CONTENTS

IMPORTANT INFORMATION ........................................................................................................ 5

AGENDA AT-A-GLANCE ....................................................................................................... 8

HOTEL FLOOR PLAN ........................................................................................................... 10

AGENDA WITH SESSION DESCRIPTIONS

WEDNESDAY, JULY 30 ........................................................................................................ 13
THURSDAY, JULY 31 ........................................................................................................ 25
FRIDAY, AUGUST 1 ............................................................................................................ 47

EDFACTS AND COMMON CORE OF DATA (CCD)
NONFISCAL COORDINATORS’ TRAINING ......................................................................... 61

KEYNOTE SPEAKERS’ BIOGRAPHIES ................................................................................ 65

DEMONSTRATION DESCRIPTIONS .................................................................................... 69

TOPICAL INDEX TO SESSIONS ....................................................................................... 75

NOTES .................................................................................................................................. 79
IMPORTANT INFORMATION

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION SCIENCES
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
The U.S. Department of Education’s 2014 National Center for Education Statistics’ (NCES) STATS-DC Data Conference, from July 30–August 1, 2014, at the Marriott Wardman Park Hotel, offers

• discussions on technical and policy issues related to the collection, maintenance, and use of education data for education researchers, policymakers, and data system managers from all levels of government who want to share innovations in the design and implementation of education data collections and information systems;

• training and business meetings for Common Core of Data (CCD) and EDFacts data coordinators;

• information sessions on the Common Core of Data (CCD), data collection, data linking beyond K–12, data management, data privacy, data quality, data standards, data use (both analytical and instructional), fiscal data, and changes in how the U.S. Department of Education collects and uses data; and

• updates on federal and state activities affecting data collection and reporting, with a focus on information about the best new approaches in collecting, reporting, and using education statistics.

The following important information will help ensure the best possible experience at the 2014 NCES STATS-DC Data Conference. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Renée Rowland, NCES STATS-DC Conference Manager, at the registration desk.

**Conference Venue**
Plenary and concurrent sessions will be held on the Mezzanine and Exhibition Levels of the

Marriott Wardman Park Hotel
2660 Woodley Road NW
Washington, DC 20008
Phone: 202-328-2000

**Conference Materials and Registration**
Preregistered attendees may pick up conference materials at the registration desk outside of the Thurgood Marshall Ballroom – West (Mezzanine Level).

An on-site registration desk is open during the following hours:

• Wednesday, July 30
  8:00 AM–5:20 PM

• Thursday, July 31
  8:00 AM–5:15 PM

• Friday, August 1
  8:00 AM–12:30 PM

Staff is available to assist you throughout the conference.

**Conference Etiquette**
As a courtesy to presenters and conference participants, please observe the following rules of conference etiquette:

• Silence your electronic devices prior to entering sessions.

• Arrive a few minutes before each session begins.

**Concurrent Session Presenters**
Please use the laptop provided in your breakout room and not your own laptop. Do not tamper with or disconnect the computer or data projector connections.

After the conference, Coffey Consulting will e-mail presenters information about posting presentation materials on the NCES website.
**Conference Evaluations**  
Your feedback is welcomed; conference evaluation forms are in your agenda programs.

**Cyber Café**  
The Cyber Café (located in the Tyler Room on the Mezzanine Level) provides participants with convenient, complimentary access to e-mail and the Internet. The Cyber Café is open during the following hours:

- Wednesday, July 30  
  8:00 AM–5:00 PM

- Thursday, July 31  
  8:00 AM–5:00 PM

- Friday, August 1  
  8:00 AM–10:00 AM

*Please note: this room will be closed during the Opening Plenary Session.*

**Contact Information**  
If you need to make changes to your contact information, please see staff at the registration desk.

**Lost and Found**  
Please remember to take all your belongings from the session rooms. If you find or lose an item, go to the registration desk.

**Message Board**  
The message board is located adjacent to the registration desk outside of the Thurgood Marshall Ballroom – West (Mezzanine Level). Please check there for information or to post a message.

**Name Badges**  
Please wear your name badge at all times. At the end of the conference, please recycle your badge holder and lanyard at the registration desk.

**Note**  
In compliance with federal policy, no food or beverages will be provided. Information regarding restaurants is available at the conference registration desk or the Marriott Wardman Park Hotel’s concierge desk.
AGENDA AT-A-GLANCE
AND
HOTEL FLOOR PLAN

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION SCIENCES
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
## 2014 NCES STATS-DC Data Conference
### July 30–August 1, 2014 — Agenda At-a-Glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
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<th></th>
<th></th>
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</tr>
</thead>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>Session C</td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session D</td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wednesday, July 30, 2014**

**Common Core of Data (CCD) Fiscal Coordinators’ Training, 8:30–12:00, Lincoln 5 (Exhibition Level)**

**Opening Plenary Session, 1:15–2:15, Thurgood Marshall Ballroom**

**Teacher and Administrator Turnover Research: A Collaboration Between the State Agency and Regional Educational Laboratory (RELA) Appalachia**

**Development, Implementation, and Evaluation of an Early Warning System**

**Improving Instruction by Putting Data to Work: Using Metadata to Address Student Needs**

**Virginia’s Data Needs Assessment Project**

**Canadian, Bell**

**Thursday, July 31, 2014**

**Concurrent Session I**

**2:30–3:20**

**EDFacts and Common Core of Data (CCD) Nonfiscal Coordinators’ Training**

**State Fiscal Coordinators Roundtable (Parts 1 and 2)**

**Common, Rader, Barkley**

**Factors That Affect Employment Outcomes: Utilizing a Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) to Develop a Model of Education-to-Workforce Transitions**

**McGrew**

**Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF) 3.0: Simple, Secure, Standard**

**Frost, Canada, Tamayo, Jennifer Schmidt**

**Sharing and Using Homeless Data and/or Health Data in a Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS)**

**Votta, Beaud, Henderson, Hansen, R. Taylor**

**Improving Instruction by Putting Data to Work: Using Metadata to Address Student Needs**

**McManus, Kincic, Gladney, Joy**

**EDFacts and Common Core of Data (CCD) Nonfiscal Coordinators’ Working Sessions**

**Early Childhood Integrated Data System Project (ECIDS) and the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy Center): Toolkits for Building Better Data Systems**

**Holmes, Cohen, Hebblet**

**Reporting Financial Data for Public Access**

**Rader, Barkley**

**Whose Data Is It Anyway? Determining the Authoritative Source Between General and Special Education Data**

**Heitman, Petro, Rhodes Magennis, Baca**

**Safeguarding Student Privacy: Key Legislative, Technical, and Communication Strategies for States**

**Domagalski, Gibson, Anderson**

**Concurrent Session II**

**3:30–4:20**

**Closing the Data Circle: A Multistate Effort to Create Core Competencies for Educator Data Use (Parts 1 and 2)**

**Katahira, Tydeman, Bevier, Chatts**

**Safeguarding Student Privacy: Key Legislative, Technical, and Communication Strategies for States**

**Domagalski, Gibson, Anderson**

**Concurrent Session III**

**4:30–5:20**

**EDFacts and Common Core of Data (CCD) Nonfiscal Coordinators’ Working Sessions**

**EDFacts and Common Core of Data (CCD) Nonfiscal Coordinators’ Working Sessions**

**Early Childhood Integrated Data System Project (ECIDS) and the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy Center): Toolkits for Building Better Data Systems**

**Holmes, Cohen, Hebblet**

**Reporting Financial Data for Public Access**

**Rader, Barkley**

**Whose Data Is It Anyway? Determining the Authoritative Source Between General and Special Education Data**

**Heitman, Petro, Rhodes Magennis, Baca**

**Safeguarding Student Privacy: Key Legislative, Technical, and Communication Strategies for States**

**Domagalski, Gibson, Anderson**

**Lunch (on Your Own)**

**Concurrent Session IV**

**9:00–10:00**

**Concurrent Session V**

**10:15–11:15**

**Concurrent Session VI**

**11:30–12:30**

**Concurrent Session VII**

**1:45–2:45**

**Concurrent Session VIII**

**3:00–4:00**

**Concurrent Session IX**

**4:15–5:15**

**Concurrent Session X**

**9:00–10:00**

**Concurrent Session XI**

**10:15–11:15**

**Concurrent Session XII**

**11:30–12:30**

**When in Doubt, Don’t Give It Out: Processes and Tools for Authorizing Access to Data**

**Higaki, Larson**

**Overcoming the Barriers to Effective Data Use**

**Buch, Dobney**

**A Comparison of State Funding Formulas in West Virginia and Kentucky**

**Barkley, Willard**

**End-to-End Demonstration of the Texas Student Data System**

**Gaston, Gentzel**

**ED Data Inventory: What Is It, How Can You Use It, and What’s Next?**

**Seastrom, Kukadela, Makadon, Low, Barret**

**A Collaboration of Two States: The Georgia Tunnel and the Rhode Island Instructional Support System**

**Rabbit, Swiggum**

**Review of a Cross-District Research Alliance Developed to Facilitate District Data Use**

**Weinberger, Kaveney, Phillips**

**Monitoring Actual Wyoming School- and District-Level Resource Allocations Compared to Funding-Model-Generated Resources**

**Cicirelli, Seder**

**College Access and Readiness Outcomes of the University of California’s Transcript Evaluation Service**

**Hillmon, Studley, Levesque**

**So You Want a 21st Century Website: North Carolina’s Move to Data Visualization Software for the School Report Cards**

**Dulaney, Baranello**

**A Panel With Pennsylvania and Texas: Lessons Learned on Deploying Statewide Dashboards to Support Student Success**

**Gaston, Ream, Van**

**Tracking the Transition From High School to Higher Education: Lessons for Successful Collaboration Between Researchers and State Partners Sharing Data**

**Douglas, House, Ruffus**

**Making Sense of Graduation and Dropout Rates**

**Sandy**

**Aligning the U.S. Virgin Islands’ (USVI) Early Childhood Grant With USVI’s Virgin Islands Virtual Information System (VIVIS)**

**A. Thomas, Mitch Johnson**

**The Collaborative Development of a Statewide Data Quality Network**

**Berger, Scott, Rodrigues**

**Creating Rich School District Datasets Through Updated Surveying Methods**

**Stratos, Kowalski**

**DC’s At-Risk Funding and Implications for Early Warning Systems**

**Eigner**

**Using Data to Identify Indicators of College Readiness**

**Rethinam**

**Effective Strategies for Granting Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) Access to Outside Researchers**

**Orians**

**Teacher and Leader Evaluation Management System**

**Koffkin, Cliford, Hupp**

**Lessons Learned From One of the Largest PK–12 Unique Identifier System Implementations**

**Gaston, Gentzel, Guerrero**

**The Uses of School Health Data in DC**

**Bamkole**

**My School Data—Making a Difference Through Data in Washington Schools**

**Retzer, Mock**

**Research Engine—Florida’s External Research Request Application**

**A. Smith**

**Who Moved My EDEN Queries: How to Make the Change From Manual Processes**

**Cowan, Pagnotta**

**Assessing Education and Employment Outcomes of Career and Technical Education (CTE) Graduates**

**Jenner, Norris**

**Using Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) Data to Demonstrate the Impact of Effective Teachers in Tennessee**

**Schwartz, Silver, Levesque**

**Inclusive State Data Systems: Policy and Practice**

**Zinn, Imperatore, Harmon, Wilson**

**Postsecondary Success: Technical Considerations for Linking National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) Data to District Data**

**Tith, Dudek, Baski, Davis, Martinez**

**Arizona Ready-for-Rigor Data Dashboard: Ongoing Use in a PK–12 Educational Environment**

**Nirschl, Wasson, Morris, Malone, Morse, Linder**
This conference is intended to provide an opportunity for state and local educators, members of associations and government agencies, and others to share information about developments and issues in the collection, reporting, and use of education data. The information and opinions expressed in this conference do not necessarily represent the policy or views of the U.S. Department of Education or the National Center for Education Statistics.
**Common Core of Data (CCD) Fiscal Coordinators’ Training**

8:30–12:00 ...................................................... Lincoln 5 (Exhibition Level)

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) and U.S. Census Bureau

(This session is reserved for CCD Fiscal Coordinators.)

This session will cover new developments in the National Public Education Financial Survey (NPEFS) and School District Finance Survey (F-33): collecting and reporting finance data on charter schools at the district level; maintenance of effort (MOE) requirements; a prospective school-level finance data collection; data items utilized in calculating state per-pupil expenditure (SPPE); Title I allocation procedures; and updates to the NCES Financial Accounting for Local and State School Systems handbook. This session will also cover special topics, including a review of key concepts and crucial variable definitions, the prospective addition or deletion of data items for NPEFS and F-33, the NPEFS Federal Register notice, a demonstration of the Census Bureau Local Education Agency Finance System (LEAFS) processing and editing system as well as the NPEFS web application, business and editing rules, the imputation process, and updates to the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB).

Welcome and Introductions

John Q. Easton, Director of Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education

Keynote Speech

Civil Rights and Data: Utilizing Statistics to Examine the Equity Health of Our Nation’s Schools

Catherine E. Lhamon, Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education

The U.S. Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights (OCR) uses data every day in its work to protect students from discrimination based on race, national origin, sex, disability, and age. OCR relies heavily on data collected through its Civil Rights Data Collection and by the National Center for Education Statistics to uncover disparities affecting students at the elementary, secondary, and postsecondary levels. During this session, Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights Catherine E. Lhamon will cover the importance of data to OCR’s work and the way OCR utilizes statistical information in its policy development and investigations.

Announcements

Ross Santy, Associate Commissioner, Administrative Data Division
National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education

2:15–2:30  Break

2:30–3:20  Concurrent Session I Presentations

I–A  State Fiscal Coordinators Roundtable (Part 1)................................. Lincoln 5 (Exhibition Level)

Stephen Cornman, U.S. Department of Education
Glenda Rader, Michigan Department of Education
Susan Barkley, Kentucky Department of Education

2:30–3:20

This session will facilitate discussion and problem solving among the state fiscal coordinators. Bring your questions, best practices, and “war stories” with you to this session so we can all learn from each other. Topics may include maintenance of effort, indirect costs, chart of accounts, Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) standards, or federal reporting. Knowledge will be shared and valuable network connections will be made.
I–E  Teacher and Administrator Turnover Research: A Collaboration Between the State Agency and Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) Appalachia

Carla Howe, West Virginia Department of Education
Jerry Johnson, University of North Florida
Eishi Adachi, Edvance Research, Inc.

2:30–3:20

Few studies have examined teacher and administrator turnover in West Virginia. Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) Appalachia is collaborating with the West Virginia Department of Education to conduct a teacher and administrator turnover study in West Virginia. Speakers at this session will present practical issues, such as submitting a research proposal for the data request, identifying appropriate data elements for the study, operationalizing terms, and finding solutions for each issue. Representatives of REL Appalachia and the West Virginia Department of Education will illustrate how researchers and state agencies can collaborate to investigate teacher and administrator turnover.

I–F  Maryland Longitudinal Data System (MLDS) Center: Building a System to Protect Identities

Chandra Haislet and Chuck Shelton, Maryland Longitudinal Data System (MLDS) Center

2:30–3:20

Maryland’s Longitudinal Data System (MLDS) Center has developed innovative, effective, and cost-effective solutions to protect student and worker information, and to link data beyond K–12 and into the workforce. This session will detail critical strategies to protect person-level data, which include the separation of data, separation of duties, tokenization, and aggregation; and strategies to link data, which include a rigorous data governance process, the use of industry-standard codes and definitions, and automated and integrated data-quality processes. A Master Data Management (MDM) database, created using Oracle products, supports both efforts.

I–G  Using a Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) to Support Educator Effectiveness

Robert Swiggum, Georgia Department of Education
Robin Taylor, SLDS State Support Team

2:30–3:20

This panel discussion will focus on how states are using the statewide longitudinal data system (SLDS) to support educator effectiveness. Some states, Georgia for example, have included teacher data in the SLDS and linked it with student data for various purposes, such as verifying classroom rosters and providing student-growth information to classroom teachers.
I–H  A Seven-Year Journey: Colorado’s Successful $22 Million Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) Grant Deliverables ........................................... Harding

Daniel Domagala, Marcia Bohannon, and Jan Petro, Colorado Department of Education

2:30–3:20

2014 marks the first year since 2007 that Colorado is operating without the wonderful assistance of a Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) grant. Attend this session to learn about Colorado’s SLDS Program implementations, innovations, tribulations, and adulations. We’ll wrap up with a lessons-learned questions-and-answers discussion, with audience participation.

I–I  Current and Future Uses of Workforce Data in Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) Programs ....................................................... Coolidge

Neal Gibson, Arkansas Research Center
Robert Sheets, University of Chicago at Urbana-Champaign

2:30–3:20

Now that most states have P–20W data systems, what tools are coming from these systems that can best inform practice and help states develop stronger programs for workforce development? This presentation will address current capacity of P–20W systems, as well as future areas of study, such as the inclusion of industry certifications and Real Time LMI. Methods for ensuring individual privacy in these expanding systems will also be demonstrated.

I–J  Forum Alternative Socioeconomic Status (SES) Measures Working Group ..................... Hoover

Matt Cohen, Ohio Department of Education
Tom Szuba, Quality Information Partners, Inc.

2:30–3:20

The Alternative Socioeconomic Status (SES) Measures Working Group of the National Forum on Education Statistics is working to identify SES measures other than the National School Lunch Program’s free- and reduced-price meals eligibility indicator in order to increase the accuracy and appropriate accessibility of student-level SES data for the education community. Join us to exchange ideas about these alternatives and hear about the development of our draft document.

3:20–3:30  Break

EDFacts and Common Core of Data (CCD) Nonfiscal Coordinators’ Training
3:30–5:20............................................. Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (East)

(This session is reserved for EDFacts and Common Core of Data (CCD) Nonfiscal Coordinators.)
II-A  State Fiscal Coordinators Roundtable (Part 2) .......................... Lincoln 5 (Exhibition Level)

Stephen Cornman, U.S. Department of Education
Glenda Rader, Michigan Department of Education
Susan Barkley, Kentucky Department of Education

3:30–4:20

This session will facilitate discussion and problem solving among the state fiscal coordinators. Bring your questions, best practices, and “war stories” with you to this session so we can all learn from each other. Topics may include maintenance of effort, indirect costs, chart of accounts, Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) standards, or federal reporting. Knowledge will be shared and valuable network connections will be made.

II-B  Closing the Data Circle: A Multistate Effort to Create Core Competencies for Educator Data Use (Part 1) .......... Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (North)

Justin Katahira, University of Hawaii
Christina Tydeman, Hawaii State Department of Education
Marcus Bevier, South Dakota Department of Education
Corey Chatis, SLDS State Support Team

3:30–4:20

For nine months, the 13-state Data Use Standards Workgroup has been addressing the question: What do educators need to know and be able to do to effectively use data in support of student learning and success? In this double session, we will describe how we identified the critical knowledge, skills, and professional behaviors that teachers and administrators need in order to use data well. We will share the complete draft product of the effort and host an interactive workshop in which you provide feedback on how the resource can be used and improved, and hear how your state can participate.

II-C  Mississippi Statewide Teacher Appraisal Rubric (MSTAR).... Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (West)

Karolyn Bridges-Jordan, Mississippi Department of Education
Ross Smith and Martin Disterheft, PITSS America LLC

3:30–4:20

Learn how the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) deployed a new Teacher Evaluation Process based on mobile technology using Application Development Framework (ADF) Mobile. The solution developed for MDE enables principals, educators, and district administrators to conduct teacher evaluations on their PC, iPad, iPhone, and Android phones. The mobile application features offline mode, a user interface driven by server-side configuration, and reference documentation for the entire teacher evaluation process. Learn how the solution was developed and implemented and the long-term educational evaluation roadmap this new mobile platform enables.
II–D  Factors That Affect Employment Outcomes: Utilizing a Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) to Develop a Model of Education-to-Workforce Transitions .................. Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (South)

Charles McGrew, Kentucky Center for Education and Workforce Statistics

3:30–4:20

Kentucky is utilizing the K–12, postsecondary, and employment data in its statewide longitudinal data system (SLDS) to analyze the connections between student characteristics, academic preparation, and school-level factors as they relate to college and workforce outcomes. This presentation will include an overview of how the data are connected within the Kentucky Longitudinal Data System, a discussion of how Kentucky goes beyond basic descriptive statistics to conduct policy-driven research with its data, and initial findings from its study.


3:30–4:20

A school district in Fairbanks, Alaska, serving approximately 14,000 students used an Early Warning System (EWS) to make changes to an existing graduation success program (GSP). Students in grades K–12 were identified as low, medium, and high risk of dropping out using student data. Graduation success coaches prioritized services with high risk students. The district analyzed the frequency, duration, and quantity of GSP activities with individual students. The development of the EWS model, the implementation of services, and evaluation of the graduation success program will be discussed.

II–F  Applying a Stakeholder Analysis to Galvanize Your Stakeholder Engagement.............. Wilson B Laurel Ballard, Wyoming Department of Enterprise Technology Services
Mitch Johnson, PRE/ETS

3:30–4:20

Is your team spending an exorbitant amount of time trying to engage system stakeholders who have little or no interest in the project and even less influence, while spending little time on the stakeholders who really matter? Learn how Wyoming’s P–20W Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) project is utilizing a detailed stakeholder identification and analysis process to strengthen its stakeholder engagement activities by categorizing stakeholders into the five levels of participation and by planning the engagement activities around the participation levels.
II–G  Georgia’s New Unique Student ID System  

Kathy Aspy and Jayesh Dave, Georgia Department of Education

3:30–4:20

In January 2014, the Georgia Department of Education implemented the Georgia Unique Identifier for Education, called GUIDE. This new web application has features that have significantly improved the accuracy and timeliness of unique student ID creation and maintenance. Some of the benefits of GUIDE include:

- Changes to student identity data must be confirmed by the school or district registrar.
- The matching algorithms are customizable by a state-level GUIDE Administrator.
- Student identity data is validated in every data collection against the GUIDE database.
- The GUIDE ensures almost instant access to eight-year student academic history.

Join us as we share how the new ID application works.

II–H  Benefits and Challenges of Integrating Data in Early Childhood: The Case of Early Childhood Special Education

Linda Goodman, Connecticut Department of Developmental Services
Abby Winer, The DaSy Center
Kathleen Hebbeler, SRI International

3:30–4:20

Young children with disabilities, who often are served in multiple programs, are likely to benefit from more coordinated state efforts to integrate data systems across programs. This session will examine how integrated data systems can improve services for young children with disabilities, by, for example, allowing states to answer critical policy questions such as, “Are children who receive early intervention or preschool special education services less likely to need special education services later on?” Panelists will discuss the issues states face when trying to link early childhood data systems, using early intervention and preschool special education programs as an example.

II–I  Maximizing NCES Resources to Develop ANSWERS, Alaska’s P–20W Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS)

Kerry Thomas and Stephanie Butler, Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education

3:30–4:20

Alaska’s approach to maximizing the FY12 Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) grant to develop ANSWERS P–20W SLDS by leveraging NCES services and resources, best practices, and subject matter experts from other states will be addressed in this session. The presenters will discuss resources available from NCES and the State Support Team (SST) and how Alaska utilized and benefitted from those resources.
II–J  Preventing Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) Errors Prior to Upload................. Hoover

Deborah Rodrigues, Pennsylvania Department of Education
Russ Redgate, eScholar LLC

3:30–4:20

The Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) implemented new data quality capabilities in 2013–14. The Pennsylvania Information Management System (PIMS) Data Quality Engine (DQE) enables even some of the most complex business rules to be applied before data are allowed to enter the statewide longitudinal data system (SLDS). This session will explain how the state’s new DQE capability is increasing the quality of the SLDS data and reinforcing a culture of data quality within local education agencies (LEAs) statewide. In addition, the ability to prevent errors is saving time for local and state education agency staff. The PIMS DQE allows PDE to implement rules as simple as validating dates and numbers are valid, as well as more sophisticated rules requiring conditional logic that involves multiple fields or even multiple datasets. In some cases, the checks involve comparisons of incoming field values or record counts against data already residing in target tables. All this is possible prior to loading data into PIMS, PDE’s SLDS data warehouse.

4:20–4:30  Break

4:30–5:20  Concurrent Session III Presentations

III–B  Closing the Data Circle: A Multistate Effort to Create Core Competencies for Educator Data Use (Part 2) ............... Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (North)

Justin Katahira, University of Hawaii
Christina Tydeman, Hawaii State Department of Education
Marcus Bevier, South Dakota Department of Education
Corey Chatis, SLDS State Support Team

4:30–5:20

For nine months, the 13-state Data Use Standards Workgroup has been addressing one question: What do educators need to know and be able to do to effectively use data in support of student learning and success? In this double session, we will describe how we identified the critical knowledge, skills, and professional behaviors that teachers and administrators need in order to use data well. We will share the complete draft product of the effort and host an interactive workshop in which you provide feedback on how the resource can be used and improved, and hear how your state can participate.
III–C  Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF) 3.0: Simple, Secure, Standard.................................................... Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (West)

Larry Fruth II, SIF Association
Bethann Canada, Virginia Department of Education
Peter Tamayo, Washington State Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
Jennifer Schmidt, Tri-Rivers Educational Computer Association (TRECA) (Ohio)

4:30–5:20

Common Education Data Standards (CEDS) usage is now being seen in the real world, and the Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF) 3.0 revolution not only encompasses all of the CEDS data points but also now allows for choice of infrastructures to be used with the most comprehensive data model spanning early childhood, K–12, higher education, and the workforce. This session will highlight the benefits for local and state education agencies in using community-built open standards to ensure secure data management as well as the SIF 3.0 move to simplicity for developers and end users.

III–D  Sharing and Using Homeless Data and/or Health Data in a Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS).......................Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (South)

Margaret Votta, Rhode Island Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Melissa Beard, Washington State Office of Financial Management
William Henderson, District of Columbia Office of the State Superintendent of Education
Laura Hansen, Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools (Tennessee)
Robin Taylor, SLDS State Support Team

4:30–5:20

Student data isn’t just useful to local education agencies in meeting the needs of students. Youth-serving organizations in the community, as well as state agencies, can be empowered to help schools meet the instructional, social, and emotional needs of students. This session will highlight efforts underway in Rhode Island, Washington, and Washington, DC, to share and use homeless and health data in their SLDS systems. The session also includes the Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools’ perspective on the challenges and promise of sharing data with community partners to meet student needs both in and outside of schools.

III–E  Improving Instruction by Putting Data to Work: Using Metadata to Address Student Needs..............................................................Wilson A

Sarah McManus, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction
Suzan Kinaci, Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Dave Gladney, Association of American Publishers (AAP)
Michael Jay, Educational Systemics, Inc.

4:30–5:20

While we collect a great deal of data for the purpose of general reporting and analysis, the hope is that one day we’ll be able to use some of that data and more to support educators and learners
in making informed decisions about instructional strategies. Metadata that describes learning attributes of instructional resources are a key foundational element in reaching this goal. Hear from states using the metadata specification produced by the Learning Resource Metadata Initiative (LRMI) to build tools that help educators find and use targeted, instructionally relevant content addressing learners’ needs. Learn how you can integrate this work into your initiatives.

III–F  Legislation Language That Is Effective and Supportive of Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) ........................................ Wilson B

Steve Snow, North Dakota Department of Education
Neal Gibson, Arkansas Research Center
Bill Hurwitch, Maine Department of Education
Meredith Fergus, Minnesota Office of Higher Education
Jeff Sellers, SLDS State Support Team

4:30–5:20

As concern continues to increase about data use and issues around confidentiality, many states are finding it challenging to move their statewide longitudinal data system (SLDS) projects along and are lacking the needed support to ensure their success. This session will highlight legislation that has supported the SLDS development in states that are successfully securing the confidentiality of their data and how that legislation has addressed issues of confidentiality. Strategies for approaching the legislature and public will be discussed and processes for communicating what the state will and will not do with the data it collects.

III–G  Why Taking State Collaboration to the Next Level Is Worth It .................................... Wilson C

Mark Masterson, Arizona Department of Education
Robert Swiggum, Georgia Department of Education
Richard Charlesworth, Tennessee Department of Education
Joyce Popp, Idaho State Department of Education
Troy Wheeler, Ed-Fi Alliance

4:30–5:20

Building the 21st century education data systems today’s students need for academic success has been a monumental task that has yielded different results from state to state. But should states try to go it alone? This moderated panel discussion will walk participants through the benefits of collaboration, using real-life examples to shed light on how these partnerships can work. Learn from these states’ successes and failures, as well as how, when, and why to engage external vendor partners. Most importantly, the panel will cover why collaboration matters, especially in this post-stimulus-funding era all states are facing.
III–H  Northeast Early Childhood Data Working Group: Vermont’s Use of Common Education Data Standards (CEDS) to Inform Policy ................................. Harding

Kathleen Eaton Paterson,
Building Bright Futures: Vermont’s Early Childhood State Advisory Council
Clare Irwin, Regional Educational Laboratory – Northeast and Islands
Dave Phillips, WestEd

4:30–5:20

Since 2013, Vermont has been working closely with several other state early childhood stakeholders across the Northeast regarding best practices in the development of integrated early childhood and longitudinal data systems. This work, supported by the Regional Educational Laboratory – Northeast and Islands (REL-NEI), has included the use of both the Connect and Align tools provided by the Common Education Data Standards (CEDS). This presentation will focus on the work of the REL-NEI Data Working Group and, specifically, how Vermont is using these CEDS tools to move forward the development of its comprehensive, integrated early childhood and K–12 data systems.

III–I  Using Workforce Data: Linkages, Analysis, and Products....................................................... Coolidge

Wendy Kang, Virginia Community College System
Ruben Garcia, Texas Workforce Commission
Tim Norris, Washington State Office of Financial Management

4:30–5:20

In this session, members of several U.S. Department of Labor-funded Workforce Data Quality Initiative (WDQI) grantee teams will share practices for linking and analyzing workforce and education data, and the products they have developed to disseminate results.

III–J  Data Governance—Year 1 Implementation................................................................. Hoover

Carla Howe, West Virginia Department of Education

4:30–5:20

In this session, learn about the implementation of a data governance structure at the West Virginia Department of Education. Hear from the Data Governance Manager about her role, the process, and all that transpired during the first year of implementation.
**EDFacts and Common Core of Data (CCD) Nonfiscal Coordinators’ Working Sessions**

9:00–12:30 ........................................ Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (East)

(These sessions are reserved for EDFacts and Common Core of Data (CCD) Nonfiscal Coordinators.)

**9:00–10:00  Concurrent Session IV Presentations**

**IV-B**  
Early Childhood Integrated Data System Project (ECIDS) and the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy Center): Toolkits for Building Better Data Systems ......................... Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (North)

*Jaci Holmes, Maine Department of Education  
Missy Cochenour, SLDS State Support Team  
Kathy Hebbeler, SRI International*

9:00–10:00  
The Early Childhood Integrated Data System Project (ECIDS) and the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy Center) will provide an overview of their two program-specific tools to improve data quality in early childhood education and discuss how these tools can help you use your data as well as the implications of integrating early childhood program data into P–20+ State Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS).

**IV-C**  
Reporting Financial Data for Public Access....................... Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (West)

*Glenda Rader, Michigan Department of Education  
Susan Barkley, Kentucky Department of Education*

9:00–10:00  
Learn how two states are responding to the demand for transparency and accountability of public education dollars with online financial data reporting. Michigan is partnering with a software company to transform datasets into user-friendly tables and graphs with comparative capabilities. Kentucky is adding a finance component to the School Report Card, highlighting key indicators of financial strengths and weaknesses.
IV–D  Whose Data Is It Anyway? Determining the Authoritative Source Between General and Special Education Data  .......Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (South)

Lindsey Heitman, Jan Petro, June Rhodes Maginnis, and Kathy Baca
Colorado Department of Education

9:00–10:00

Colorado has struggled historically with conflicting demographic data across general and special education collections when reporting for EDFacts. With the advent of our new Data Pipeline system, data governance was employed to determine the “one truth” for reporting student data. Listen as we explain our processes and share how you have addressed problems of inconsistent data within your agencies.

IV–E  Virginia’s Data Needs Assessment Project ................................................................. Wilson A

Bethann Canada, Virginia Department of Education
Brooke Bell, Center for Innovative Technology

9:00–10:00

The Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) and the Center for Innovative Technology (CIT) conducted a statewide needs assessment to determine the data practices, requirements, and needs of Virginia’s school divisions to develop an action plan for providing data and data services that will allow schools and school divisions to make data-driven decisions and to assist in targeted interventions that will ultimately improve student achievement. This session will describe the results of the assessment and how input from a wide variety of stakeholders is guiding a transition from traditional static one-way data interaction to a model that also includes tools, services, and support.

IV–F  Following High School Career and Technical Education (CTE) Completers Into College and the Workforce ................................................................. Wilson B

Lolita Hall, Virginia Department of Education
Deborah Jonas, Research & Analytic Insights
Ryoko Yamaguchi, Plus Alpha Research and Consulting

9:00–10:00

We used the Virginia Longitudinal Data System (VLDS) to describe the long-term postsecondary and employment outcomes of high school graduates who earned diplomas and completed a career and technical education (CTE) program of study. Postsecondary outcomes include enrollment, persistence, and diploma type. Employment outcomes include employment status and wages. Analyses are aimed to understand the high school factors associated with different college and workforce outcomes, with a particular focus on the influence of CTE program completion on these outcomes. We will share key study results and describe the data available for this study, including its strengths and limitations.
IV–G  Maturing an Organization Through Governance and Stakeholder Engagement .......... Wilson C

Peter Tamayo and Tim Stensager, Washington State Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction

9:00–10:00

As organizations move systems from project status into maintenance and operations, the transition can be difficult. System sustainability efforts, a governance framework, and stakeholder engagement are keys to maximizing the value of your system investments for your customers and stakeholders. This session will discuss how Washington is making the transition. Key topics are how the state addressed (1) ongoing funding for the maintenance and operations of the new systems; (2) a governance framework that is more than just data governance but includes governance around maintenance and operations, technical standards, and priorities on new and competing projects; (3) stakeholder engagement through supporting, collaborating, and communicating with our partner; and (4) change management processes that help systems evolve over time.

IV–H  Empowering Users to Make Data-Informed Decisions ........................................ Harding

Margie Johnson, Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools (Tennessee)
Jenny Rankin, Northcentral University

9:00–10:00

Having a data system is one component of data use. A critical piece to fostering data-informed decisionmaking throughout an organization is building the capacity of users. In this session, Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools (MNPS), which has empowered approximately 10,000 employees since 2010 to make informed decisions, will share the Data-Informed Decisionmaking Framework developed from their lessons learned. This session also will describe results from a quantitative study investigating the effects of data guides embedded in the district’s data warehouse designed to support data analysis efforts of MNPS Staff.

IV–I  Lessons Learned From an IIS Implementation—“It’s Complicated” ......................... Coolidge

Suzan Kinaci, Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

9:00–10:00

The story of an Internet Information Services (IIS) implementation is a much more complicated one than it first appears. This presentation will take attendees on a journey from the requirements collection and procurement stages of the implementation through the numerous technology-integration and statewide roll out challenges encountered along the way. Lessons learned will be shared in the hope that this may benefit others on a similar path in their states.
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IV–J Privacy Technical Assistance Center (PTAC) Update on Recent Guidance

Michael Hawes, U.S. Department of Education
Ross Lemke, AEM Corporation
Baron Rodriguez, Privacy Technical Assistance Center (PTAC)

9:00–10:00

In this session, the Privacy Technical Assistance Center (PTAC) and the U.S. Department of Education will give an update on recent guidance that has been released in the last year, such as preserving student privacy while using online educational services, as well as advice on how to destroy data when it is no longer needed.

10:00–10:15 Break

10:15–11:15 Concurrent Session V Presentations

V–B Answering the Relevant Questions

Laurel Ballard, Wyoming Department of Enterprise Technology Services
Mitch Johnson, PRE/ETS
Alex Jackl, Houghton Mifflin Harcourt (HMH)

10:15–11:15

Grounding policy questions and data outcomes in the reality of how data are used, stored, and moved in the education ecosystem requires a clearly defined process. With today’s anti-data consolidation world, P–20W systems need to address concerns voiced by constituents who are skeptical of a centralized data warehouse while providing valuable and usable information. Wyoming is pioneering a nontraditional P–20W statewide longitudinal data system (SLDS) architecture able to address relevant policy questions while providing all of the access and reporting of a traditional P–20W SLDS, without the centralization of the P–20W dataset. Learn how Wyoming is using a data access layer to develop On-Demand Access to augment the minimum set of stored P–20W data by requiring the system to reach back to agency data systems to pull the required data for reporting.

V–C Title I Allocations

William Sonnenberg and Stephen Cornman, National Center for Education Statistics
Lucinda Dalzell, U.S. Census Bureau

10:15–11:15

The Title I Allocations process involves a vast number of subject matter specialists from various agencies. The extensive data collection and verification of very specialized data elements from both state and local education agencies is an NCES and U.S. Department of Education responsibility.
Title I necessitates the development and application of complex mathematical, statistical, and data processing algorithms. NCES has managed these complex processes since the inception of Title I nearly 50 years ago. Since 1997, the annual production and use of school-age poverty estimates has evolved into a multistep project undertaken by the U.S. Census Bureau and NCES. This presentation will describe the allocation process in some detail, including submission dates of state revenue and expenditure data; calculation of state per pupil expenditures (SPPE); the biennial update to school district boundaries that represents a significant functional start of the U.S. Census Bureau process; and the model-based procedures used to create the school-district-level poverty estimates from multiple data sources and the calculation of final allocations.

V–D  An Early Warning System for You: Wisconsin’s
Open Source Predictive Analytic Approach.........................Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (South)

Jared Knowles, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

10:15–11:15

In the past two years, Wisconsin has deployed a Dropout Early Warning System (DEWS) for all students in grades 6–9 in the state. During this time, the agency has committed to open sourcing the core components of this system to share with others. The Wisconsin DEWS toolset can be adopted to solve various problems, including those related to predicting assessment scores, college-going, or high school completion. Built on the cutting edge predictive analytics within the R programming language, these tools will help you make better predictions and easily understand the accuracy of the resulting models. This session will provide an overview of the tools and serve as a forum to ask questions about implementing your own flavor of the DEWS.

V–E  Safeguarding Student Privacy: Key Legislative,
Technical, and Communication Strategies for States .....................Wilson A

Dan Domagala, Colorado Department of Education
Neal Gibson, Arkansas Research Center
Rachel Anderson, Data Quality Campaign

10:15–11:15

Safeguarding privacy is a critical component of states’ work to use data effectively in support of student learning. But states can meet their responsibility to use data effectually and ethically in a number of ways. Colorado and Arkansas are two states leading diverse efforts in this area. With the recent passage of Colorado HB 1294, a bill to govern the use and protection of student data, Colorado is using policy to ensure that data are used appropriately and that data decisions are communicated transparently to the public. In Arkansas, state data officials are using the structure of the state longitudinal data system itself to manage data securely, reduce data duplication, and ensure student privacy. In this session, moderated by members of the Data Quality Campaign (DQC), Colorado Chief Information Officer Dan Domagala and Neal Gibson, Director of the Arkansas Research Center, will share their states’ strategies for safeguarding privacy and highlight lessons learned for other states.
V–F Building Educator Capacity to Use Data: Three States’ Efforts to Support Teachers and Administrators ................................................................. Wilson B

Robert Swiggum, Georgia Department of Education
Patrick Bush, Delaware Department of Education
Ginny Clifford, New Hampshire Department of Education
Corey Chatis, SLDS State Support Team

10:15–11:15

Increasingly, states are focusing on supporting local educators as high-priority users of statewide longitudinal data system (SLDS) data. However, most educators require professional development and support to understand and use data effectively in support of their instructional and administrative decisions. In this session, representatives from the Georgia, Delaware, and New Hampshire Departments of Education will discuss their background and overall approach, the training and professional development they provide (including how they differentiate supports between teachers and administrators), and their lessons learned and effective practices.


Lee Rabbitt, Rhode Island Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

10:15–11:15

The current focus on preparing all students to be college and career ready requires state and local education agencies to work with one another and partner with higher education and workforce agencies to implement a wide variety of programs and support systems to ensure students are graduating college and career ready. The National Forum on Education Statistics has convened a working group to develop a guide on using data to support college and career readiness. This session will discuss the five data-use cases and related examples that will be included in the guide.

V–H Chronic Absenteeism in Hawaii: Tracking and Addressing a Vital Metric for the First Time ................................................................. Harding

David Moyer, Hawaii State Department of Education

10:15–11:15

Learn how Hawaii, a state that was late in adopting and calculating chronic absenteeism, has quickly incorporated the metric into policy and practice. This session will introduce participants to Hawaii’s data and will highlight which students in Hawaii are most likely to be chronically absent, some of the factors related to chronic absenteeism, and what effects absenteeism has on student outcomes. In addition to the data, participants will learn how Hawaii is addressing chronic absenteeism from a policy perspective.
V–I  What Schools of Education Are Doing to Improve Teachers’ Data Literacy: A Deeper Dive.............................................................. Coolidge

Ellen Mandinach, Jeremy Friedman, and Edith Gummer, Regional Educational Laboratory – West

10:15–11:15

This session will describe a study that surveyed schools of education to determine the availability of courses on data use for teachers. The survey also examined state licensure documents to understand if and how data literacy is being addressed by states in their requirements for teacher certification. The session will describe the findings and implications for improving data literacy for teachers.

V–J  Improving Data Quality Through the Source: Implementing an Interactive Data Quality Curriculum and “Friendly” Data Audits................................. Hoover

Patricia Rydlak and Christina Lento
Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

10:15–11:15

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education’s current data verification system includes a series of complex business/validation rules that verify the accuracy of each data element prior to acceptance by the department and certification by each local superintendent. However there is room to significantly improve the quality of the data entered at the source, and it is increasingly important to do this. As we implement a more integrated data system, this system will increasingly be used to target and evaluate the impact of investments to improve instruction and related systems and to inform high-stakes decisions. Hence, the data must be of the highest quality. To achieve this, the department has designed and implemented a data-quality curriculum and audit protocols that will increase data quality at the source. This session will describe this project, which is funded through the federal Longitudinal Data System (LDS) Grant Program and is part of a larger effort to develop an integrated suite of tools for Massachusetts educators.

11:15–11:30  Break
VI–B  Civil Rights Data Collection:  
Changes for 2013–14 and How to Prepare  
Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (North)

*Abby Potts and Rebecca Fitch, U.S. Department of Education
Ross Lemke, AEM Corporation*

**11:30–12:30**

The Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC) will be launching this fall, collecting data from more than 17,000 educational institutions and agencies from across the nation. This presentation will discuss various aspects of this mandatory collection, including the participants who will be included, the CRDC timeframe, and what districts should be doing now to prepare. The presenters will discuss identified data quality issues with the CRDC and how districts can proactively resolve them. They will also discuss changes for 2013–14, including new data elements being collected and the new tool that participants will use to submit their data. Finally, the presenters will showcase new resources, such as online Communities of Practices organized by topical areas and publications, and they will discuss with the audience opportunities for providing proactive technical assistance in advance of the collection.

VI–C  School-Level Finance Data—Massachusetts and Rhode Island and How They Came to Collect It  
Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (West)

*Jay Sullivan, Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Cynthia Brown, Rhode Island Department of Elementary and Secondary Education*

**11:30–12:30**

Both Massachusetts and Rhode Island have been collecting school-level finance data for a number of years. This session will describe how and why both states changed their finance data collection protocols to get school-level data, the challenges encountered, and how they overcame them.

VI–D  Using Data to Inform Instruction: How New Hampshire Is Building District, School, and Grade-Level Data Teams in Its Schools  
Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (South)

*Irene Koffink and Donna Beauregard, New Hampshire Department of Education*

**11:30–12:30**

Learn how New Hampshire’s team of data coaches is working across the state to help administrators (principals, guidance counselors, special education directors, and team leaders), as well as grade-level teachers, use data to inform instruction. New Hampshire’s statewide longitudinal data system includes multiple measures and extensive student data. Multiple measures include Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA), Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), AimsWeb, STAR, Fountas and Pinnell, as well as many other national and locally created assessments.
Measures include both formative and summative assessments using benchmarks and progress-monitoring tools. Student demographic data includes absence information, suspension, and basic student factors, such as English learners (EL), individualized education program (IEP), and SES. Learn how leadership teams and data teams are structured to take advantage of this data. Learn how teachers use the state system to analyze this data. How often do data teams meet? Who is involved? How are all teachers included? Come and ask questions!!

**VI–E**  
**Data Standards for Competency-Based Education** .......................................................... Wilson A

*Jim Goodell, Quality Information Partners, Inc.*  
*Liz Glowa and Maria Worthen, International Association for K–12 Online Learning*

**11:30–12:30**

After completing this session, participants will be able to answer the following questions: What is “competency-based” education? What kinds of data are used in competency-based learning processes? What data standards address competency-based learning? Where can I find tools to align my datasets to Common Education Data Standards and to connections supporting competency-based learning?

**VI–F**  
**Measuring Improvement in K–12 Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education: A Multistakeholder Collaborative Effort** .......................................................... Wilson B

*Thomas Smith, Vanderbilt University*  
*Jessica Mislevy, SRI International*

**11:30–12:30**

Policymakers stress the importance of science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) education to our country’s economy, yet much work is needed to measure the key components of K–12 STEM education. SRI International supports the National Science Foundation’s efforts to implement a system of 14 progress indicators outlined in the National Research Council’s *Monitoring Progress* report that could be used by policymakers, researchers, and practitioners to guide improvement. After introducing the project, session presenters will engage participants in a discussion about how state and district data systems might help inform the indicators and the potential benefits of the indicator system to states and districts.
VI–G  Institute of Education Sciences (IES) Grants to Analyze Your State or District Data ........ Wilson C Allen Ruby, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education

11:30–12:30

The purpose of this session is to identify Institute of Education Sciences (IES) grant opportunities to support using your state and local data for research and evaluation purposes. These grants are not for building or improving state or local data systems but for analyzing the data from such systems to improve policy and practice. The grant applications are peer reviewed and require both substantive and methodological rigor. The session will discuss the different grant opportunities available and the requirements of each.

VI–H  The Use of National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Contextual Variables—One State’s Example.............................. Harding

Angela Mangiantini, Washington State Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction

11:30–12:30

This session will focus on the use of National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) contextual variables to influence policy and decisionmaking in Washington State. Strategies for obtaining and analyzing data will be provided, along with examples of other states’ use of contextual variables. Participants will also be asked to brainstorm on other uses of these variables.

VI–I  State Privacy Legislation: State Perspective, Lessons Learned, and Best Practices .......... Coolidge

John Kraman, Oklahoma State Department of Education
Kathy Gosa, SLDS State Support Team
Baron Rodriguez, Privacy Technical Assistance Center

11:30–12:30

Nearly 40 states passed some sort of data privacy and/or security legislation. Much of this legislation focused specifically on the use of education data. Attend this session to hear several state perspectives on best practices and lessons learned as they relate to working with state legislators on privacy and security bills.
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**VI–J Using P–20W Linkages to Inform Policy, Programs, and Progress: Resources for State Data System Leaders ............................................................ Hoover**

*Charles McGrew, Kentucky Center for Education and Workforce Statistics  
Carol Jenner, Washington State Office of Financial Management  
Erica Orians, Utah Education Policy Center  
Deborah Jonas, Research & Analytic Insights  
Dorothyjean Cratty, National Center for Education Statistics*

**11:30–12:30**

The Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) Grant Program has a new report to support states’ successful use of linked P–20W data. The report synthesizes information from states that have identified college-and-career-ready research questions, explains question relevance, and provides examples of state and researcher P–20W data use. Our panel members have experience using linked P–20W data for research and public reporting. During the discussion, we will introduce the report, but the majority of the time will focus on learning about how states have successfully used linked P–20W data. In this interactive session, panel members will discuss the bridges they built to gain value from their education and workforce data.

**12:30–1:45 Lunch (on Your Own)**

**1:45–2:45 Concurrent Session VII Presentations**


*Jennifer Higaki and Shelly Larson, Hawaii State Department of Education*

**1:45–2:45**

The Hawaii State Department of Education (HIDOE) receives numerous requests for data, from external individuals unaffiliated with HIDOE to local university researchers, community partners, and school vendors. HIDOE has developed mechanisms that enable school and district leaders to properly release and authorize access to data in compliance with Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment (PPRA), and other state and federal regulations. These mechanisms include data requests, data-sharing agreements, memoranda of understanding, and research applications. Presenters in this session will provide information about HIDOE’s related processes and tools and invite attendees to share and discuss how their states and districts handle requests for data.
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VII–B Overcoming the Barriers to Effective Data Use

Patrick Bush, Delaware Department of Education
Elizabeth Dabney, Data Quality Campaign

1:45–2:45

Delaware is one of the first states to achieve all 10 of the Data Quality Campaign’s (DQC) “10 State Actions to Ensure Effective Data Use.” While Delaware continues to refine its policies and practices, this award-winning state has marshalled the leadership, policies, and resources to overcome barriers that hamper states from realizing a culture of effective data use. In this session, DQC will present an overview of its 2013 survey results on states’ progress toward implementing the 10 State Actions; and the Delaware Department of Education will describe how the state established a statewide vision of data-informed decisionmaking supported by a solid, sustainable, and usable data infrastructure.

VII–C A Comparison of State Funding Formulas in West Virginia and Kentucky

Susan Barkley, Kentucky Department of Education
Amy Willard, West Virginia Department of Education

1:45–2:45

State funding formulas for public education vary greatly but also share many similar characteristics. Learn how the state funding formulas in West Virginia and Kentucky compare to one another. Support Education Excellence in Kentucky (SEEK) operates primarily on a per-pupil funding amount, while the Public School Support Program (PSSP) in West Virginia is an eight-step allowance formula. Provisions to ensure adequacy and equity in each funding structure will be highlighted.

VII–D End-to-End Demonstration of the Texas Student Data System

Sharon Gaston and Mark Gentzel, Texas Education Agency

1:45–2:45

This session will demonstrate the Texas Student Data System (TSDS), a statewide solution improving the availability and timeliness of high-quality, longitudinal data. Sub-components are (1) Operational Data Store (ODS) which supports the collection of local education agency (LEA) operational data for student assessments, statutory submissions, and other LEA data needs; (2) Unique ID, which applies to all staff and students throughout Texas school systems, allowing for a single identification number; (3) Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS), which is the state education reporting system that has been improved to be more efficient and stable; and (4) studentGPS ™ Dashboards, is an optional system providing educators with actionable metrics that indicate early warning flags and performance trends.

Marilyn Seastrom, Kashka Kubzdela, and Patrick McFadden,
National Center for Education Statistics
Mark Low and Robert Barret, Avar Consulting, Inc.

1:45–2:45

In response to an increased interest in making government data open and machine readable, NCES led the U.S. Department of Education’s (ED) effort to provide an inventory of all datasets owned, managed, collected, and/or created by ED. This inventory includes information on program data as well as statistical data. The inventory includes basic metadata about each dataset, along with details at the variable level. The publicly available internet “beta tool” improves accessibility to information about the department’s data and enables users to quickly identify data collected and used by ED. This panel includes speakers involved in all aspects of developing the inventory, from conceptualization to information collection to the details of building the underlying database to public display of the inventory to potential uses of the inventory by education stakeholders. The presentation will discuss past efforts with the initiative and outline future plans for improving it.

VII–F  Pros and Cons of Federated and Centralized Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) P–20 Models .................................................. Wilson B

Charles McGrew, Kentucky Center for Education and Workforce Studies
Jim Schmidt, Washington Education Research and Data Center
Dan Domagala, Colorado Department of Education
Karl Pond, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction
Jeff Sellers, SLDS State Support Team

1:45–2:45

In this session, panelists will discuss their states’ use of a federated or centralized statewide longitudinal data system (SLDS) P–20 model. Panelists will present their rationale for choosing the model, the roles and responsibilities of participating agencies, the matching process employed, data access and response time, and rules for data integrity. Collectively, a summary of the information provided by the panelists and the ‘pros and cons’ of each model will be presented.

VII–G  The Nevada School Performance Framework ......................................................... Wilson C

Glenn Meyer and Julian Montoya, Nevada Department of Education
Dixie Knight and Lauren Chiuminatto, eMetric, LLC

1:45–2:45

This session will explore the Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF). The NSPF was developed as a way to evaluate school performance and assign a star rating to each school. This rating is determined based on several data collections and computations performed by the Nevada Statewide Longitudinal Data System. It uses student assessment, growth, college and career readiness, as well as gap reductions in special populations to rank schools. This framework
was developed as part of Nevada’s No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Waiver request in 2012 and was approved by the U.S. Department of Education as an acceptable alternative to Average Yearly Progress.

VII–H  EDFACTS Shared State Solution (ES3) Expands ................................................................. Harding

Joyce Popp, Idaho State Department of Education
Kim Oligschlaeger, Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Angie Bren, South Dakota Department of Education

1:45–2:45

The EDFACTS Shared State Solution (ES3) is a collaborative effort (with no license fee) to create EDFACTS files that are being used currently by six states. South Dakota has completed a full cycle of EDFACTS reporting; and Idaho, Missouri, and Tennessee have completed large portions of EDFACTS file reporting using this process. The solution has recently added a web-based management system and a mechanism for ensuring that the results produced match appropriately with prior year results. This panel of participating state EDFACTS coordinators will discuss their experience using ES3 and discuss how additional states can join the collaborative.

VII–I  Common Education Data Standards (CEDS) 201: Using CEDS Tools................................. Coolidge

Beth Young and Jim Goodell, Quality Information Partners, Inc.
Jim Campbell, AEM Corporation

1:45–2:45

Do you know what Common Education Data Standards (CEDS) are but aren’t sure how to start utilizing them? This 201 session will review the different ways to use CEDS with both the Align and Connect tools. Features such as myConnect, which joins the two tools, as well as new reports and other enhancements, will be demonstrated. State users of the CEDS tools will also share their experiences.

VII–J  Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) and Intentional Communications: Strategies to Communicate in Certain Scenarios ............................. Hoover

Chandra Haislet, Maryland Longitudinal Data System (MLDS) Center
Kathy Gosa and Robin Taylor, SLDS State Support Team

1:45–2:45

Many states face difficult situations with privacy advocates and groups, a partner agency sharing data, changes in the political environment, or challenges with the parent “opt out” provision of Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). This interactive session will provide some context around these situations and solicit best practices and strategies that states can use to communicate more effectively when faced with similar circumstances. Come share your experiences and learn from Maryland, Kansas, and other states that attended the regional meeting!
This session will highlight the collaboration of Georgia and Rhode Island to provide an instructional data system that meets the needs of both states. Georgia developed the Georgia Tunnel through a statewide longitudinal data system (SLDS) grant. Rhode Island (RI) used the Georgia Tunnel code to develop the RI Instructional Support System. This presentation will highlight the collaboration between the two states and the benefits from this collaborative process.

**VIII–B**

**Review of a Cross-District Research Alliance**

Developed to Facilitate District Data Use

**3:00–4:00**

This presentation will review the recent progress of the Urban School Improvement Alliance (USIA), a research alliance composed of directors of research for mid-sized urban districts in the Northeast. This alliance has identified a goal of helping build the capacity of its members to use and access data to address questions around how to improve low-performing schools. In its third year, this research alliance has established norms for meeting and sharing information and is working with the Regional Education Laboratory Northeast and Islands (REL–NEI) to support data use in its member districts and to implement components of its research agenda.

**VIII–C**

**Monitoring Actual Wyoming School- and District-Level Resource Allocations Compared to Funding-Model-Generated Resources**

**3:00–4:00**

Since 2008–09, the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) has generated the annual “Continued Review of Educational Resources in Wyoming” report utilizing data managed almost
exclusively within the state’s statewide longitudinal data system (SLDS). This report provides Wyoming’s education community with a high-quality view of actual school- and district-level staffing allocations and expenditures compared to resources generated by the state’s funding model for the state’s 300-plus public schools in all 48 districts. This session will explain how WDE and Wyoming’s school districts have worked collaboratively to develop common staffing definitions, assignment codes, and state/federal time-allocation detail allowing for increasingly precise reporting of full-time equivalent (FTE) and salary data. Participants will want to explore an illustrative web portal at https://portals.edu.wyoming.gov/Reports/Public/wde-reports-2012/finance/crerw-2013.

VIII–D College Access and Readiness Outcomes of the University of California’s Transcript Evaluation Service ...... Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (South)

Reginald Hillmon, University of California, Office of the President
Roger Studley and Karen Levesque, RTI International

3:00–4:00

This session will present results of an outcomes analysis—conducted under an Institute of Education Sciences (IES) Research Grant—of the first seven years of the University of California’s (UC) Transcript Evaluation Service (TES). TES offers students, counselors, and administrators data tools to assist with student preparation for college, college advising, and school-level planning. Among the 152 participating high schools, college eligibility rates increased substantially. College-level course-taking and applications and admissions to UC also increased. UC’s Office of the President has used the outcomes results to drive improvement in its college preparation initiatives and better coordination between its high school and transfer admissions programs.

VIII–E So You Want a 21st Century Website: North Carolina’s Move to Data Visualization Software for the School Report Cards .........................Wilson A

Diane Dulaney, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction
Emily Baranello, SAS

3:00–4:00

North Carolina converted from an out-of-date technology platform to SAS Visual Analytics for the 2014 release of the Title I School Report Cards. This move allows the state to adapt more quickly to changes in the policy environment and provide a much richer user experience, while at the same time reducing the burden on the department’s IT staff. With the new technology, parents and other community members will be able to dig deeper and access more information about school performance. Please join us for a demonstration of the new North Carolina School Report Cards.
VIII–F  It Mattered for That One—Utilizing Data for Effective Interventions ................................. Wilson B

Katrina Craft, Arkansas Department of Education
Christina Kucek, Pennsylvania Department of Education

3:00–4:00

This session will offer an interactive overview of Arkansas’ Student Intervention System and Pennsylvania’s Educator Early Warning System. Topics include how connecting the pieces can transform classroom instruction using the Ed-Fi platform as the one-stop shop for educational information, how to get the right data to the right people at the right time, and what your state could do with that data.

VIII–G  Dealing With the Misses........................................................................................................ Wilson C

Patrick Keaton and Mark Glander, National Center of Education Statistics

3:00–4:00

As more and more people use the Common Core of Data (CCD) to make decisions about schools and districts, it is critical that the data are properly reviewed and edited. In the same way, it is critical that the data be utilized so that data are not misrepresented. Discover how NCES staff deals with the various “misses” in the data: missing data, misreported data, and misinterpreted data. This session will discuss some of the methods used to improve data quality. In addition, Patrick Keaton and Mark Glander of NCES will share their experiences and recommendations for making sure data are used properly.

VIII–H  Using Standards for Data Collection, Regardless of Data Warehouse Schema .............. Harding

Jim Peterson, Bloomington Public Schools District 87 (Illinois)
Gay Sherman, CPSI, Ltd.

3:00–4:00

This session will focus on the use of Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF) as a proven and robust standard to collect data from districts. From there, data can be formatted to the desired schema. With the use of SIF, data collection can be real-time and standardized easily.
VIII–I  Georgia’s Academic and Workforce Analysis and Research Data System (GAAWARDS)—Crossing Lines ................................. Coolidge

Kriste Elia and Jackie Lundberg, Georgia Governor’s Office of Student Achievement
Ashley Custard, Georgia Student Finance Commission (GSFC)
Donyell Francis, Technical College System of Georgia (TCSG)

3:00–4:00

Georgia’s Academic and Workforce Analysis and Research Data System (GAAWARDS) has been developed during the last three years with the Race to the Top Grant and will continue to be funded by the state beyond the federal grant, which ends in September 2014. GAAWARDS, with its data warehouse, governance structure, and research teams, has matured and continues to grow as GAAWARDS provides a common driver across these groups. The data warehouse and governance team are sourced by education, labor, and private organizations in support of a dialogue that goes beyond basic education reporting. Our intent in this session is to share the key components that make GAAWARDS useful to those it supports and explain how a service model works for P–20.

VIII–J  Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) Community of Practice Launch ....................... Hoover

Robin Taylor, SLDS State Support Team

3:00–4:00

The State Support Team (SST) is in the process of launching a new Community of Practice (CoP) relating to all of the components of a longitudinal data system framework: vision/purpose, stakeholder engagement, data governance, system design, data use, and sustainability. The SST will discuss the features of the new CoP, including opportunities for states to network and share information across the different sectors.

4:00–4:15  Break
4:15–5:15 Concurrent Session IX Presentations

IX–A  A Panel With Pennsylvania and Texas: Lessons Learned on Deploying Statewide Dashboards to Support Student Success ................................................................. Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (East)

Sharon Gaston, Texas Education Agency
Dave Ream, Pennsylvania Department of Education
Shawn Bay, eScholar LLC

4:15–5:15

Texas Education Agency (TEA) and the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) have been implementing statewide dashboards to provide administrators and teachers access to information on students’ academic performance, behavioral development, attendance, assessment scores, and courses. In this session, the panelists from PDE and TEA will share their experience, best practices, and lessons learned from rolling out dashboards across their respective states.

IX–B  Tracking the Transition From High School to Higher Education: Lessons for Successful Collaboration Between Researchers and State Partners Sharing Data......................... Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (North)

Brian Douglas and Emily House, Tennessee Higher Education Commission
Eric Rolfhus, Regional Educational Laboratory – Appalachia

4:15–5:15

The presenters will offer practical lessons for researchers wishing to collaborate with state agencies of higher education, such as how to gain buy-in for research questions, submit a successful data-request, link P–12 and postsecondary data, address National Student Clearinghouse coverage and matching issues, and work together to prepare data. Representatives of Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) Appalachia and the Tennessee Higher Education Commission will illustrate how researchers and state agencies can partner to examine key issues in college readiness while providing practical and tangible results to policymakers.

IX–C  Making Sense of Graduation and Dropout Rates ............... Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (West)

Ross Santy, National Center for Education Statistics

4:15–5:15

The U.S. Department of Education currently publishes the four-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (ACGR), the Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate (AFGR), and Event Dropout Rates. While each rate has its own uses and purpose, the presence of so many rates can be confusing to data users. How are ACGR and AFGR similar? How are they different? Why do graduation and dropout rates not add up to 100 percent? This session is intended as an overview of issues that affect sound use of graduation and dropout statistics.
**IX–D**  Aligning the U.S. Virgin Islands’ (USVI) Early Childhood Grant With USVI’s Virgin Islands Virtual Information System (VIVIS) ........................................ Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (South)

*Randolph Thomas, U.S. Virgin Islands Department of Education*

*Mitch Johnson, PRE/ETS*

*4:15–5:15*

The U.S. Virgin Islands (USVI) is the only state education agency that received the Early Childhood Grant in the last round of grant funding. The USVI has organized its Early Childhood Grant within its Virgin Island Virtual Information System (VIVIS) P–20W statewide longitudinal data system (SLDS) project. Learn how the USVI has structured the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) Grant to be complimentary with its self-funded SLDS project and the lessons learned on how the USVI has aligned the participating early childhood participating stakeholders.

**IX–E**  The Collaborative Development of a Statewide Data Quality Network ......................... Wilson A

*Daniel Berger, Tuscarora Intermediate Unit (Pennsylvania)*

*Alison Scott, Montgomery County Intermediate Unit (Pennsylvania)*

*Deborah Rodrigues, Pennsylvania Department of Education*

*4:15–5:15*

Never underestimate the power of collaboration. Learn how the 29 Intermediate Units (IUs) of Pennsylvania came together with the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) to roll out a professional learning community for all Pennsylvania local education agencies (LEAs) to grow a culture of quality data across the Commonwealth. The panelists will outline how the IUs and PDE used a combination of videoconference technology, face-to-face meetings, and collaborative agenda building to create the Data Quality Network (DQN) in Pennsylvania. Success stories and learning experiences from the first year of the DQN will be shared.

**IX–F**  Empowering Parents and Communities With Publicly Reported School Performance Information......................................................... Wilson B

*Chris Woolard, Ohio Department of Education*

*Jeffrey Noel, District of Columbia Office of the State Superintendent of Education*

*Rebecca Shah, Data Quality Campaign*

*4:15–5:15*

Data are powerful tools for informing stakeholder decisions but won’t be used if they aren’t presented in actionable formats tailored to specific stakeholder needs. States have a responsibility to ensure that all stakeholders receive timely, actionable, and comprehensible information about the state’s public education system. Join us to learn best practices on what good public reporting looks like, understand recommendations for states, and hear from leading states on how they prioritized this work and transformed their public reporting efforts to better support all stakeholders.
IX–G  Using Data to Improve Students’ High School Transition to Postsecondary .......................... Wilson C

Jean Osumi, Anita Huang, and Justin Katahira, University of Hawaii

4:15–5:15

If you build it, will they use it? This session will cover how Hawaii’s stakeholders are using statewide longitudinal data system (SLDS) data to improve students’ transition to postsecondary education. Hawaii’s projects that use SLDS data take advantage of high school feedback reports to guide conversations about policy and student outcomes; support public high schools and postsecondary institutions working together to develop twelfth-grade “bridge” courses; use high school transcripts postsecondarily for student placement into college-level English and mathematics courses; involve a community-based organization’s use of student outcomes to plan support services; and use data to develop and benchmark strategic planning.

IX–H  Introducing a Flexible Data Analysis Protocol for Classroom-Through-School Transformation ................................................................. Harding

Elaine Hou and Khizer Husain, Two Rivers Public Charter School (District of Columbia)

4:15–5:15

Data-driven decisionmaking is the hallmark of learning organizations that strive to improve student outcomes. In this session geared towards school leaders, participants will learn about the Data Analysis Strategy Loop (DAS Loop) developed at Two Rivers Public Charter School—a protocol used to analyze data that is flexible and applicable at both the micro and macro levels of learning organizations. The presenters will guide participants through examples of how to use the protocol to make decisions from the classroom level to the charter-management level. We’ll look at how leadership can use quantitative and qualitative data to inform student interventions, accelerations, teacher evaluation, and professional development.

IX–I  Using Common Education Standards (CEDS) to Answer Policy Questions............................... Coolidge

Beth Young and Jim Goodell, Quality Information Partners, Inc.
Julia Bloom-Weltman and Jim Campbell, AEM Corporation

4:15–5:15

What do Common Education Standards (CEDS) have to do with answering policy questions? CEDS Connect can be used to catalog policy questions, identify the data elements necessary to answer those questions, and add additional analytic notations and notes. See a demo of the Connect Tool and how to use myConnect to join policy questions with CEDS Align maps. Hear from those who have participated in the process of mapping policy questions with needed CEDS elements.
IX–J Know Before You Go—Empowering Stakeholders With Data They Can Use to Make Better-Informed Decisions

Hoover

Bill Hurwitch, Maine Department of Education

4:15–5:15

Maine provides online public outcome reports to help students, guidance counselors, and other stakeholders make well-informed decisions about college and careers. This session will focus on data available on postsecondary and workforce outcomes from the Departments of Education and Labor as well as from Maine’s public two-year and four-year college and university systems.
8:00–12:30 Registration .................................................. Registration A [Outside of Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (West)]

8:00–10:00 Cyber Café ................................................................................................................................................. Tyler

8:00–10:30 Demonstrations ........................................................................................................................................ Registration A Corridor

9:00–10:00 Concurrent Session X Presentations


Kati Stratos and David Kowalski, School District of Philadelphia (Pennsylvania)

9:00–10:00

In years past, the School District of Philadelphia (SDP) has administered an annual districtwide parent and student survey using a paper-and-pencil-based system that was inconsistent and unreliable and that yielded low response rates. In 2013–14, the surveys were moved entirely online and now require a unique student ID in order for a parent or student to respond. This session will discuss these changes and how they have allowed existing family demographic and student performance data to be triangulated with survey response data on the back end, creating a more robust, high-quality dataset to inform school improvement efforts, program evaluation, and district decisionmaking.

X–B DC’s At-Risk Funding and Implications for Early Warning Systems .......................................................... Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (North)

Alex Engler, District of Columbia Office of the State Superintendent of Education

9:00–10:00

In 2014–15, Washington, DC, will be allocating to schools an additional $2,079 for each student deemed “at-risk.” Learn about the factors currently used to determine risk for funding, the use of early warning system indicators to drive risk evaluation, and the corresponding efforts to better understand the impacts of poverty and socioeconomic status (SES) in a state that has fully embraced the community eligibility provision to expand access to free school lunch. This presentation will include analysis utilizing new indicators of SES and risk and linking them to such outcomes as attendance, DC CAS scores, SAT scores, discipline, and school disengagement.

X–C Using Data to Identify Indicators of College Readiness........ Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (West)

Vasuki Rethinam, Howard County Public School System (Maryland)

9:00–10:00

A large number of students are entering college underprepared for rigorous college-level work, leading to remedial course taking, delays in graduation, and dropping out of college. How can
high schools help prepare students for college and career success? This session will demonstrate research on developing a statistical model to identify indicators of college readiness and fall college enrollment. This session will also highlight the strategies that a district and its schools use to leverage indicator data to promote students’ enrollment in rigorous coursework.

**X–D Effective Strategies for Granting Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) Access to Outside Researchers**

*Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (South)*

*Erica Orians, Utah Education Policy Center*

*9:00–10:00*

Utah’s state longitudinal data system (SLDS), the Utah Data Alliance (UDA), offers researchers outside the partner agencies the opportunity to use SLDS data in a secure environment for research purposes. In order to extend these research opportunities to graduate students, faculty, and other researchers, the Utah Data Alliance has developed and implemented extensive policies and practices related to data access and security. This session will discuss the application process for outside researchers, procedures to secure data and access, researcher support, usage and issue tracking, and other protocols that could be adopted by other states.

**X–E Teacher and Leader Evaluation Management System**

*Wilson A*

*Irene Koffink and Ginny Clifford, New Hampshire Department of Education*

*Dean Hupp, Hupp Information Technologies*

*9:00–10:00*

New Hampshire has been working on a data system to manage the evaluation of educators (both teachers and leaders). The system allows superintendents and principals to track evaluations, document evaluations in progress, capture professional development needs, track deadlines, and include teacher responses to the evaluation. The data system is flexible so that each school district can define an evaluation rubric (e.g., using the Charlotte Danielson or Marzano structure), identify and document “indicators of effectiveness” used as input for the evaluation, and allow for documents to capture classroom observations, student surveys, or peer feedback. The system captures all of this information, which is then used to complete an evaluation rubric. Join us for a demonstration of the pilot tool that New Hampshire schools will be using this fall. The tool is being developed by Hupp Information Technologies, and a representative from Hupp will participate in the presentation.

**X–F The Future Is Here in Massachusetts With Actionable, Near-Real-Time, Event-Driven Data Integration Using Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF)**

*Wilson B*

*William Holscher, Massachusetts Executive Office of Education (EOE)*

*9:00–10:00*

The Massachusetts Executive Office of Education (EOE) delivered a near-real-time, event-driven data management and reporting system utilizing the School Interoperability Framework (SIF).
state is replacing legacy periodic data collection and reporting with a new event-driven model that delivers actionable information to key stakeholders where and when needed. In this session, the Massachusetts SIF Program Manager will share the implementation strategy, tactical approach, and lessons learned while reviewing valuable tools and resources available to other states.

**X–G** Civil Rights Data 2014: Use Cases and Stakeholder Stories..................................................... Wilson C

*Melanie McCalmont, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction*
*Abby Potts, U.S. Department of Education*
*Marlene Dorenkamp, Iowa Department of Education*

**9:00–10:00**

Who uses the Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC)? What decisions can it inform? This panel will tell stories from those who have used CRDC data in many fields of inquiry and discuss the benefits and limitations of its scope. Learn more about how the Office for Civil Rights and state education agencies are partnering to improve data quality that will make data inquiry, policy analysis, and school improvement more effective. An update of the upcoming 2014 CRDC survey will also be provided.

**X–H** Distance Learning Dataset Training System: An Online Guide to NCES Data Across the Education Spectrum..................................................... Harding

*Andrew White, National Center for Education Statistics*
*Jennifer Nielsen, Manhattan Strategy Group*

**9:00–10:00**

The Distance Learning Dataset Training (DLDT) System is a new approach to facilitating the use of education data. This session on the DLDT common modules offers an overview of NCES data systems; methods used to ensure consistent, reliable, complete, and accurate data collection and reporting; complex sampling designs and implications for micro-data users; and how to access publications, products, data tools, and public- and restricted-use datasets. Survey-specific modules present more detailed information about datasets from selected studies conducted by NCES. Currently, five sets of modules detailing nine NCES surveys are available. Module sets detailing additional survey and administrative datasets will be added annually.
Collaboration, Convergence, and Cost Containment—Using Common Education Data Standards (CEDS) and Ed-Fi to Drive Down Total Cost of Ownership While Accelerating Innovation and Delivering Longitudinal Data Solutions

Patrick Bush, Delaware Department of Education
Christina Kucek, Pennsylvania Department of Education
Dean Folkers, Nebraska Department of Education
Troy Wheeler, Ed-Fi Alliance

9:00–10:00

This session will provide three state stories capitalizing on the convergence of Common Education Data Standards (CEDS) and how the adoption of the Ed-Fi technology suite speeds solution delivery, creates a conduit for state education agency collaboration, leverages interstate sharing, and promotes accelerated data conversations in a common language that wasn’t possible before.

Disclosure Avoidance in Public Reporting: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly!

Michael Hawes, U.S. Department of Education

9:00–10:00

Using examples from various state education agency websites, this session will provide an overview of a number of disclosure avoidance methods commonly used to protect privacy in public reporting of tabular data, and some common pitfalls and mistakes to avoid.

10:00–10:15 Break

Lessons Learned From One of the Largest PK–12 Unique Identifier System Implementations

Sharon Gaston and Mark Gentzel, Texas Education Agency
Juan Guerrero, eScholar LLC

10:15–11:15

One of the cornerstones of the Texas Student Data System is the implementation of eScholar Uniq-ID, which provides a unique identifier for all staff and students in the state. During this session, representatives from the Texas Education Agency and eScholar will discuss the benefits, transition process, and the lessons learned from implementation, training, and deployment of a statewide identifier system for more than 14 million active/historical records of students and staff members.
The 2014 Texas award-winning “Best Application Serving the Public” was implemented within six months.

**XI–B**  The Uses of School Health Data in DC ................................. Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (North)

*Ifedolapo Bamikole, District of Columbia Office of the State Superintendent of Education*

**10:15–11:15**

Innovative health policy and programs such as the Healthy Schools Act are part of aggressive public health actions that DC’s leadership has taken in schools to address health issues. This has resulted in DC leading the nation in free school breakfast and being well on its way to better health and academic outcomes for DC students. With multiple implementation efforts, progress monitoring provides a unique data challenge in assessing outcomes alongside test scores, the Youth Risk Behavior Survey, School Health Profiles, and health-related information in the statewide longitudinal data system (SLDS). We plan to share how we utilize these multiple sources of data in evaluation.

**XI–C**  My School Data—Making a Difference
Through Data in Washington Schools ......................... Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (West)

*Carrie Retzer and Ken Mock, Washington School Information Processing Cooperative (WSIPC)*

**10:15–11:15**

Washington School Information Processing Cooperative represents 295 districts in Washington State. To assist our districts with their data needs, we’ve developed a product called “My School Data,” powered by our longitudinal data warehouse. This data warehouse allows My School Data to show the history of students, regardless of which district in our state they have attended. In this session we will show how different “views” of data, including an Early Warning System for districts, schools, teachers, and students, can provide answers to educators’ questions. By knowing more about students, we can better target programs and interventions to help students be more successful.

**XI–D**  Research Engine—Florida’s External
Research Request Application .................................................. Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (South)

*Andre Smith, Florida Department of Education*

**10:15–11:15**

Florida’s Department of Education (FLDOE) is known as a national leader for its education data system. The system contains comprehensive data, spanning from prekindergarten to postsecondary education and workforce experiences. Built in 2003, the State Longitudinal Education Data System (SLDS) allows business and public users to request data dating from the early 1990s. These data are used in the development of comprehensive reports, analysis, and research pertaining to students within the Florida education system for the length of his or her learning career and beyond. This session will provide an overview of the FLDOE new user-friendly, web-based research
engine. Using the research engine, researchers are now able to systematically navigate through the data request process, monitor their status, and request anonymous student-level data from the department.


*Joseph Cowan, Pennsylvania Department of Education*
*John Pagnotta, eScholar LLC*

*10:15–11:15*

During the past three-plus years, the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) has teamed with eScholar to use the data collected in the Pennsylvania Information Management System (PIMS), PDE’s statewide longitudinal data system (SLDS) data warehouse, to simplify and automate EDEN/EDFacts reporting. This session will cover the technologies used and the processes enacted to make this project successful.

**XI–F  Using Longitudinal Data to Guide Successful Student Transitions to Postsecondary Education.................................Wilson B**

*David Reeg, Minnesota Department of Education*

*10:15–11:15*

As postsecondary education becomes increasingly important for the success of today’s students, longitudinal data linking K–12 and postsecondary education is essential for K–12 educational practices. Minnesota’s Statewide Longitudinal Education Data System (SLEDS) provides easy access to school-specific information about student choices and success in transitions from K–12 to higher education. It provides critical evidence for evaluating the effectiveness of programs and designing targeted improvement strategies, particularly related to career and college readiness. We will demonstrate SLEDS and show you how to build the reports schools and policymakers want. View the power of this analytic tool to strengthen decisionmaking.

**XI–G  Ensuring Data Quality for Value-Added Measures .....................................................Wilson C**

*Mary Wolfson, Pittsburgh Public Schools (Pennsylvania)*
*Brian Gill and Matthew Johnson, Mathematica Policy Research*

*10:15–11:15*

Since 2010, Pittsburgh Public Schools has worked collaboratively with Mathematica Policy Research to implement high-quality, value-added measures (VAMs) for teachers, teams, and schools. Although there is extensive research on the statistical characteristics of VAMs, districts and states have far less guidance about how to ensure the integrity of the underlying data—which is essential for the validity of the VAMs and their credibility in the eyes of educators. This session will describe the data assurance process implemented in Pittsburgh, including establishing accurate teacher-student data linkages, providing an opportunity for appeals, and implementing revisions based on validated appeals.
**XI–H** New Mexico’s “Enchanting” Evolution in Longitudinal Data Collection ............................. Harding

*Kathryn Cleary, New Mexico Public Education Department*

*Figen Bilir, eScholar LLC*

10:15–11:15

In partnership, the New Mexico Public Education Agency (NMPED) and eScholar have worked on several statewide data initiatives, including implementing a district-facing data warehouse, establishing unique identifiers for students, and applying data-quality solutions. NMPED will discuss the progress it has made with its statewide data collections using a commercial, off-the-shelf, and standards-aligned solution; enabling data collection from such diverse domains such as student, staff, and transportation; and the agency’s evolution of data reporting. Participants will learn how NMPED was able to achieve these accomplishments without support from any Race to the Top (RTTT) or statewide longitudinal data system (SLDS) grants.

**XI–I** Can Strategic Analytics Improve High School Graduation Rates in DC Schools? .............. Coolidge

*Celine Fejeran and Jeffrey Noel,*

*District of Columbia Office of the State Superintendent of Education*

*Steve Cartwright, Tembo, Inc.*

10:15–11:15

This session will explore the results from an unprecedented, year-long partnership among Washington, DC, education agencies, across traditional and charter schools, to study the high school outcomes of more than 10,000 public school students and create an enduring set of citywide strategies to increase secondary graduation rates. Discussants will share the project’s analytic roadmap, review the most compelling findings from their research, and discuss how the data are being used by school and district leaders to support students with varying levels of need through the completion of high school. Key analyses include a predictive, early warning model of high school completion; individual measures of schools’ “graduation value-added”; and a latent class cluster analysis of high school students’ disengagement patterns.

**XI–J** Equity, Inclusion, and Opportunity: Addressing Success Gaps in Our Schools ............... Hoover

*Tom Munk, Westat*

10:15–11:15

This session introduces a research-based guidance document and self-assessment rubric designed by the Office of Special Education Program’s (OSEP) Disproportionality Priority Team to help districts and schools identify the root causes of “success gaps” (in, for example, test scores, suspension or graduation rates, or course credits) for some groups of students, thereby helping schools to improve and equalize results for all students. These tools will be particularly helpful to districts and schools that have been selected for attention by states because of identified success gaps.
11:30–12:30  Concurrent Session XII Presentations


Carol Jenner and Tim Norris, Washington State Office of Financial Management

11:30–12:30

Comprehensive P–20W data systems provide a rich source of information that can be used to examine the postsecondary education and employment outcomes of high school career and technical education (CTE) program completers. State and district CTE administrators have requested a variety of outcome measures for CTE graduates, including postsecondary enrollment, credential attainment, employment, and employment characteristics (e.g., industry of employment, full-time/part-time status, earnings). This information is used for mandatory reporting, program evaluation, and planning. The presenters will discuss (1) how CTE-related data are handled in the Education Research and Data Center’s P–20W “PRO” data model; (2) education and employment data sources; and (3) the development of feedback information for local CTE administrators.

XII–B  Using Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) Data to Demonstrate the Impact of Effective Teachers in Tennessee ............................................. Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (North)

Nathaniel Schwartz, Tennessee Department of Education
David Silver, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
Karen Levesque, RTI International

11:30–12:30

This session presents the results of an analysis of the impact of effective teachers on student learning in Tennessee. The analysis was conducted using the Evaluation Engine, which transforms state longitudinal data into a powerful tool for obtaining quick-turnaround, quasi-experimental results of the impact of education interventions, while protecting the confidentiality of underlying student data. Presenters will discuss the study results and the potential of statewide longitudinal data system (SLDS) data for making rigorous research more accessible and less costly for state and local practitioners, researchers, and policymakers.
XII–C  Inclusive State Data Systems: Policy and Practice ................. Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (West)

Rachel Zinn, Workforce Data Quality Campaign
Catherine Imperatore, Association for Career and Technical Education (ACTE)
Tim Harmon, Center for Law and Social Policy
Bryan Wilson, National Skills Coalition

11:30–12:30

Many states are expanding their data systems to capture a broader range of students, programs, and outcomes. This session will outline a blueprint for more inclusive state data systems and provide examples of federal and state policies that support cross-program data linkages. Speakers will explain how inclusive data systems can be used to measure the attainment and value of credentials, including certifications awarded by industry; assess progress through career pathways; and create tools to show policymakers the results of their investments across the education and workforce spectrum.

XII–D  Postsecondary Success: Technical Considerations for Linking National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) Data to District Data .................................................. Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (South)

Michael Tith and Anya Dudek, Center for Education Policy Research at Harvard University
Brandi Bakshi and Jeffrey Davis, Nassau Board of Cooperative Educational Services (New York)
Monica Martinez, Elizabeth Public Schools (New Jersey)

11:30–12:30

Educational agencies have made great strides in improving the quality of student achievement data to more effectively understand postsecondary success. Agencies have started to use National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) data that allows them to tackle key college readiness questions. Using their own agencies’ data, Nassau Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) and EPS have utilized the SDP Toolkit to answer key questions about student high school completion, what it means to be on-track to graduate, and postsecondary enrollment and persistence. This session will provide an overview of the SDP Toolkit while also demonstrating the applicability of this resource to analysts in education agencies working on postsecondary success initiatives.

XII–E  Arizona Ready-for-Rigor Data Dashboard:
Ongoing Use in a PK–12 Educational Environment.................................Wilson A

Ann Nielsen, Barnaby Wasson, Kelly Morris, Veronica Malone, Robert Morse, and Angelia Linder
Arizona State University

11:30–12:30

This session will describe the dashboards Arizona has created dashboards to support teacher-effectiveness assessment efforts during preservice and inservice activities. Arizona State University’s (ASU) iTeachAZ Data Dashboard is a tool created to support teacher candidate achievement. It provides an online environment where teacher candidate performance data is securely reported
and visualized to all stakeholders. The dashboard displays data collected by student teaching supervisors from walkthroughs, performance assessments, notebook checks, progress reports, and attendance. The dashboard is changing the way the Teachers College uses data to support and measure student success. The session also will describe the Arizona Ready-for-Rigor (AZRfR) Data Dashboard, which was developed to provide school leaders and teachers access to data that supports improving teacher effectiveness. The AZRfR Data Dashboard is a tool to store and capture student-to-teacher roster connections; student demographic, achievement, and growth data; and teacher professional development in relation to student data. This presentation will review the latest advancements in the project structure, Year 4 successes and additions, analytics of end users, and next steps in relation to this data.

XII–F  ISLE ODS—Data Collection in the Cloud ......................................................... Wilson B

Jim Peterson, Bloomington School District 87 (Illinois)
Aziz Elia, CPSI, Ltd.

11:30–12:30

Bloomington District 87 is part of a 35-district Illinois Race to the Top Phase 3 grant pilot that is collecting data and using validation toolsets to accomplish its goals. The objective is to allow educators access to data, resources, and tools that will enhance student performance. The project incorporates real-time Extract, Transform, and Load (ETL) and validation options to provide data to a central, cloud-based data store available for Illinois school districts to allow interoperability among student data, student achievement, and learning. Bloomington District 87 will explain their current status in deployment and present the dashboard in the deployment, including the dashboard developed by Illinois Interactive Report Card (IIRC), their vision of the real-time architecture using Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF), and the underlying data center “infrastructure as a service” (IaaS)/“software as a service” (SaaS)—called IlliniCloud.

XII–G  A Review of State Approaches to Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Coordinated Early Intervening Services Reporting ................................................................. Wilson C

Dave Phillips, WestEd
Jody Fields, University of Arkansas at Little Rock
Chris Thacker, University of Kentucky

11:30–12:30

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) allows, and sometimes requires, local educational agencies (LEAs) to use funds provided under Part B of the IDEA for Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS) for nonspecial education students. There are multiple data collection and reporting requirements associated with the use of these funds for CEIS, and staff from the IDEA Data Center will review how a diverse subset of states and their local education agencies (LEAs) are working to meet those requirements. Both aggregate and student-level reporting approaches will be reviewed.
XII–H  Public Data Reporting Tools That Enable
District and School Comparison and Trend Analysis....................................................... Harding

Lien Hoang and Sarah Carleton
Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

11:30–12:30

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education developed a set of District Analysis and Review Tools (DARTs), which turn the department’s vast amount of data into valuable and easily consumable information. These publicly available, Excel-based DARTs offer snapshots of district/school performance, allowing users to easily track select data elements over time and make meaningful comparisons to the state or to comparable organizations. This session will provide an overview of the DARTs and the “comparables selection” algorithm, and it will highlight some of the unique indicators developed in the areas of staffing and finance, English language learners, and students’ success after high school.

XII–I  Feel the Power of Your Common Education Data Standards (CEDS) Data: Actualize It With Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF)................................................................. Coolidge

Vicente Paredes, SIF Association
Jim Goodell, Quality Information Partners, Inc.
Aaron Harte, Houghton Mifflin Harcourt (HMH)

11:30–12:30

This session will explain how to implement Common Education Data Standards (CEDS) data elements using the SIF data model. The Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF) Data Model, Version 3, includes the complete set of CEDS data elements. The SIF CEDS objects may be used as stand-alone elements or may be used to extend regular SIF objects where CEDS elements are needed. We will cover important issues in creating a physical model using CEDS; for example, where to create a repeating element and how to ensure the normalization of data. eXtensible Markup Language (XML) examples will demonstrate how SIF data structures can contain CEDS elements.

Christian Heneghan, South Carolina Department of Education
Matt Betts, Level Data

11:30–12:30

This presentation will detail South Carolina’s next-generation plan to leverage both free and fee assets to improve the quality, availability, timeliness, and use of education data. Come learn how Ed-Fi, Common Education Data Standards (CEDS), master data management techniques, and managed integration services (Level Data) can be used to deliver better data, better service, and lower operational costs. If you have ever been frustrated by efforts to coordinate your state and local education agency data collection and reporting activities, then this presentation will be of interest to you.
EDFacts and Common Core of Data (CCD) Nonfiscal Coordinators’ Training

National Center for Education Statistics
Institute of Education Sciences
U.S. Department of Education
### EDFacts and Common Core of Data (CCD) Nonfiscal Coordinators’ Training Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time &amp; Room</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday, July 30, 2014</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15–2:15</td>
<td>2014 NCES STATS-DC Data Conference Opening Plenary Session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurgood Marshall Ballroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30–3:20</td>
<td>2014 NCES STATS-DC Data Conference Concurrent Sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30–5:20</td>
<td>EDFacts and Common Core of Data (CCD) Nonfiscal Coordinators’ Training</td>
<td>Mandatory for sponsored EDFacts/CCD Nonfiscal Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (East)</td>
<td>EDFacts General Session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overview of Changes for EDFacts and Common Core of Data (CCD) Reporting for SY 2014–15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDFacts and CCD Reporting Issues, including:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• EDFacts/NCES Merge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Data Collection Changes for SY 2014–15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Missing/Not Applicable/Zero Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• EDFacts Data Usage from ED Perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR), Migrant, and Coordinated Data Quality Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Technical Support and System Updates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thursday, July 31, 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time &amp; Room</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00–10:30</td>
<td>EDFacts and Common Core of Data (CCD) Nonfiscal Coordinators’ Working Sessions:</td>
<td>Mandatory for sponsored EDFacts/CCD Nonfiscal Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (East)</td>
<td>• Local Education Agency (LEA) Membership and CCD Reporting Issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CCD Data Management System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30–10:45</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45–12:30</td>
<td>EDFacts and Common Core of Data (CCD) Nonfiscal Coordinators’ Working Sessions:</td>
<td>Mandatory for sponsored EDFacts/CCD Nonfiscal Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurgood Marshall Ballroom (East)</td>
<td>• Highly Qualified Teacher Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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John Q. Easton  
**Director of the Institute of Education Sciences**  
**U.S. Department of Education**  

John Q. Easton is Director of the Institute of Education Sciences (IES), where he started his six-year term on June 1, 2009. Dr. Easton comes to IES from Chicago, where most recently he was Executive Director of the Consortium on Chicago School Research at the University of Chicago. Dr. Easton was affiliated with the consortium since its inception in 1990, and became its Deputy Director in 1997. Dr. Easton also served a term (2003–07) on the National Assessment Governing Board, which sets policies for the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). Dr. Easton holds a doctorate in measurement, evaluation, and statistical analysis from the University of Chicago; a master’s degree from Western Washington University; and a bachelor’s degree from Hobart College. He is the author or coauthor of numerous reports and articles and two books: *Charting Chicago School Reform: Democratic Localism as a Lever for Change*, published by Westview Press in 1999 and *Organizing Schools for Improvement: Lessons from Chicago*, published by the University of Chicago Press in 2010.

Catherine E. Lhamon  
**Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights**  
**U.S. Department of Education**

Catherine E. Lhamon is the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights at the U.S. Department of Education. Ms. Lhamon’s 17-year track record of success has earned her repeated accolades as one of California’s top women lawyers, and as an Attorney of the Year for Civil Rights in 2004 by *California Lawyer*. She was also named one of California’s Top 20 Lawyers Under 40 in 2007. Immediately prior to coming to the Department of Education, Ms. Lhamon was the Director of Impact Litigation at Public Counsel, which is the nation’s largest pro bono law firm. Before coming to Public Counsel, Ms. Lhamon practiced for a decade at the ACLU of Southern California, ultimately as Assistant Legal Director. Before then, Ms. Lhamon was a teaching fellow and supervising attorney in the Appellate Litigation Program at Georgetown University Law Center after clerking for the Honorable William A. Norris on the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. She received her J.D. from Yale Law School, where she was The Outstanding Woman Law Graduate, and graduated *summa cum laude* from Amherst College.
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Demonstration Descriptions

CaseNEX-DataCation

Peter Bencivenga

With so many data points available in a school district, how do seasoned educators make the most of their data? This demonstration will show why, for a product to succeed, it needs to work within (not above) the workflow of a teacher’s busy schedule. DataCation tools maximize student and teacher learning through the use of formative and performance assessments, teacher-led inquiry, and ongoing professional development. Track student progress toward Common Core exams and allow teachers to use actionable data in all decisions. Discover how DataCation helps unlock accurate, actionable, and interconnected data to improve outcomes in your school.

CPSI, Ltd.

Gay Sherman, Aziz Elia, and Michelle Elia

CPSI, Ltd.—Create a Dynamic Standards-Based Longitudinal Data System (LDS). In longitudinal data collection and analysis, better data collections mean better reporting and making better decisions. Gathering and collecting data in near real time with extensive data validation gives you confidence in the consistency of your data, while standardization is the key to data governance. The CPSI xDStudio Enterprise solution provides a standardized data model for reporting, ETL (extraction, transformation, and load) functions, complete information access, operational and transactional data systems, longitudinal data systems, and complete ad-hoc reporting tools. Why wait for reporting time? Address and resolve data inconsistencies in real time.

eScholar LLC

Shawn Bay, Wolf Boehme, and Nisa Torres

eScholar—Personalized Education Starts at eScholar. eScholar is the nation’s leading innovator in using data to support personalized education. Our award-winning solutions simplify reporting, streamline data management, and transform the way educators use data to help pre-K to postsecondary students achieve their own individual success. eScholar delivers data warehouse, student and staff identifier management, and collaborative goal-planning solutions, which enable 13 education agencies and more than 5,000 districts to better serve the needs of more than 20 million students across the nation. Visit us at www.escholar.com and follow us on Twitter @eScholar
ESP Solutions Group

Joshua Goodman, Glynn Ligon, Steve King, and James Rife

ESP Solutions Group is solely focused on improving the quality of education data. Our team of education experts originally pioneered the concept of “data-driven decisionmaking” (D3M) and now partners to optimize the management of data within state agencies. ESP Solutions Group has advised school districts, all 52 state education agencies, and the U.S. Department of Education on the practice of P–20W data management. ESP Solutions Group is comprised of nationally recognized experts in implementing the data and technology requirements of state accountability systems, No Child Left Behind (NCLB), EDEN/EDFacts, and the Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF), as well as the National Education Data Model (NEDM), Ed-Fi, and the Common Education Data Standards (CEDS). ESP’s collective expertise is represented in its optimal reference guides (downloads are available at http://www.espsolutionsgroup.com/library/). To learn more, please visit www.espsolutionsgroup.com.

FindTheBest

Allen Kim and Bob Goldman

This demonstration will be delivered through a live demo of the website as well as a PowerPoint presentation. The content is comprised of four major sections: the historical landscape of New York City’s high school admissions process, New York City’s Department of Education’s decision to open its data through an API portal, the implementation process and final outcome of the open data policy, and the future of open data. Through this presentation, we hope to highlight how students, parents, and teachers have benefited from the partnership with New York City and what the future holds for the state of education and open data policy.

Houghton Mifflin Harcourt (HMH)

Jennifer Lally Sargeant, Zach Tussing, Stuart Trafford, and Dave Bargeron

Houghton Mifflin Harcourt’s (HMH) edFusion. By taking a partner-centric approach with customers, the HMH team helps education entities deliver on their vision of integrated content and data environments. Our work includes data use for reporting and analytics, enterprise reporting (including growth model, at-risk management, RTI programs, digital libraries, and allowing business users to create their own reports), standards usage, secure portals, standards management, classroom tools, and entire statewide longitudinal data systems (SLDSs). By working with us, your organization can put the power of data and digital tools at your educators’ fingertips.
**Demonstration Descriptions**

**Infinite Campus**

*Joe Fox*

Infinite Campus provides a statewide data collection solution that collects, certifies, and transforms data into a standardized data set for reporting and analysis; realizes efficiencies by publishing data to districts; and improves district data quality via electronic student data record transfers. Infinite Campus delivers a proven, comprehensive state solution that includes unique student and staff ID assignments, a student locator, enrollment overlap detection, data integration services, district-to-district record transfers, standard reports, ad-hoc reports, common course numbering, state-defined data elements, final grade reporting, 21st Century Schools, longitudinal economic indicator, robust limited-English-proficient (LEP) tracking, and teacher-student data linkage. Our five statewide initiatives give us unique insights into the complexities and subtleties of planning and managing statewide data collection.

**Manhattan Strategy Group**

*Jennifer Nielsen and Bill Murphy, Manhattan Strategy Group*

*Missy Cross, Windwalker Corporation*

See the new Distance Learning Dataset Training (DLDT) System, an online guide to NCES data across the education spectrum. DLDT common modules offer an overview of NCES data systems; methods used to ensure consistent, reliable, complete, and accurate data collection and reporting; complex sampling designs and implications for micro-data users; and strategies for accessing publications, products, data tools, and public- and restricted-use datasets. Survey-specific modules present more detailed information about selected studies conducted by NCES. Currently, five sets of modules detailing nine NCES surveys are available. Module sets detailing additional surveys and administrative data will be added annually.

**PITSS America LLC**

*Martin Disterheft, Joel Bell, and Wes Oliver*

Learn how the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) deployed a new evaluation system for use statewide using ADF Fusion and ADF Mobile. The solution developed for MDE enables principals, educators, and district administrators to conduct teacher evaluations on their PC, iPad, iPhone, and Android phones. The mobile application features an offline mode, a user interface driven by server-side configuration, and reference documentation for the entire teacher evaluation process. Learn how the solution was developed, what sort of support and management is involved with an application of this scale, and the long-term educational evaluation roadmap the platform enables.
SAS

*Wes Rehm, Karen Patch, Wes Avett, Rob Harper, Scott MacConnell, and Emily Baranello*

Your Day Made Easier: Bring your Data to Life with SAS. SAS helps state education agencies track student progress and trends longitudinally from data such as attendance, test scores, and demographics. SAS enables states to merge vast amounts of student data from the disconnected levels of education—culminating in the development of a data-rich, state-specific longitudinal data system that integrates relevant data about a student’s education, from preschool through graduate school or workforce entry.

The SAS demo will showcase how states can do the following:

- Integrate data, improve data quality, and manage metadata
- Use analytics to identify current and future trends for better decisionmaking
- Equip all decisionmakers with secure self-service reporting

Thinkgate

*Jeff Skene*

In this interactive demonstration, Jeff Skene will show how Thinkgate’s solutions can be used to bring the instructional lifecycle full circle, starting with assessment creation and administration and ending with instructional improvement through assessment analytics, curriculum resources, and administrator feedback. The demo will emphasize on the data provided through Thinkgate’s solutions and how that data can be used to personalize instruction. In learning how data and technology allows them to gather and connect information, participants will leave empowered to make instruction more effective and personal.
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<tr>
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<td>II-D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-E</td>
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