /////35 //// 17
Feedback reports: Employment	33 20 4
Program placements	28 4 11 9
Workforce readiness reports by career cluster/industry	26 7 13 //////46//////9
Federal reports: Other federal reports	26 4 26
Cross-sector collaboration	24 9 13 //////43////// 11
Funding decisions	24 9 4 13
Making policy/guidance updates	22 9 15 /////43///// 11
Feedback reports: Training programs	22 7 13 //////50 //////9
Instructional support (e.g., dashboards for teachers)	20 7 22 /////43///// 9
Resources for public, community members (e.g., consumer scorecards)	15 7 17 ////////////////////////////////
Data skills and use training for educators	11 7 13 9
Curricular/material decisions	9 11 4 11
Professional learning needs for staff	9 4 11 11
Horizontal and vertical alignment planning	7 11 9 ///////63
Human resources	4 7 ///////////////////////////////////
Talent management	4 11
Other	46
	0 20 40 60 80 100
	Percent
Operational	In progress Planned Not planned Not answered

EARLY CHILDHOOD DATA USE

The most common uses of early childhood data reported as operational by states and territories are for state reports for the legislature (41 percent); state reports on early childhood programs, outcomes, and interventions (37 percent); and state reports on board or agency goals and priorities (37 percent). Other common operational uses of early childhood data are for state reports on law and policy requirements (35 percent), state reports on research agendas and strategic plans (33 percent), and federal reports on special education (33 percent).

Only 24 percent of states and territories reported that early childhood data are operationally in use for policy updates or for program or intervention placements. These two uses of early childhood data are planned for the future for 20 and 24 percent of states and territories, respectively. Detailed information about the operational status of each type of early childhood data use can be seen in figure 14.

FIGURE 14.

Percentage of states and territories with selected uses for early childhood data, by operational status: 2017

Data use	I			
State reports: Legislature	41	9	13 //28	9
Early childhood programs/ outcomes/interventions	37	11	22	7
State reports: Board/ agency goals/priorities	37	11	13	7
State reports: Law/ policy requirements	35	7 13	37	9
State reports: Research agenda/strategic plans	33	15	15 /28	9
Federal reports: Special education (non-ED <i>Facts</i>)	33	4 4	50	9
Funding decisions	30	4 15	41	9
Policy updates	24	9 20	41	7
Program/intervention placements	24	4 24	41	7
Resources for parents (e.g., parent dashboards, consumer scorecards)	22	9 11	54	4
Community/partnership collaboration	22 4	22	48	4
Federal reports: Other federal reports	22	5	2	24
Resources for soon-to-be parents, community, public (e.g., consumer scorecards)	20	11 11	/54///	4
Instructional support (e.g., dashboards for teachers)	15 4	26	50	4
Data skills and use training for educators	11 9	22	52	7
Professional learning needs for staff	11 4 13		67	4
Curricular decisions	9 4 11		67	9
Horizontal and vertical alignment planning	4 7 20		63	7
Human resources	4 9		78	7
Talent management	4 9		78	7
Other		50	48	
	0 20	40 Per	60 80 cent	100
Operational	In progress	□ Planned □	Not planned 🗆 N	ot answered

NOTE: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding.

FIND OUT MORE

For questions about content, to download this Statistics in Brief, or to view this report online, go to: <u>https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2020157</u>

Readers of this brief may be interested in the following NCES reports:

The Feasibility of Collecting School-Level Finance Data: An Evaluation of Data From the School-Level Finance Survey (SLFS) School Year 2013–14 (NCES 2018-305). https://nces.ed.gov/pubSearch/pubsinfo. asp?pubid=2018305

Forum Guide to Collecting and Using Attendance Data (NFES 2017-007). <u>https://nces.ed.gov/pubSearch/ pubsinfo.asp?pubid=NFES2017007</u> Forum Guide to Facility Information Management: A Resource for State and Local Education Agencies (NFES 2018-156). <u>https://ies.ed.gov/pubsearch/ pubsinfo.asp?pubid=NFES2018156</u>

METHODOLOGY AND TECHNICAL NOTES

Overview of the SLDS Survey

The Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) Survey was created to assess states' and territories' capacity for automated linking of K-12 student, teacher, postsecondary, workforce, Perkins career and technical education (CTE), and early childhood data in their SLDSs. Although states and territories that were awarded SLDS grants provide updates on the progress of their data systems, the SLDS Survey is the first formal and systematic collection of SLDS capacity information across all states and territories. The information collected as a result of the survey will help the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) evaluate the program and improve the technical assistance efforts that the program provides to states and territories in the areas of systems development, enhancement, and use.

The SLDS Survey was designed to inventory data systems in several ways. First, the survey asks states and territories to identify the types of data included and available for use in their SLDSs by providing a list of K-12 student data types and asking states and territories to indicate whether each type is operational, in progress, planned, or not planned for inclusion in the SLDS. The survey also asks whether there is automated infrastructure in place to link K–12 student data with data from five other sectors: K-12 teacher, postsecondary, workforce, Perkins CTE, and early childhood data. For each of these sectors, states and territories are asked how data are

linked and what types of data within each sector are directly linked to K–12 student data. States and territories also are asked to report how they use data within each sector to inform policy, practices, and decisionmaking based on a provided list of data uses. The response categories are defined at the onset of the survey as the following:

Operational—This element/capability is fully functional and available for its intended users.

In Progress—The state is currently building or implementing this element/capability as part of its SLDS, but it is not yet fully operational.

Planned—The state intends to include this element/capability in its SLDS and has a documented plan and funding source to implement, but implementation work has not begun.

Not Planned—The state is currently not planning to include this element/ capability in its SLDS. "Not Planned" should also be marked for items that are not applicable to the state SLDS at this time (e.g., legislative prohibitions, "unadopted" interest, etc.).

The 2017 survey contained 42 questions and was completed by respondents via a fillable PDF sent electronically to each state education agency (SEA). Respondents from each SEA were invited to participate in a presurvey webinar to learn more about the SLDS Survey. One limitation of the 2017 survey was that many of the survey items did not include definitions to further clarify terms. In response to feedback from the survey, more definitions will be provided in subsequent survey iterations.

Sample Frame/Selection

The respondent universe for this survey included SEAs from each of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands. This was a census of the universe of SEAs eligible to receive grants through the SLDS program, thus sampling was not used.

Data Collection

Letters from NCES were sent to the SLDS project director in each SEA to request participation in the survey.

The SLDS Survey was distributed to SEA contacts electronically as an e-mail attachment. In addition, NCES invited SLDS contacts to participate in a presurvey informational webinar about the SLDS Survey in order to share further information about the survey's purpose and to answer any questions. Survey recruitment began in April 2017, and respondents were asked to complete and return the survey by June 2017. However, completed surveys were still accepted through October 2017.

Data Processing and Imputation

Survey responses were collated from the returned fillable PDFs, from which an analytic file was produced. No imputation was performed at either the unit or item level. Data cleaning was conducted to ensure that state responses were recorded correctly, taking skip logic into account. That is, survey respondents were directed to skip a question if their state did not have a particular aspect of the data system planned. Skipped responses were populated as "not planned" rather than "not answered." This ensured that the "not answered" category represented true missing responses and that they were not comingled with "not planned" responses that were only missing because of the skip logic.

Response Rates

Forty-six of 56 SEAs completed the SLDS Survey, for a response rate of 82 percent. No weighting or imputations were used to address missing data in this survey.

Data Validation

One limitation of this survey is that responses might vary based on who provided the survey response. To address this limitation, the SLDS State Support Team (SST) conducted data validation on survey responses. The SST is a group of data systems experts who provide direct support to states related to the development, management, and use of SLDSs. SST support is available regardless of whether the requesting state or territory has received an SLDS grant. Data validation was conducted in two ways during data processing and analysis. First, the SST members reviewed survey data for their assigned states and communicated potential errors to the states so that they could review the data and make any needed corrections. The second step in data validation was to provide SST members with aggregate analyses in order to further validate state responses.

Statistical Procedures

The survey data were analyzed to produce aggregate summary data showing the proportion of states and territories who reported that aspects of their SLDSs were operational, in progress, planned, or not planned, or who failed to answer. Because no sampling or weighting was performed, simple percentages were calculated and are presented in this brief.

APPENDIX A: DATA TABLES

Table A-1. Percentage of states and territories with selected K–12 student data elements included in the SLDSs, by operational status: 2017

Data element	Operational	In progress	Planned	Not planned	Not answered
Demographics	91	4	0	0	4
Grade level	91	4	0	0	4
School enrollment and completion	89	7	0	0	4
Transfer in/out	85	7	0	2	7
Diploma/certificate	85	4	0	4	7
Assessments: Statewide summative/end of course	83	4	2	7	4
Attendance	80	9	7	0	4
Drop out history	80	4	9	2	4
In-state postsecondary/dual enrollment	78	7	7	4	4
Homelessness status	76	11	7	2	4
Other program participation ¹	76	9	2	7	7
Course enrollment	74	11	2	9	4
Course completion	67	13	2	11	7
Discipline	65	11	7	13	4
Assessments: College-readiness test scores (SAT, PSAT)	65	11	7	11	7
Migrant status	65	11	4	15	4
Virtual school/learning enrollment or participation	65	9	2	15	9
Assessments: Information on students not tested by grade and subject	61	4	11	17	7
Assessments: AP scores	52	11	13	17	7
Out-of-state postsecondary/ dual enrollment	41	4	13	33	9
Assessments: Kindergarten entry	39	9	24	24	4
Assessments: Statewide benchmark or interim	26	9	13	46	7
Assessments: Local benchmark or interim	22	7	2	65	4

¹ "Other program participation" includes participation in free and reduced-price lunch, Title I, English language learners, and special education programs. AP refers to Advanced Placement.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. Survey responses to whether K–12 student data of any type are included in the SLDS are 96 percent "Yes" and 4 percent "No." SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) Survey, 2017.

Table A-2. Percentage of states and territories with other sector data linked to K-12 student data: 2017

Sector of data	Yes	No	Not answered
K–12 teacher data	76	20	4
Postsecondary data	76	20	4
Workforce data	50	43	7
Perkins CTE data	72	28	0
Early childhood data	70	30	0

NOTE: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. CTE refers to career and technical education. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) Survey, 2017.

Table A-3. Percentage of states and territories with direct K-12 student data links to other data sectors, by linking method and operational status: 2017

Sector of data and linking method	Operational	In progress	Planned	Not planned	Not answered
K–12 teacher data					
Course assignments	72	4	4	2	17
Statewide unique teacher IDs	67	4	2	9	17
Roster verification process	39	2	7	35	17
Other method	4	0	0	30	65
Postsecondary data					
An assigned unique identifier	63	7	7	11	13
An element match process	61	2	2	15	20
Social Security number	17	2	2	59	20
Other method	0	0	0	41	59
Workforce data					
An assigned unique identifier	26	4	4	37	28
An element match process	41	2	4	24	28
Social Security number	28	4	0	37	30
Another state agency	28	2	0	41	28
Other method	7	0	0	43	50
Perkins CTE data					
An assigned unique identifier	70	2	2	15	11
An element match process	33	0	0	41	26
Social Security number	17	0	0	54	28
Another state agency	7	2	4	61	26
Other method	0	0	0	50	50
Early childhood data					
An assigned unique identifier	59	4	4	11	22
An element match process	26	7	4	26	37
Social Security number	4	2	2	57	35
Another state agency	4	4	2	52	37
Other method	2	0	0	46	52

NOTE: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding.

Table A-4. Percentage of states and territories with finance data linked to K–12 data, by operational status: 2017

Sector of data	Operational	In progress	Planned	Not planned	Not answered
K–12 student data	43	9	13	26	9
K–12 teacher data	33	4	9	52	2

NOTE: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) Survey, 2017.

Table A-5. Percentage of states and territories with direct workforce data links to other data sectors, by linking method and operational status: 2017

Sector of data and linking method	Operational	In progress	Planned	Not planned	Not answered
Postsecondary data					
An assigned unique identifier	22	2	2	37	37
An element match process	37	2	2	28	30
Social Security number	43	2	0	26	28
Another state agency	17	2	2	41	37
Other method	7	0	0	48	46
Adult education and Perkins CTE data					
An assigned unique identifier	17	4	7	41	30
An element match process	30	2	4	26	37
Social Security number	28	4	0	35	33
Another state agency	15	2	2	41	39
Other method	4	0	0	41	54

NOTE: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. CTE refers to career and technical education.

Table A-6. Percentage of states and territories with sector data elements aligned to the Common Education Data Standards (CEDS), by operational status: 2017

Sector of data	Operational	In progress	Planned	Not planned	Not answered
K–12 student data	24	35	17	20	4
Postsecondary data	17	22	22	33	7
Workforce data	4	13	17	50	15
Perkins CTE data	20	15	22	39	4
Early childhood data	9	15	26	48	2

NOTE: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. For more information on CEDS, please see https://ceds.ed.gov. CTE refers to career and technical education. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) Survey, 2017.

Table A-7. Percentage of states and territories with selected uses for sector data, by sector of data and operational status: 2017

How data are used and sector of data	Operational	In progress	Planned	Not planned	Not answered
Instructional support					
K–12 student data	46	24	7	20	4
Postsecondary data	13	13	11	57	7
Perkins CTE data	20	7	22	43	9
Early childhood data	15	4	26	50	4
Resources for parents, public, and/or comm	nunity members				
K–12 student data	54	11	10	21	4
Postsecondary data	41	17	17	22	2
Perkins CTE data	15	7	17	52	9
Early childhood data	21	10	11	54	4
Making policy or guidance updates					
K–12 student data	63	13	4	15	4
Postsecondary data	46	9	9	35	2
Perkins CTE data	22	9	15	43	11
Early childhood data	24	9	20	41	7
Curricular decisions					
K–12 student data	26	11	11	46	7
Postsecondary data	15	11	13	59	2
Perkins CTE data	9	11	4	65	11
Early childhood data	9	4	11	67	9
Funding decisions					
K–12 student data	50	4	17	24	4
Postsecondary data	24	11	11	48	7
Perkins CTE data	24	9	4	50	13
Early childhood data	30	4	15	41	9

NOTE: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. CTE refers to career and technical education.

Table A-8. Percentage of states and territories with selected federal and state reports produced by the SLDS, by operational status: 2017

Report	Operational	In progress	Planned	Not planned	Not answered
State legislature	39	9	20	28	4
Agency research agenda priorities	35	17	13	30	4
Commitment to data quality reports (timeliness of submissions/certifications, error correction rate prior to certification)	35	9	9	39	9
Agency/board goal/initiative/ policy attainment	30	7	9	48	7
Statewide assessment nonparticipation report by type/category (e.g., opt out, absent, medical emergency, etc.)	28	2	9	52	9
Usage statistics by user role (e.g., teachers, administrators, SEA, public, etc.)	24	4	13	52	7
Other	7	0	2	41	50

NOTE: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. SEA refers to state education agencies.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) Survey, 2017.

Table A-9. Percentage of states and territories with selected sources of information from critical stakeholders for SLDS dashboards, reports, and tools, by operational status: 2017

Source	Operational	In progress	Planned	Not planned	Not answered
Ad hoc feedback	59	9	7	17	9
Focus groups	48	7	13	26	7
Posttraining evaluations	46	2	13	30	9
Observations	46	2	9	35	9
Interviews	33	2	7	46	13
Large-scale surveys	26	7	15	41	11
Other	24	2	0	28	46

NOTE: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding.

Table A-10. Percentage of states and territories with sector data matched, by degree of data matching: 2017

Sectors of data matched	Less than 50 percent	50–75 percent	75–90 percent	Greater than 90 percent	Not applicable	No response
Postsecondary students matched to former in-state K–12 students	9	9	24	35	15	9
Individuals employed within the state matched to former in-state K–12 students	24	7	15	7	37	11
Individuals employed within the state matched to former in-state postsecondary students	15	15	13	9	37	11

NOTE: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) Survey, 2017.

Table A-11. Percentage of states and territories with selected K–12 teacher data elements directly linked to K–12 student data, by operational status: 2017

K–12 teacher data element	Operational	In progress	Planned	Not planned	Not answered
Course assignments	63	9	4	9	15
Years of experience	59	2	2	20	17
Certificate type	57	7	4	15	17
Highly qualified status	57	4	4	15	20
Preparation program/institution name	48	9	9	17	17
Certification path (traditional vs. alt-cert)	48	7	9	20	17
Postsecondary program/major	43	11	7	22	17
Salary	39	2	2	39	17
Assessment results (e.g., Praxis)	37	9	2	35	17
Teacher/administrator evaluation data	28	9	4	39	20

NOTE: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. The abbreviation alt-cert refers to alternative certification.

Table A-12. Percentage of states and territories with selected postsecondary data elements directly linked to K-12 student data, by operational status: 2017

Postsecondary data element	Operational	In progress	Planned	Not planned	Not answered
Period of enrollment	65	11	11	4	9
Prior postsecondary institutions attended	63	9	15	4	9
Course remediation	63	9	11	9	9
Progress toward completing program or degree	63	7	11	9	11
Recognized postsecondary credential	61	11	11	7	11
Demographics	61	11	7	13	9
Program/major upon completion	59	11	13	7	11

NOTE: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) Survey, 2017.

Table A-13. Percentage of states and territories with selected workforce data elements directly linked to K–12 student data, by operational status: 2017

Workforce data element	Operational	In progress	Planned	Not planned	Not answered
Current earnings	48	7	7	17	22
Historical earning records	46	7	4	22	22
Employer county	37	9	4	28	22
UI (unemployment insurance)	35	9	7	22	28
Employer ID	33	9	7	30	22
UC (unemployment compensation)	20	7	4	41	28
Wagner-Peyser	17	11	4	39	28
Occupation code	17	7	11	43	22
Trade Adjustment Assistance	17	4	4	46	28
Workforce Investment Act Standardized Record Data (WIASRD)	15	13	2	41	28

NOTE: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding.

Table A-14. Percentage of states and territories with selected Perkins CTE data elements directly linked to K-12 student data, by operational status: 2017

Perkins CTE data element	Operational	In progress	Planned	Not planned	Not answered
Participation	70	2	4	13	11
Program area/program of study	70	2	4	13	11
Certificates	41	11	15	17	15
Placement (after leaving program)	41	7	11	24	17

NOTE: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. CTE refers to career and technical education.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) Survey, 2017.

Table A-15. Percentage of states and territories with selected early childhood data elements directly linked toK-12 student data, by operational status: 2017

Early childhood data element	Operational	In progress	Planned	Not planned	Not answered
Demographics	61	2	7	13	17
Assessment data	30	11	13	28	17
Program data: Provider/center	30	7	22	22	20
Provider data: Licensure	22	4	20	35	20
Provider data: Certification	20	4	22	35	20
Program data: Quality ratings	17	11	17	35	20
Program data: Program attributes	17	9	22	33	20
Provider data: Training/ professional development	13	7	22	39	20
Provider data: Other	4	2	7	43	43

NOTE: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding.

Table A-16. Percentage of states and territories with selected uses for K–12 student data, by operational status: 2017

Data use	Operational	In progress	Planned	Not planned	Not answered
Feedback reports on high school (e.g., graduation rates, SAT scores)	70	15	4	7	4
State reports for/on legislature	70	7	9	11	4
Policy updates/changes	63	13	4	15	4
State reports for/on agency law/policy	63	9	4	20	4
Resources for community members, public (e.g., consumer scorecards)	61	15	11	9	4
State reports for/on research agenda/strategic plans	61	15	7	13	4
Feedback reports on remediation rates by high school upon college entry	52	15	9	17	7
State reports for/on board goals/priorities	52	13	7	20	9
Resources for parents (e.g., parent dashboards, consumer scorecards)	50	20	7	20	4
Feedback reports on middle schools	50	17	9	17	7
Direct certification for participation in the National School Lunch Program	50	7	7	33	4
Funding decisions	50	4	17	24	4
Data skills and use training for educators	48	11	7	30	4
Instructional support (e.g., dashboards for teachers)	46	24	7	20	4
Feedback reports on elementary schools	46	20	9	20	7
Program/intervention needs	46	15	13	22	4
Feedback reports on K-12 access/equity	37	22	11	22	9
Early warning systems	33	22	22	20	4
Educator preparation program feedback	33	15	15	30	7
Educator placements/transfers	33	4	13	46	4
State-level collected courses aligned in the School Courses for the Exchange of Data (SCED)	28	15	15	35	7
Curricular alignment decisions/materials	26	11	11	46	7
Community/partnership collaboration	24	11	15	46	4
Professional learning needs for staff	22	11	11	52	4
Horizontal and vertical alignment planning	17	17	11	50	4
Other feedback reports	11	4	4	37	43
Other	2	0	0	30	67

NOTE: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) Survey, 2017.

Table A-17. Percentage of states and territories with selected uses for K–12 teacher data, by operational status: 2017

Data use	Operational	In progress	Planned	Not planned	Not answered
Federal reports on EDFacts	57	11	7	24	2
State reports for/on legislature	50	2	9	37	2
State reports for/on research agenda/ strategic plans	46	7	17	28	2
State reports for/on board/agency goals/priorities	46	4	15	33	2
State reports for/on law/policy requirements	43	4	11	35	7
Feedback reports on educator effectiveness	39	2	17	39	2
Policy updates	39	2	9	46	4
Feedback reports on teacher preparation programs	37	9	20	33	2
Other federal reports	37	7	11	37	9
Funding decisions	33	4	4	54	4
Retention/transfer/promotion	33	2	13	50	2
Horizontal and vertical alignment planning	17	11	2	65	4
Feedback reports on professional learning	17	4	17	59	2
Curricular decisions (teacher prep/ professional development)	17	2	11	65	4
Talent management	15	7	9	67	2
Human resources	15	7	4	72	2
Merit pay	15	0	0	83	2
Other feedback reports	0	4	0	46	50
Other	2	0	0	43	54

NOTE: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) Survey, 2017.

Table A-18. Percentage of states and territories with selected uses for postsecondary data, by operational status: 2017

Data use	Operational	In progress	Planned	Not planned	Not answered
Feedback reports on high schools	65	13	11	9	2
Feedback reports on community college outcomes (e.g., degree attained, graduation rates)	59	11	11	17	2
Feedback reports on 4-year postsecondary institution outcomes	59	9	9	22	2
State reports for/on research agenda/ strategic plans	57	11	11	20	2
State reports for/on legislature	57	7	9	26	2
State reports for/on board/agency goals/ priorities	54	9	7	28	2
Feedback reports on employment	50	11	20	17	2
Federal reports on Perkins CTE (non-ED <i>Facts</i>)	48	11	17	22	2
State reports for/on law/policy requirements	48	11	7	28	7
Cross-sector collaboration/partnerships	46	13	13	26	2
Making policy/guidance updates	46	9	9	35	2
Resources for parents/community (e.g., parent dashboards, consumer scorecards)	41	17	17	22	2
Other federal reports	26	2	15	41	15
Funding decisions	24	11	11	48	7
Data skills and use training for staff	24	9	13	52	2
Federal reports on the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS)	24	7	9	54	7
Horizontal and vertical alignment planning	17	13	11	57	2
Curricular decisions (teacher prep/ professional development)	15	11	13	59	2
Instructional support (e.g., dashboards for professors/administrators)	13	13	11	57	7
Professional learning needs for staff	13	4	9	72	2
Human resources	7	4	2	83	4
Talent management	4	7	4	83	2
Other	2	0	2	50	46

Table A-19. Percentage of states and territories with selected uses for workforce data, by operational status: 2017

Data use	Operational	In progress	Planned	Not planned	Not answered
State reports for/on research agenda/ strategic plans	50	9	11	28	2
Feedback reports on community colleges' transfer and employment outcomes	46	7	15	33	0
State reports for/on board/agency goals/priorities	43	7	11	35	4
State reports for/on legislature	43	7	11	33	7
State reports for/on workforce/economic development programs	41	11	11	33	4
Feedback reports on district-level college-going and employment outcomes	41	7	22	30	0
Feedback reports on 4-year postsecondary institutions' transfer or continuing education and employment outcomes	41	7	20	33	0
Feedback reports on regional-level college-going and employment outcomes	39	13	7	39	2
Feedback reports on Perkins CTE programs	37	13	20	30	0
Federal reports	37	11	7	41	4
Cross-sector collaboration/discussion	33	17	13	35	2
State reports for/on law/policy requirements	33	7	11	43	7
Feedback reports on industry need/ saturation	30	15	15	37	2
Feedback reports on adult education programs' college-going and employment outcomes	28	13	20	37	2
Funding decisions	15	11	11	59	4
Other	4	2	2	52	39

Table A-20. Percentage of states and territories with selected uses for Perkins CTE data, by operational status: 2017

Data use	Operational	In progress	Planned	Not planned	Not answered
Feedback reports on completers	57	4	7	28	4
Feedback reports on high schools	54	7	9	24	7
Federal reports on Perkins CTE (non-ED <i>Facts</i>)	52	4	13	26	4
State reports on board/agency goals/ priorities	43	2	9	35	11
Feedback reports on postsecondary institutions	41	7	7	37	9
State reports on research agenda/ strategic plans	41	4	15	28	11
State reports on legislature	37	4	9	37	13
State reports on law/policy requirements	33	4	11	35	17
Feedback reports on employment	33	2	20	41	4
Program placements	28	4	11	48	9
Workforce readiness reports by career cluster/industry	26	7	13	46	9
Other federal reports	26	0	4	43	26
Cross-sector collaboration	24	9	13	43	11
Funding decisions	24	9	4	50	13
Making policy/guidance updates	22	9	15	43	11
Feedback reports on training programs	22	7	13	50	9
Instructional support (e.g., dashboards for teachers)	20	7	22	43	9
Resources for public, community members (e.g., consumer scorecards)	15	7	17	52	9
Data skills and use training for educators	11	7	13	61	9
Curricular/material decisions	9	11	4	65	11
Professional learning needs for staff	9	4	11	65	11
Horizontal and vertical alignment planning	7	11	9	63	11
Human resources	4	2	7	76	11
Talent management	2	2	4	80	11
Other	2	0	0	52	46

Table A-21. Percentage of states and territories with selected uses for early childhood data, by operational status: 2017

Data use	Operational	In progress	Planned	Not planned	Not answered
State reports for/on legislature	41	9	13	28	9
Early childhood programs/outcomes/ interventions	37	11	22	24	7
State reports for/on board/agency goals/priorities	37	11	13	33	7
State reports for/on law/policy requirements	35	7	13	37	9
State reports for/on research agenda/ strategic plans	33	15	15	28	9
Federal reports on special education (non-ED <i>Facts</i>)	33	4	4	50	9
Funding decisions	30	4	15	41	9
Policy updates	24	9	20	41	7
Program/intervention placements	24	4	24	41	7
Resources for parents (e.g., parent dashboards, consumer scorecards)	22	9	11	54	4
Community/partnership collaboration	22	4	22	48	4
Other federal reports	22	0	2	52	24
Resources for soon-to-be parents, community, public (e.g., consumer scorecards)	20	11	11	54	4
Instructional support (e.g., dashboards for teachers)	15	4	26	50	4
Data skills and use training for educators	11	9	22	52	7
Professional learning needs for staff	11	4	13	67	4
Curricular decisions	9	4	11	67	9
Horizontal and vertical alignment planning	4	7	20	63	7
Human resources	4	2	9	78	7
Talent management	4	2	9	78	7
Other	0	0	2	50	48

NOTE: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) Survey, 2017.