

NCES SUMMER FORUM AND DATA CONFERENCE 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| NATIONAL FORUM ON EDUCATION STATISTICS AGENDA..... | 5 |
| DATA CONFERENCE AGENDA WITH SESSION DESCRIPTIONS | 11 |
| WEDNESDAY | 11 |
| THURSDAY..... | 21 |
| FRIDAY | 41 |
| DEMONSTRATION DESCRIPTIONS | 53 |
| TOPICAL INDEX TO SESSIONS..... | 61 |



Forum Agenda

Washington, DC
July 24-26, 2006

<http://nces.ed.gov/forum>

National Center for Education Statistics
Institute of Education Sciences
U.S. Department of Education

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.

MONDAY, JULY 24, 2006

Registration
7:30 – 5:00 State

Cyber Café
7:30 – 5:00 State

Morning Break
7:30 – 8:00 State/Georgia

Task Force, Working Group, and Action Plan Team Meetings
8:00 – 12:00

New Members' Orientation Session
10:00 – 12:00 Grand Ballroom

Lunch On Your Own
12:00 – 1:15

Forum Opening Session
1:15 – 2:45 Grand Ballroom

Forum Agenda Review

Bill Smith, Forum Chair, Sioux Falls School District, South Dakota

NCES Update

Mark Schneider, Commissioner of Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education

FERPA Questions and Answers

LeRoy Rooker, U.S. Department of Education

Break
2:45 – 3:00 State/Georgia

Standing Committee Meetings
3:00 – 4:30

National Education Statistics Agenda Committee Virginia
Dave Uhlig, Committee Chair, Charlottesville City Public Schools, Virginia

Policies, Programs, and Implementation Committee South Carolina
Susan VanGorden, Committee Chair, Lakota Local School District, Ohio

Technology Committee Pennsylvania
Bertha Doar, Committee Chair, Rockwood School District, Missouri

Steering Committee Meeting
4:30 – 5:30 Rhode Island

Reception
5:30 – 7:00 State

TUESDAY, JULY 25, 2006

Registration
7:30 – 5:00 State

Cyber Café
7:30 – 5:00 State

Morning Break
7:30 – 8:00 State/Georgia

Roundtable Discussions
8:00 – 8:30

Data Quality Curriculum Task Force South Carolina

pK-12 Data Model Working Group Virginia

Data Cycle Action Plan Rhode Island

FERPA Toolkit Action Plan Pennsylvania

Joint Session
8:45 – 10:00 Grand Ballroom

Statewide Longitudinal Grants
Grover J. Whitehurst, Director, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education

Data Quality Campaign: Consolidated Data Ask
Deborah Newby, Council of Chief State School Officers
Aimee Guidera, National Center for Educational Accountability

Break
10:00 – 10:15 State/Georgia

Standing Committee Meetings
10:15 – 12:00

National Education Statistics Agenda Committee Virginia
Dave Uhlig, Committee Chair, Charlottesville City Public Schools, Virginia

Policies, Programs, and Implementation Committee South Carolina
Susan VanGorden, Committee Chair, Lakota Local School District, Ohio

Technology Committee Pennsylvania
Bertha Doar, Committee Chair, Rockwood School District, Missouri

Lunch On Your Own
12:00 – 1:30

Standing Committees Reconvene
1:30 – 4:30

Steering Committee Meeting
4:30 – 5:30 Rhode Island

WEDNESDAY, JULY 26, 2006

Registration

7:30 – 5:00

State

Cyber Café and Demonstrations Open

7:30 – 5:00

State

(This room will be closed during the Forum Closing Session)

Morning Break

7:30 – 8:15

State/Georgia

Standing Committee Meetings

8:15 – 10:15

National Education Statistics Agenda Committee

Dave Uhlig, Committee Chair, Charlottesville City Public Schools, Virginia

Virginia

Policies, Programs, and Implementation Committee

Susan VanGorden, Committee Chair, Lakota Local School District, Ohio

South Carolina

Technology Committee

Bertha Doar, Committee Chair, Rockwood School District, Missouri

Pennsylvania

Break

10:15 – 10:30

State/Georgia

Forum Closing Session

10:30 – 11:30

Grand Ballroom

Education Data Collection

Tom Luce, Assistant Secretary, Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development
U.S. Department of Education

Standing Committee Progress Reports

Task Force Progress Reports

Election of New Officers

Recognition of Projects Completed

Steering Committee Meeting

11:30 – 12:15

Massachusetts

DATA CONFERENCE

AGENDA WITH SESSION DESCRIPTIONS

**Washington, DC
July 26-28, 2006**

**National Center for Education Statistics
Institute of Education Sciences
U.S. Department of Education**

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.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 26, 2006

Registration

7:30 – 5:00

State

Cyber Café and Demonstrations Open

7:30 – 5:00

State

(This room will be closed during the Data Conference Opening Session)

Morning Break

7:30 – 8:30

State/Georgia

Common Core of Data (CCD) Training Sessions

9:00 – 12:00

CCD New Nonfiscal Coordinator Training (For NEW Coordinators)

CCD Nonfiscal Survey Staff

East

CCD Fiscal Coordinator Training (For ALL Coordinators)

CCD Fiscal Survey Staff

Chinese

Lunch On Your Own

12:00 – 1:15

Opening Plenary Session

1:15 – 2:15

Grand Ballroom

Welcome and Introduction of Speaker

Mark Schneider, Commissioner of Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education

Keynote Speech

Jane Hannaway, Director, Education Policy Center, The Urban Institute

Using Longitudinal Data to Support Education Policymaking in States and School Districts

Dr. Jane Hannaway is currently Director of the Education Policy Center at the Urban Institute. She formerly served on the faculty of Columbia, Princeton, and Stanford Universities. A prolific writer on education policy, Dr. Hannaway most recently led successful efforts to establish a Center for the Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research (CALDER). CALDER is intended to inform state and local education policy through analysis based in large part on state administrative records data on individual students and teachers over time.

Break

2:15 – 2:30

CCD Training Sessions

2:30 – 5:00

CCD Nonfiscal Coordinator Training (For ALL Coordinators)

CCD Nonfiscal Survey Staff

East

CCD Fiscal Coordinator Training (For ALL Coordinators)

CCD Fiscal Survey Staff

Chinese

WEDNESDAY, JULY 26, 2006

Concurrent Session I Presentations

2:30 – 3:20

- I-D The Effective Use of Data to Improve Instruction Senate**
John Brainard, Pueblo School District No. 60, CO
Les Morse, Alaska Department of Education and Early Development

The power in longitudinal data systems lies in their ability to inform curriculum and classroom instruction to increase student achievement. The panelists will discuss their efforts in using student data to improve student achievement. The assessment program in Pueblo District 60 is designed as a comprehensive assessment system that not only assesses student achievement, but also attempts to continuously improve the instructional program, utilizing classroom, district, and state assessments. Alaska reorganized the assessment system to provide coherent and consistent information regarding individual student, group, and school achievement in a manner that is directly tied to the state-adopted standards and grade level expectations.

- I-E NCES Handbooks Online V4.0 South Carolina**
Tolani Adeboye, Council of Chief State School Officers
Ghedam Bairu, National Center for Education Statistics
Beth Young, Quality Information Partners

Version 4.0 of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Handbooks Online will go live on the NCES website in August 2006. The Handbooks Online provide guidance on consistency in data definitions and maintenance of education data, so that such data can be accurately aggregated and analyzed. This updated version contains many new features, including an improved table of contents, better organized object detail pages, and expanded search capabilities. Revised content areas include exit codes, virtual education, early childhood education, and assessment. The presentation will give an overview of the updates and a demonstration of how to use the new features.

- I-F Zero to 950,000 in 9 Months Virginia**
Leigh Ann Grant-Engle, Missouri Department of Elementary
and Secondary Education
Bertha Doar, Rockwood School District, Missouri
Pete Muenks, Lee's Summit School District, Missouri

Missouri staff will explain how they implemented a student ID system and additional student-level data to pre-code state assessment in less than one year from start to finish. An online demonstration of the Missouri Student Information System will be provided along with a discussion of Missouri's plans for next steps.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 26, 2006

Concurrent Session I Presentations

2:30 – 3:20

- I-G **Becoming EDEN: Education Data Exchange Network Update** **Rhode Island****
Ross Santy, U.S. Department of Education

The Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) is now established as an institutional program within the Office for Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development for the collection, management, and use of elementary and secondary education data. This session will summarize the accomplishments and lessons learned over the past year working with the states to transmit quality education data between the states and the U.S. Department of Education. This overview will also describe upcoming milestones in 2006 and 2007 to fully establish EDEN as the primary federal source of elementary and secondary education data. In closing, the presenter will provide a quick overview of each of the upcoming EDEN sessions.

- I-H **School Finance Adequacy: Data Needs and Political Acceptance** **Pennsylvania****
Lawrence Picus, University of Southern California

This paper will discuss the data needs of school finance adequacy studies and will describe how those data can be used to work with state policymakers to establish adequate funding levels. The paper will focus on the Evidence-Based model of adequacy and use recent work in Arkansas, Washington, and Wyoming as examples.

- I-I **South Carolina SAVE\$ (Schools and Agencies Verify Energy Dollars)** **New York****
Roger Young, Roger Young and Associates
Mitch Perkins, South Carolina Energy Office

South Carolina SAVE\$ provides a common framework for energy managers to track monthly utility costs and usage, identify problem areas, and analyze the impact of efficiency measures. The statewide system has also enabled the South Carolina Energy Office to develop an energy consumption database that yields historical trends and comparisons among organizations, building types, and categories of organizations. The South Carolina Energy Office has a partnership with SchoolDude.com to utilize a web-native system allowing multiple users within each organization to view consumption data and print reports from any computer with internet access while providing the Energy Office real-time access to consumption data.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 26, 2006

Concurrent Session I Presentations

2:30 – 3:20

- | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| I-J | Quantifying the Magnitude by which AYP Targets were Missed <i>Diane Lowery, South Dakota Department of Education</i> <i>David Lamitina, Otis Educational Systems</i> | Massachusetts |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|

A metric for quantifying the magnitude by which schools or districts did not make adequate yearly progress (AYP) will be reviewed. The session will cover the conceptual development of the AYP Achievement Metric; a free software package developed to generate metric values; and initial content, criterion-related, and construct validity analyses. Plans for future studies, including the evaluation of school improvement initiatives, evaluation of school progress toward the achievement targets of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), and the study of the validity of NCLB prescribed accountability systems will be shared.

Break

3:20 – 3:30

State/Georgia

WEDNESDAY, JULY 26, 2006

Concurrent Session II Presentations

3:30 – 4:20

II-A The Electronic XML High School Transcript Schema (Part I) Grand Ballroom

Moderator:

Barbara Clements, National Transcript Center

Presenters:

Bruce Marton, University of Texas at Austin

Tom Stewart, Miami-Dade College (retired)

The Postsecondary Electronic Standards Council (PESC) released the XML Postsecondary (College) Academic Transcript Schema as a PESC Approved National Standard in April 2004. Since then, a PESC Workgroup has been holding regular meetings to develop an electronic XML version for the Secondary (High School) Academic Transcript. With broad-based participation and collaboration, the development work is complete and has been released as a PESC Approved National Education Community Standard in June 2006.

The purpose and scope of the PESC XML High School Transcript is to support the electronic exchange of the high school transcript with a postsecondary school, or to a state or other agency. Participants in the workgroup included secondary schools, postsecondary schools, state and federal agencies, and vendors involved in the secondary Student Information Systems market. In this session, we will review the considerations that were made to support a standard methodology and national standards while allowing for local flexibility and control.

This presentation will include a discussion of the PESC XML Schema itself, a brief look at the Implementation Guide that accompanies the Schema, current plans for implementation of the Schema at states and schools, and usage of the Texas Internet Server, a free service of the University of Texas that authenticates and facilitates exchanges between educational institutions. We will also review technical specifications and features along with a review of how the National Standard references and interacts with National Center for Education Statistics standards, particularly the upcoming School Codes for the Exchange of Data code set. Finally, we will discuss how this Schema and the work of the Schools Interoperability Framework Association can be integrated into a single standard process.

II-D The Effective Use of Data to Improve Instruction Senate

Cory Curl and Mary Reel, Tennessee Department of Education

Molly Schaeffer, Poway Unified School District, California

The power in longitudinal data systems lies in their ability to inform curriculum and classroom instruction to increase student achievement. The panelists will discuss their efforts in using student data to improve student achievement. Poway Unified School District has put in place a customized web-enabled data system, paired with a benchmark-assessment tool, which guides the work of teachers in classrooms. Tennessee administrators and teachers use web-based data tools to inform curriculum and instructional strategies for accelerating student academic growth toward state learning standards and ACT college-readiness standards.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 26, 2006

Concurrent Session II Presentations

3:30 – 4:20

II-E Forum Guide to the Privacy of Student Information: South Carolina
A Resource for Schools

*Levette Williams, Wanda Jones, and Angela Hagans
Georgia Department of Education
Mary K. Hervey DeGarmo, Brooke County Schools, West Virginia
Mary Gervase, Blaine County School District, Idaho
Polly Sorcan, Eveleth-Gilbert Public Schools, Minnesota
Beth Young, Quality Information Partners
Ghedam Bairu, National Center for Education Statistics*

The *Forum Guide to the Privacy of Student Information: a Resource for Schools* is a toolkit that was written to help school and local education agency staff better understand and apply the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, a federal law that protects privacy interests of parents and students in students' education records. The Forum has developed full reports on student (and staff) privacy guidance but a more succinct document was needed for schools to provide them with quick resources and links to other resources. The document defines terms such as "education records" and "directory information" and provides guidance for developing appropriate privacy policies and information disclosure procedures related to military recruiting, parental rights and annual notification, the use of videotapes, online information, media releases, surveillance cameras, and confidentiality concerns related specifically to health-related information. The Forum members who developed the document will be available to describe the school resource they developed.

II-F CECAS-Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Virginia
Compliance Management Update

Malcolm Alexander, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction

The presenter will review the current capabilities and strengths of the Comprehensive Exceptional Children Accountability System (CECAS) implementation, including planned enhancements for online Individual Education Programs and Medicaid reporting. Special emphasis will be on ease of use, client participation, and features that eased system acceptance by districts. This system, created in partnership with the Michigan Compliance Information System project, was installed and operational within 12 months of the project start. This funded application continues to be improved with additional features at both sites being added annually.

II-G Department of Education Data Policy Updates Rhode Island

Patrick Sherrill, U.S. Department of Education

The Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development published a Notice of Proposed Rule Making on April 28, 2006 that will enable the Secretary of Education to require that U.S. Department of Education sponsored and Office of Management and Budget approved collections be mandatory collections, enforceable under the grantmaking authority of the Secretary. This session will discuss these regulations as well as the status of the development of agency guidance on the collection and reporting of race and ethnicity data on students and education staff.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 26, 2006

Concurrent Session II Presentations

3:30 – 4:20

- II-H** **New Jersey's Abbott v. Burke: Accountability for Equity and Adequacy** **Pennsylvania**
Lesley Hirsch, Education Law Center

New Jersey is on the leading edge of educational adequacy as a result of the landmark decisions of the State Supreme Court in *Abbott v. Burke* that go well beyond equalizing school funding to mandating their efficient and effective use to enable students to achieve to high academic standards. The presenter will describe the capacity-building approach to accountability that is embodied within the *Abbott* rulings and on-the-ground implications of this approach, including the needs for appropriate and sustainable accountability mechanisms; better and more accessible data; careful indicator selection; and deeper, broader public engagement. Finally, the presenter will discuss in brief, the findings of a 2006 statewide progress report on the Abbott districts, entitled *Progress and Challenges: The Abbott Districts in 2005-06*.

- II-I** **State and National Longitudinal Policy and Data Initiatives** **New York**
Elizabeth Laird and Nancy Smith
National Center for Educational Accountability

Since its inception in November 2005, the Data Quality Campaign has been gathering state-specific and national research and policy initiatives that promote the building and use of longitudinal data systems, which are crucial to enabling informed policy decisions. The information documented thus far can be found on the Data Quality Campaign's website, www.DataQualityCampaign.org. This session will highlight findings and reports about state and national longitudinal data initiatives identified thus far and provide an opportunity for states to share their progress towards creating and implementing longitudinal data systems and research based on that data.

Break

4:20 – 4:30

WEDNESDAY, JULY 26, 2006

Concurrent Session III Presentations 4:30 – 5:20

- III-A The Electronic XML High School Transcript Schema (Part II) Grand Ballroom**
Moderator:
Barbara Clements, National Transcript Center
Presenters:
Bruce Marton, University of Texas at Austin
Tom Stewart, Miami-Dade College (retired)

See Session II-A for description.

- III-D Best Practices in IT Project Management Senate**
Marty Daybell, Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
Bob Bellamy, Better School Business

Typically, state education agencies as well as local education agencies are not staffed or equipped with adequate resources (personnel, environment, and skills) to undertake a large information technology project, such as the development of a comprehensive longitudinal student data system or educational data warehouse. This workshop presents key considerations and factors for success in the design, development, management, and delivery of these systems.

- III-E Data Quality Curriculum South Carolina**
Lee Tack, Iowa Department of Education
Roy Herrold and Michael Derman
Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit, Pennsylvania
Ghedam Bairu, National Center for Education Statistics

The data quality curriculum provides training on data quality issues to local education agency staff, based on the *Forum Guide to Building a Culture of Quality Data*. The curriculum will include lesson plans, instructional material, and supplementary resources designed to help participants understand the necessary concepts and content and begin the process of analysis and planning necessary to establish a culture of quality data. One set of lesson plans is aimed at all of the key players identified in the Forum Guide; the second set is focused on those staff responsible for fulfilling the role of Data Steward or Data Coordinator.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 26, 2006

Concurrent Session III Presentations

4:30 – 5:20

- III-F** **Evaluating Supplemental Service Providers:
What are the SES Experiences of Parties Involved?** **Virginia**
Tony Ruggiero and Theresa Kough, Delaware Department of Education

The Council of Chief State School Officers' (CCSSO) Comprehensive Assessment Systems Transition in Sanctions (CAS TAS) Study Group conducted an exploratory study to learn about the experiences of state education agencies, local education agencies, supplemental education service (SES) tutors, school principals, classroom teachers, and parents for the provision of supplemental educational services. In this session the results of the study will be discussed, but more importantly, the discussion will involve the effectiveness of the data collection instruments and how this study fits in with the overall plan of evaluating SES providers.

- III-G** **EDEN Data Collection for the 2006–2007 School Year** **Rhode Island**
Barbara Timm, U.S. Department of Education

This session will review the status of the current 2006–2007 Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) clearance package, which was published for public comment on May 1, 2006. This package has been sent to the Office of Management and Budget for final approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act. The presenter will discuss the public comments received by the U.S. Department of Education (ED) about the proposed changes to the current (2005–2006) EDEN Data Set. The session will briefly review the current EDEN Data Set and then discuss ED's proposed changes and the reasons for those changes for the 2006–2007 school year data.

- III-H** **The Legacy of *Rodriguez*: Assessing Three Decades
of School Finance Reform in Texas** **Pennsylvania**
Jennifer Imazeki, San Diego State University
Andrew Reschovsky (presenter), University of Wisconsin-Madison

The legacy of *Rodriguez* has been more than three decades of judicial and legislative activity that has spurred substantial changes in public school funding in Texas. In this paper, we explore whether Texas has achieved the equity and fiscal neutrality objectives that were at the core of the *Rodriguez* case. We also ask whether the current funding system is providing school districts with sufficient revenues to meet the state's student performance standards, identify which school districts are underfunded, and estimate the amount of money needed to close the funding gap.

We conclude that Texas has made great strides in addressing inequities in resources, although in recent years, inequities have begun to increase. We find that a significant number of school districts do not receive sufficient resources to provide an adequate education and show that districts that are most underfunded are also those with the highest proportions of poor and minority students.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 26, 2006

Concurrent Session III Presentations

4:30 – 5:20

III-I Data Quality Campaign: Partnerships, Products, and Progress **New York**
Nancy Smith and Aimee Guidera
National Center for Educational Accountability

In this session, we will discuss partnerships that have formed as a result of the data quality campaign, share findings from four state site visits, discuss activities and publications produced by the campaign, and update the audience on the progress of the campaign towards meeting its objectives. Time will be set aside for you to guide us on how the campaign can be an effective partner for state and local education agencies.

THURSDAY, JULY 27, 2006

Registration

7:30 – 5:00

State

Cyber Café and Demonstrations Open

7:30 – 5:00

State

Morning Break

7:30 – 8:30

State/Georgia

Concurrent Session IV Presentations

8:30 – 9:30

IV-A SIF: Version 2.0 Looking to the Future

Grand Ballroom

Larry Fruth, Vince Paredes, and Mark Reichert
Schools Interoperability Framework Association

The release of the Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF) Specification version 2.0 again brings sweeping changes to enable data movement at new levels. With the inclusion of Web Services, Student Record Exchange, and requested new additional data objects, this release highlights the SIF Association's willingness to work with and respond to the needs of the educational community. See what is new in version 2.0, what is taking place to strengthen the SIF Certification process, and where we see the SIF Association heading as we look beyond 2.0. This session will also update attendees on how the SIF Association is working with the International and Higher Educational Communities to enhance data movement in education globally and for all ages, as our stakeholders become life-long learners.

IV-B Is the Common Core of Data Obsolete?

East

John Sietsema, National Center for Education Statistics
Jennifer Sable, American Institutes for Research

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) survey series was first implemented in 1987 to collect data pertaining to the 1986-87 school year. With the rise of the U.S. Department of Education's Education Data Exchange Network data system, some state education agency officials have asked whether NCES will continue to maintain a publicly accessible national database of information on public education systems at the state, district, and school level. This session will explore that question and help participants understand why it is in the interest of each state to maintain a collection of basic data based on the CCD model regardless of the data collection mechanism used by the U.S. Department of Education.

THURSDAY, JULY 27, 2006

Concurrent Session IV Presentations

8:30 – 9:30

- IV-C NCES and OPEPD Working Together: Chinese**
The Merger of the Common Core of Data (CCD) with the
Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN)
Lee Hoffman, National Center for Education Statistics
Patrick Sherrill, U.S. Department of Education
Beth Young, Quality Information Partners

The National Center for Education Statistics and the Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development are working closely together to reduce collection burdens, improve data quality, and assist the states in the development of education information systems. This work has resulted in a collaborative effort to collect CCD data through the EDEN Submission System. This session will address the progress in those areas including the Institute of Education Sciences Grants to States and the CCD.

- IV-D Building Political Support and Will to Build and Use Longitudinal Data Systems Senate**
Jay Pfeiffer, Florida Department of Education
Robert McGrath, Pennsylvania Department of Education

As a data manager, you understand and believe in the power of longitudinal systems, but in most states, educational longitudinal data have received little time in the policy and political spotlight. Hear how Florida and Pennsylvania have built champions for their data systems.

- IV-E Geographic Visualization: South Carolina**
A Tool for a More Effective Understanding of Education—GIS
Carl Schmitt, National Center for Education Statistics

Geographic Information System (GIS) tools are powerful for visualizing and analyzing information about schools and school districts for making effective decisions and focusing information development.

This presentation will introduce GIS and its uses in education for the new user, provide a more in-depth view for those who would like to use these tools for practical and analytic purposes, and explore what is new to the National Center for Education Statistics GIS website and how to get more out of the information available from the website. New school and district data included on this site will also be discussed.

THURSDAY, JULY 27, 2006

Concurrent Session IV Presentations

8:30 – 9:30

IV-F Web-Based Interactive Mapping in Delaware **Virginia**
Don Berry, Delaware Department of Education

Delaware has created a number of web-based interactive maps during the last two years. These maps include planning maps to assist districts with school location decisions and broad-based maps to assist the public with school choice, day care, and private school decisions.

Planning maps include small area population projections, newly approved local development, and tax parcel data.

Public interest maps include the locations of all Delaware public schools, private schools, and day care centers. Public maps have a built-in geocoding function that allows the public to enter an address or to click in a map to view their school attendance. Public maps also contain relevant census data, and school links which pop up school profiles and State test scores.

IV-G Keeping an Eye Out for 2014: Trends in Accountability Policies, AYP, and Student Achievement **Rhode Island**
*Nina de las Alas, Andra Williams, Carla Toye, and Rolf Blank
Council of Chief State School Officers*

For the past decade, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) has tracked, analyzed, and reported on state accountability systems. That practice has taken on new meaning since the passage of No Child Left Behind in 2002. CCSSO has been following the developments with states' accountability plans through its "Profiles of State Accountability Systems" website. This presentation will showcase CCSSO's online accountability information resources by reviewing sample state accountability policies, especially Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) formulation like annual measurable objectives, and examining them in relation to sample states' AYP outcomes and student achievement trends from 2003 through 2005.

IV-H What Occupations are Comparable to Teaching? **Pennsylvania**
Bill Fowler, National Center for Education Statistics

The usual procedure for comparing teachers' wages involves comparing them to all full-time non-teachers, or to all college graduates, or to compare directly with those of specific professions thought to be comparable to teaching. "Unfortunately, these professions are chosen based on limited data availability or are chosen somewhat arbitrarily with reference to any selection criteria" (Allegretto, Corcoran, and Mishel 2004, p. 17). In this presentation, three National Center for Education Statistics datasets are explored to begin to understand the occupations that teachers either come from or leave to. The Schools and Staffing Survey 2004 dataset may help understand what occupations present teachers left to become teachers. The Teacher Follow-Up Survey of 2001 may assist in identifying what occupations teachers leave to go to after teaching in 2000. The 1993/03 Baccalaureate and Beyond Longitudinal Study (B&B:93/03) followed students who earned a bachelor's degree in 1992–93 and were first interviewed in 1993, and then subsequently in 1994, 1997, and 2003. The final follow-up interview of the B&B:93 cohort, 10 years following completion of the bachelor's degree in 2003, may also reveal occupations to which former teachers moved.

THURSDAY, JULY 27, 2006

Concurrent Session IV Presentations

8:30 – 9:30

- IV-I The Future of Accountability: Utilizing Value-Added Models to Improve Teaching and Learning** **New York**
Kristina Scott, Fayetteville Education Foundation
Sean Mulvenon, University of Arkansas

Historically excluded from the realm of public schooling, educational researchers are now leading collaborative efforts to improve student achievement through more complex longitudinal measures of performance. This presentation will describe one such collaboration between the Fayetteville Public School District, University of Arkansas, and a local business that has produced a value-added model utilizing a Performance Growth Index. This model allows educators to go beyond traditional cross-sectional comparisons to look at actual student growth over time, and to identify strengths and weaknesses within buildings, classrooms, and overall district curriculum. Presenters will discuss the various components and outcomes of this program.

- IV-J Improving the Quality of Data in a District Student Information System** **Massachusetts**
Bethany Heslam, Charlotte County Public Schools, Florida
James Lair and Jeffrey Averick, The Center for Data Quality

Charlotte County Public Schools (CCPS), comprising twenty-one schools, is developing a process for automatically validating student data in its Pearson SASI system. The process entails periodically checking the quality of incoming data and ensuring that data provided to the state, and ultimately to the U.S. Department of Education, are of optimum quality. The CCPS student data validation system will improve the district's ability to deliver complete, appropriate, consistent information, without having to perform manual queries.

Break

9:30 – 9:45

THURSDAY, JULY 27, 2006

Concurrent Session V Presentations 9:45 – 10:45

- V-A SIF: Student Record Exchange** **Grand Ballroom**
Bethann Canada, Virginia Department of Education
Judith Barnett, Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit, Pennsylvania
Laurie Collins, Schools Interoperability Framework Association
Barbara Andrepont, ESP Solutions Group
Aziz Elia, Computer Power Solutions of Illinois

The introduction of Student Record Exchange in the Schools Interoperability Framework Specification has enabled the movement of data that was only a dream a few years ago. States and districts working together to set in motion this technology will securely and seamlessly be able to transmit and receive student records, allowing for accurate and timely data. In this session, we will highlight the work that has been done and the models districts and states are designing to make this a reality. We will discuss how the modular design of the Student Record Exchange objects can allow for choice by the requesting and receiving entities, and facilitate not only transmission of transcripts from high schools to higher education, but the exchanges of student records and additional files at all levels.

- V-B Tools for Accessing Education Data on the Web** **East**
John Sietsema, National Center for Education Statistics
Mazda Ebrahimi, Kforce Government Solutions

More than ten thousand people visit the National Center for Education Statistics Common Core of Data website each month seeking statistical data and directory information about schools, school districts, and state-level education systems. Some of them do not find what they are looking for. This session is designed to give participants the keys to unlock the mysteries of the Locators and the Build-a-Table tool. We will also seek feedback from users to help us decide what new features to add and how to improve the user-friendliness of the site.

- V-C Best Practices: Submitting Data to EDEN** **Chinese**
Tom Ogle, Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

State Education Agency data managers will discuss the decisions, processes, challenges, and opportunities associated with submitting complete, timely, and accurate data files to the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) Submission System. As the annual EDEN collection becomes mandatory for 2006–2007 school year data, these "lessons learned" should prove very useful to session attendees.

THURSDAY, JULY 27, 2006

Concurrent Session V Presentations 9:45 – 10:45

- V-D SEA Data Services to Districts** **Senate**
Timothy Webb, Tennessee Department of Education
Howard Woodard, Georgia Department of Education

Tennessee was one of many states participating in the Council of Chief State School Officer's Decision Support Architecture Consortium (DSAC). DSAC was tasked with conducting state specific analyses of existing data systems and providing recommendations for improvement. Through this model, state education agencies could support their local education agencies in designing and developing a Decision Support Architecture to improve efficiency and data quality at the local level. Georgia provides districts with data management and business intelligence services with both student and financial data. Soon they will link with a teaching/learning and assessment system.

- V-E An Overview of the New National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Locale Typology and Providing Local Governmental Services to Census Designated Places** **South Carolina**
Doug Geverdt, U.S. Census Bureau
Seymour Sacks, Syracuse University

Part one focuses on NCES's recently adopted urban-centric typology for classifying the location of schools and school districts. These new assignments differ from the earlier locale framework in many ways, and these changes will impact federal education programs and a significant portion of the NCES data portfolio. This presentation provides an overview of the new local framework and explains why the changes were needed, how they were implemented, and how the school and school district local universe is affected. Particular attention will be given to the impact these changes have on rural school and school district locale assignments.

The second part focuses on Census Designated Places (CDPs). CDPs have attracted attention, especially in the Washington/Baltimore area, and in other regions as well. The provision of local services may be the reason why transitions out of the CDP status may be easy, discouraged, or even controversial. Since they are not incorporated, determining which governments provide them with education and other local government services can be a difficult task and can be overlooked by sophisticated analysts such as Robert Lang and Dawn Dhavale of Virginia Tech. This discussion will present such information for all large and/or other CDPs designated as Principal cities—even though by definition they should not be accorded such status. The crux of the problem involves education as an active or passive element.

- V-F Attention to Details Does Matter** **Virginia**
Sonya Edwards, California Department of Education

Two years ago, the California Department of Education demonstrated its Data Resource Guide (DRG) at the Summer Data Conference. Since then, we have used information from the DRG to drive our initiative to reduce the department's data collections, which resulted in a 12 percent reduction in total collections. This year, we will demonstrate the standard, detailed, web-based reports that we are developing in the Data Resource Guide that will promote further changes in how the department manages our data.

THURSDAY, JULY 27, 2006

Concurrent Session V Presentations

9:45 – 10:45

- V-G A Big Box Data Store for Your Neighborhood: Environmental Issues Rhode Island**
Scott Gausland, Rhode Island Department of Education
Chris Letterman, Alaska Department of Education and Early Development
Jake Jacobs, South Carolina Department of Education
Lee Tack, Iowa Department of Education
Glynn Ligon, ESP Solutions Group

A panel of state education agency (SEA) representatives will discuss the reasons they are pursuing a central data store for their agencies' mission-critical information. These states (Iowa, Alaska, Rhode Island, and South Carolina) represent contrasting data topographies but similar goals. Design and implementation differences will be highlighted and supported (e.g., single stores vs. distributed stores, SEA vs. regional, local education agency vs. ownership, buy vs. build, On Line Analytical Processing vs. custom analyses). A major challenge is how to meet the SEAs' demands for official statistics and reports, and a school's demands for diagnostic-level detail. Interoperability, data quality, access, and other crucial issues will be discussed.

- V-H The Importance of Geography for Understanding Pennsylvania**
National Variation in Teacher Labor Markets
Michelle Reininger, Stanford University

Understanding the geographic size and variation in teacher labor markets across the nation is crucial for policymakers to be able to develop effective policies for recruitment and retention of teachers in hard-to-staff schools and shortage areas. Earlier research has found that teacher labor markets in New York State are geographically small, which has implications for areas that tend to be net importers of teachers. While this finding is important, it is limited to New York and does not address differences that may exist across states. This work expands on the previous study by exploring the geographic size of teacher labor markets across the United States. The presenter compares the geographic size of teacher labor markets to the size of labor markets for other occupations using a nationally representative dataset, National Educational Longitudinal Study of 1988. Exploiting information on an individual's occupation, zip code of high school attended, and zip code while working, the presenter calculates the distance that a worker lives from where he or she grew up.

- V-I Data for the People: Public Education Data Use in a Community Base New York**
Deinya Phenix, New York University

Access to meaningful information is important for greater public accountability. This discussion encompasses how lay education reform agents have used publicly available data to inform direct action. Some of this data use requires technical assistance, including the translation of voluminous administrative data into usable forms, by university faculty and staff. Drawing on publicly available national, state, and local databases, this technical assistance work helps community-based organizations examine local school conditions, define reform priorities, and articulate research questions. The common goal in all of these analyses is to effect change in community capacity and in education policy.

THURSDAY, JULY 27, 2006

Concurrent Session V Presentations

9:45 – 10:45

- V-J Improving District Performance through Process Benchmarking** **Massachusetts**
Travis Colton, American Productivity and Quality Center

The American Productivity and Quality Center, known worldwide for its award-winning benchmarking methodology to help businesses increase their productivity, has launched a K-12 initiative. To date, three benchmarking studies have been conducted in order to quantify process data in three key areas: Human Resources (hiring and selecting district personnel), Information Technology Management, and Student Assessment. This presentation will summarize the data collection methodology and the data analysis methodology used to create customized benchmarking reports for individual K-12 districts. Samples of the reports and surveys will be distributed.

Break

10:45 – 11:00

State/Georgia

Concurrent Session VI Presentations

11:00 – 12:00

- VI-A The SIFA Cost Analysis and Benefits Study** **Grand Ballroom**
Joe Kitchens, Western Heights Public Schools, Oklahoma
Todd Hughes, Durant Public Schools, Oklahoma
Laurie Collins, Schools Interoperability Framework Association

The Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF) Association has commissioned an independent third party study of the impact of implementing SIF at the district level. Featured at this session will be the results that show how SIF is informing and enhancing the teaching and learning process by providing teachers with data that allow them to more effectively differentiate instruction. The study also shows how SIF allows for more accurate data-driven decisionmaking through access to real-time data and can increase funding opportunities. We will highlight districts that, through implementing SIF, have been empowered with real-time and accurate data to improve timeliness of services for their stakeholders.

- VI-B Adding Another Dimension to the CCD School Locale Codes** **East**
Lee Hoffman and Tai Phan, National Center for Education Statistics

In the late 1980s, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) began assigning 8-level “locale codes” to schools for statistical analysis and sampling purposes. After reviewing methods used by other agencies such as Agriculture and Public Health, NCES based these codes on a formula combining both metropolitan and rural/urban concepts. As more and more programs, both Federal and private, began to adopt these codes as a means of targeting resources, their accuracy has become increasingly important to schools and school districts. Census, under the guidance of the Executive Office of the President, has periodically modified the demographic concepts under which United States geography is categorized, with a major change taking effect after the 2000 Census. A 4-level “urban-centric” code with three subcategories at each level has recently been developed by Census. NCES plans to publish these codes in parallel with the old codes for 3 years before dropping the old codes. This session will provide more information on that process and its implications.

THURSDAY, JULY 27, 2006

Concurrent Session VI Presentations

11:00 – 12:00

- VI-C Summary Report on the Civil Rights Data Collection in EDEN** **Chinese**
Clare Banwart, Rebecca Fitch, and Mary Schifferli
U.S. Department of Education
Lavan Dukes, Florida Department of Education

The most recent Civil Rights Data Collection (E&SS 101 and 102 for 2004) was conducted during 2005 using the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) Survey Tool. This approach allows for a more streamlined collection, pre-population of the Civil Rights Data Collection with some district and school data from the EDEN repository, and broader analysis of the resulting data when they are linked to other EDEN elements. The presenters will discuss strategies to reduce the burden and improve the timeliness and quality of the data collected in 2007. The presenters will also discuss how the state of Florida provides civil rights collection data for all of its school districts and how that model might be implemented by other state agencies. Session attendees will be invited to comment on these strategies and propose improvements in the civil rights data collection.

- VI-D Institute of Education Sciences (IES) Student Longitudinal** **Senate**
Data Systems (SLDS) Grantee Reports
Representatives from the IES SLDS Grantee States

In 2005, IES awarded grant funds to 14 states to develop Student Longitudinal Data Systems. Representatives from these states will discuss their efforts in implementing the grants and developing their data systems and respond to questions from participants.

- VI-E American Community Survey Availability by School District Geography** **South Carolina**
Laura Nixon, U.S. Census Bureau

The Census Bureau will replace the decennial census long form with the American Community Survey (ACS), an effort designed to provide similar social and economic data each year instead of once every ten years. The ACS will provide summarized data for school districts, and the National Center for Education Statistics plans to produce additional ACS school district custom tabulations. These sources will provide a wealth of geographic and demographic data for school planners and administrators, and they offer great opportunity for educational spatial analysis. This presentation will briefly discuss when ACS school district data will be available, what demographic characteristics will be provided, what will be included in the custom tabulations, and how these data will be useful for educational planning and decisionmaking.

- VI-F Accelerating Towards EDEN** **Virginia**
Sonya Edwards, California Department of Education
Steven King, ESP Solutions Group

This session will share the strategies and steps that California took that resulted in California's 2004–05 Education Data Exchange Network participation going from 12 percent to 37 percent over one month's time.

THURSDAY, JULY 27, 2006

Concurrent Session VI Presentations

11:00 – 12:00

- VI-G Reaching for the STARS: New Mexico’s Student and Teacher Accountability and Reporting System** **Rhode Island**
Daryl Landavazo, New Mexico Public Education Department
Alan Hartwig, Deloitte Consulting

The New Mexico Public Education Department is currently implementing the Student and Teacher Accountability and Reporting System (STARS). STARS will go into production during fall 2006. This presentation will discuss the importance of doing a pilot during implementation to resolve data standards, business processes, defining reporting and analysis requirements, and the challenges and lessons learned during the pilot and how those lessons learned will impact the full statewide implementation.

- VI-H Teaching Inequality: How Poor and Minority Students are Shortchanged on Teacher Quality** **Pennsylvania**
Heather Peske (presenter) and Kati Haycock, The Education Trust

The Education Trust collaborated with stakeholders in Ohio, Illinois, and Wisconsin to examine the distribution of teacher quality. There were large differences between the qualifications of teachers in the highest-poverty and highest-minority schools and teachers serving in schools with few minority and low-income students. The session includes findings from the data analysis and recommendations.

- VI-I Renewal and Revival of Public Schooling in Post-Katrina New Orleans** **New York**
Amy Claire Thoreson and Amy Dellinger, University of New Orleans
Jonathan Williams, University of New Orleans Charter School

In New Orleans, life in general and public schooling in particular are demarcated by hurricane Katrina. While New Orleanians strive to “return to normal,” educators view the devastation of the public schooling system, historically among the worst in the country, as an opportunity to rebuild and renew, a chance to provide high quality education to the city’s poorest, primarily minority, students. Among the challenges and opportunities we face are creating plans for systemic reform, developing evaluation methods to assess both school and student performance and progress, and methodically analyzing the streams of data generated by this enormous undertaking to monitor and adjust operations for this renewal.

- VI-J The Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools’ Uniform Data Set** **Massachusetts**
Deborah Rudy and Maria Worthen, U.S. Department of Education
Barbara Williams, Westat

Data can be an important and powerful tool in the prevention of youth drug use, violence, and in-school behavioral incidents. The Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools has spent the past year developing the Uniform Data Set (UDS) in a collaborative process that every state education agency (SEA) was given the opportunity to participate in. The primary purpose of the UDS is to standardize the data elements and definitions used by SEAs to comply with federal data collection requirements and to use in managing drug and violence prevention efforts. This session will “unveil” the UDS and inform participants of its use and applicability within the larger state data collection and use framework.

THURSDAY, JULY 27, 2006

Lunch On Your Own
12:00 – 1:30

Concurrent Session VII Presentations
1:30 – 2:30

VII-A SIFA's Teaching and Learning Framework **Grand Ballroom**
Jill Abbott and Larry Fruth
Schools Interoperability Framework Association

The Schools Interoperability Framework Association has focused its initial development and drive around interoperability between administrative applications, vertical reporting, and the infrastructure standards necessary for the seamless transfer of data. The long-term vision of the association has been to facilitate this transfer of data to inform the teaching and learning process, ultimately leading to increases in student achievement. While some data objects exist for the teaching and learning process, a strategic direction and framework have been developed to build upon this work. This framework will be discussed to enable interoperability between teaching and learning applications in order to impact the classroom.

VII-B NCES Average Teacher Salary Data **East**
Frank Johnson, National Center for Education Statistics

Annual average teacher salary data for public school teachers across the nation are currently available from the teacher unions only. NCES has initiated the collection of data for calculating and publishing an average teacher salary statistic. This session will review the issues regarding collecting average teacher salary data and what plans are in motion for collecting and reporting these data.

VII-C Introduction to EDFacts: The Use of EDEN Data **Chinese**
Ross Santy and Gerald Kehr, U.S. Department of Education

A number of data analysis and presentation tools have been developed for the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) team and U.S. Department of Education program managers. In this session the presenters will discuss how the EDEN data and data analysis tools will support the work of federal elementary and secondary education program managers and analysts. The presenters will also discuss how states can access EDEN data and these data analysis and reporting tools.

THURSDAY, JULY 27, 2006

Concurrent Session VII Presentations

1:30 – 2:30

- VII-D The Effective Use of Data to Improve Instruction** **Senate**
Todd Hughes, Durant Public Schools, Oklahoma
Joe Kitchens, Western Heights Public Schools, Oklahoma

The power in longitudinal data systems lies in their ability to inform curriculum and classroom instruction to increase student achievement. The presenters will discuss their efforts in using student data to improve student achievement. The efforts in both Western Heights and Durant provide teachers, parents, administrators and other stakeholders with real time access to valued multi-source trend data that validates the efficacy of school improvement efforts.

- VII-E Results of Pennsylvania's Data Dictionary Crosswalk Project** **South Carolina**
Judith Barnett, Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit, Pennsylvania
Jerry Hottinger, Pennsylvania Department of Education

The Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE), in partnership with the Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit, has developed a comprehensive crosswalk between the PDE Data Dictionary, National Center for Education Statistics Handbooks, and Schools Interoperability Framework objects and elements. The crosswalk will be a supportive tool in the development of the new Pennsylvania Information Management System (PIMS). The session will provide an overview of the project and deliverables, followed by a question and answer period.

- VII-F Using Data for Targeted Interventions** **Virginia**
Irene Spero, Consortium for School Networking

Data-driven decisionmaking is an evolving process—moving from the collection of the data, to the reporting and analysis, and finally to their use for targeted interventions. Research from the Consortium for School Networking's Data-Driven Decisionmaking Initiative, www.3d2know.org, indicates that most districts are making progress in the collection, reporting, and analysis of the data, but are lagging behind in its use for targeted interventions. This presentation will focus on best practices in the use of data for targeted interventions.

- VII-G Data Games: Not Child's Play** **Rhode Island**
Marta Burgin, South Carolina Department of Education
Barbara Andrepont, ESP Solutions Group

Hide and Seek, Chase, Tag, Hop Scotch, Musical Chairs, Marco Polo, and Red Rover should all be avoided in education data management. Education enterprise data management supports best practices in collecting, storing, analyzing, and reporting our data. States are developing metadata dictionaries and documenting data collections, repositories, and reports, and relationships across data elements, definitions, and code sets (option lists). We will discuss South Carolina's goals in initiating its data inventory project, and reference other state data inventory projects.

THURSDAY, JULY 27, 2006

Concurrent Session VIII Presentations
2:45 – 3:45

VIII-A How States Can Help Districts with SIF Implementations **Grand Ballroom**

Moderators:

*Laurie Collins and Vince Paredes
Schools Interoperability Framework Association
Aziz Elia, Computer Power Solutions of Illinois*

Panel Members:

*Bethann Canada and Peter Coleman, Virginia Department of Education
Tom Olson, South Carolina Department of Education
Vince Meyer, Wyoming Department of Education
Barbara Roewe, Oklahoma State Department of Education*

Many states are now planning Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF) implementations. Others would like to assist their districts as they move toward using SIF. Join us as we discuss (a) how states are helping districts with implementations; (b) how to take a little bit of money and make it go a long way; (c) how states are offering encouragement, awareness building, and training; and (d) how they are working with the SIF Association to improve the SIF Specification.

Representatives from Virginia, South Carolina, Wyoming, and Oklahoma will share their successes, challenges, ideas, and tips and tricks in this panel discussion, and update us on their progress and next steps.

VIII-B Determining Factors in Title I Allocations **East**

*William Sonnenberg, National Center for Education Statistics
David Waddington, Craig Cruse, Patricia Ream, and Ian Millett
U.S. Census Bureau*

Over \$12.5 billion are allocated to local education agencies under Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act. In this three-part presentation we will present details on the rules and regulations that determine how the allocations are made, details on the multifaceted production process for producing the model-based poverty and population estimates that are a primary determinant in the allocations, and a comprehensive overview of the processes for the biennial update of school district boundaries.

THURSDAY, JULY 27, 2006

Concurrent Session VIII Presentations 2:45 – 3:45

VIII-C Transformation of ED Collections **Chinese**
Lee Eiden, Kitty Wooley, and Barbara Timm
U.S. Department of Education

This session will discuss how the U.S. Department of Education (ED) data analysis and reporting system, *EDFacts*, has changed the way ED will not only be collecting data, but also managing information, in the future. The Regulatory Information Management Service of the Office of Management is responsible for reviewing and approving all proposed ED information collections activities. The presenters will discuss how ED is transforming its internal collection review process, specifically covering the Consolidated State Performance Reporting process for 04-05 and changes for 05-06. The session will also discuss the transformation of states to Education Data Exchange Network-only reporting for the Office of Special Education Programs Individuals with Disabilities Act reports.

VIII-D Linking K-12 and Postsecondary Data **Senate**
Jeff Sellers and Lavan Dukes, Florida Department of Education
Roth Aymond, Louisiana Department of Education

This workshop will illustrate the process Florida and Louisiana went through to design their PK-20 data linkages, and the process for collecting data and how to establish links between the different data sources of PK-12 and postsecondary. Additionally, examples of some practical uses of this process will be presented, demonstrating how a longitudinal database can be used to empower decisionmakers.

VIII-E Don't Drown in Data! The Wise Use of Data to Improve Student Achievement (Part I) **South Carolina**
Anthony Costello, Michael Hanlon, Kathie Estock, and Michael Christian
Garnet Valley School District, Pennsylvania

Schools gather and generate massive amounts of data, but do administrators and staff know what data to use, or how or when to use it? To truly know if your school is achieving its purpose and is continually improving, multiple measures gathered from varying perspectives must be collected and analyzed. Learn about our district's successful Data Days—how we gather, maintain, and benefit from the use of data.

A PowerPoint slide show will guide participants through our district's multi-year approach to data collection and analysis. Additionally, there will be interactive activities for attendees, and time for questions and answers.

THURSDAY, JULY 27, 2006

Concurrent Session VIII Presentations
2:45 – 3:45

VIII-F Internet2 and SEGPs: What Is It and Why? **Virginia**
Joseph Pangborn, Roger Williams University

This session will provide an overview of Internet2 and Sponsored Education Group Participants (SEGPs). Learn what they are and why they have been formed. The K20 Connectivity Data survey will be presented, giving attendees a sense of the available connectivity and growth of Internet2 across the nation and reaching out to the global community. We will review examples of applications and content utilizing both resources of the k20.internet2.edu website and those of Roger Williams University and other Rhode Island SEGP and Primary members. The structure of the Rhode Island SEGP, including the Ocean State Higher Education Economic Development and Administrative Network and the Rhode Island Network for Educational Technology, will be briefly discussed.

VIII-G Real-Time Student Data Transfer: The End of State Reporting? **Rhode Island**
David Gall, South Dakota Department of Education
David Frankson, Infinite Campus

This session will demonstrate how states can collect and manage student information in real time, virtually eliminating district-level reporting. The benefits of this innovative approach include automatic unique student ID assignment, district-to-district student record transfer, statewide student data warehousing, real-time data analysis, and streamlined No Child Left Behind report card generation.

VIII-H Fund the Child: Tackling Inequity and Antiquity in School Finance **Pennsylvania**
Eric Osberg, Thomas B. Fordham Institute

Under weighted student funding (WSF), money fully follows the child to the public school of his or her family's choice, funding is weighted (disadvantaged students are allocated more), and principals have authority to spend those dollars as necessary. The presenter and publisher of *Fund the Child: Tackling Inequity and Antiquity in School Finance* will explain WSF and discuss its potential to reform American education.

THURSDAY, JULY 27, 2006

Concurrent Session VIII Presentations

2:45 – 3:45

- VIII-I Implementing an Education Personnel Information System** **New York**
Helene Bettencourt, Massachusetts Department of Education
Jeffrey Averick, The Center for Data Quality

The Massachusetts Department of Education is rolling out its Education Personnel Information Management System. The system expands upon existing licensure information and assigns unique identifiers to more than 116,000 educators statewide. A new data collection on education staff will help Massachusetts meet Education Data Exchange Network reporting requirements and make informed policy decisions regarding the educator workforce. Presenters will address the challenges and benefits of implementing an individual education personnel data collection, and the differences between this system and a student information system. In addition, presenters will discuss the data submission process, identifier assignment, and automated data quality validation.

- VIII-J Mississippi's Online Student Assessment Project** **Massachusetts**
Roscoe Henry and LaToya Hood, Mississippi Department of Education

The State of Mississippi's newly developed Mississippi Alternate Assessment of Extended Curriculum Frameworks (MAAECF) system provides public school districts a method to assess their Significant Cognitive Disability (SCD) students online. Districts' Special Education programs in Mississippi are now using the system to rate their students in the areas of language arts and mathematics.

Break

3:45 – 4:00

THURSDAY, JULY 27, 2006

Concurrent Session IX Presentations

4:00 – 5:00

IX-A SIFA University **Grand Ballroom**

Judith Barnett and Mike Matukaitis
Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit, Pennsylvania
Laurie Collins, Schools Interoperability Framework Association

Administrators, data managers, and information technology personnel are all asking where they can find the accurate, concise information they need to understand Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF) and put it to use. States and districts are asking how they can provide professional development for their stakeholders. The Schools Interoperability Framework Association (SIFA) has responded by developing SIFA University online coursework in conjunction with the Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit using their eSchool Builder tools.

This session will highlight the purpose of the courses currently offered, giving the attendees a sneak peak at the valuable information that they contain, and provide a look at the delivery and interactive nature of the courses. Presenters will also discuss what's next for SIFA University as they strive to provide professional development opportunities about SIF.

IX-B Measuring Performance in International Assessments **East**

Laurence Ogle and Holly Xie, National Center for Education Statistics

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) participates in a number of international assessments. Among the most prominent are the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), and the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS). This panel will present results from each assessment and will discuss how these are reported and used in the United States by educators, policymakers, and others. The panel will also present information on construction of the assessments, development and use of background questionnaires, and the sampling techniques used in the assessments.

IX-C The Future of the EDEN Data Model, the ED Data Dictionary, and the Federal Enterprise Architecture **Chinese**

Barbara Timm and Kitty Wooley, U.S. Department of Education
Lee Hoffman, National Center for Education Statistics
Kimberly Koran, Computer Sciences Corporation/U.S. Department of Education

The Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) has pioneered the development of an elementary and secondary data model for the U.S. Department of Education (ED). EDEN staff members have worked with education data experts and the Enterprise Architecture Team of the Office of the Chief Information Officer to develop the data model upon which the EDEN data repository is built. This session will discuss the current status of this work in the context of agency information management improvements. The presenters will also discuss the current status of K-12 data mapping and the future processes to improve and extend the ED enterprise data dictionary.

THURSDAY, JULY 27, 2006

Concurrent Session IX Presentations

4:00 – 5:00

- IX-D Using State Databases to Identify School and District Improvement** **Senate**
Joseph McCrary, U.S. Department of Education
Susan Hanes, Council of Chief State School Officers
Thomas Kerins, Center on Innovation and Improvement

This panel discussion will demonstrate various examples of how assessment data can be used to identify areas of strength and weakness in student achievement and education program areas. These examples include how assessment data can be analyzed to find improving schools and districts as well as to measure program effectiveness. One such study, being conducted by the Center for Innovation and Improvement, relies on state assessment data to identify improving school districts. Follow-ups with surveys to identify district practices that contributed to these achievement gains will be conducted. The data used are collected by the American Institute for Research for the U.S. Department of Education. Other examples of data that can be used for identifying improving schools and districts include statewide longitudinal data systems being developed in collaboration with the Institute of Education Sciences and the National Center for Education Statistics. Emphasis will be placed on the need for quality data for decisionmaking and the importance of involving stakeholders in the development of data systems.

- IX-E Don't Drown in Data!** **South Carolina**
The Wise Use of Data to Improve Student Achievement (Part II)
Anthony Costello, Michael Hanlon, Kathie Estock, and Michael Christian
Garnet Valley School District, Pennsylvania

See Session VIII-E for description.

- IX-F Characteristics of High Quality Decision Support in K-12 Education** **Virginia**
Christopher Thorn, Robert Meyer, Bob Glover, and Jeffery Watson
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison

This presentation will discuss a generalized value-added assessment model and its implications for warehouse design; the characteristics of best practice in workflow and tool set needed for data dictionary creation and maintenance; warehouse design tradeoffs in light of the very challenging requirements of advanced statistical techniques; and the implications of these discussions for designing and building a decision support system.

THURSDAY, JULY 27, 2006

Concurrent Session IX Presentations

4:00 – 5:00

- IX-G Nevada's Annual Reports of Accountability** **Rhode Island**
Kimberly Vidoni, Nevada Department of Education
David Lamitina, Otis Educational Systems

A small state department of education will share its experiences in building a data collection and reporting system to support public accountability. The session will review the tools, process, and procedures developed to produce Nevada's Annual Reports of Accountability. Participants will learn how one state built a sustainable system for producing what the U.S. Department of Education labeled the best state report card it had reviewed. Lessons learned, recommendations for large-scale data collection projects, and future plans for the system will be shared.

- IX-H Narrowing in on Educational Resources that Do Affect Student Achievement** **Pennsylvania**
Sarah Archibald, University of Wisconsin-Madison

In an era dominated by issues of school finance adequacy, it seems particularly important to provide evidence that, despite a number of claims to the contrary, educational resources are indeed positively related to improved student achievement. One of the hypotheses of this paper is that expenditures per pupil must be disaggregated into more meaningful categories in order to discern the relationship between resources and student achievement. The evidence presented here is the result of a covariate adjustment model using a three-level hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) analysis of students (approximately 10,000) nested in classrooms (approximately 550) nested in schools (approximately 55). Using data from a large, urban school district in the West, the three levels of analysis include controls at all three levels for all of the factors that research tells us affect student achievement, including student demographic characteristics and pretest score, teacher experience, education, and a measure of his or her instructional practice, and school size, school-level poverty, and expenditures broken out into four categories: instruction, instructional support, leadership, and operations and maintenance. The results show that expenditures for instruction and instructional support were positively related and statistically significant for the reading achievement of third, fourth, fifth, and sixth graders in the 2002–2003 school year.

- IX-I From Months to Minutes: Producing EDEN From Your State Warehouse** **New York**
Bob Beecham and Kathy Boshart, Nebraska Department of Education
Tim Garrison, eScholar

Nebraska's goal is to produce state Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) files directly from its eScholar data warehouse. This presentation will compare how Nebraska is currently supplying EDEN data to the U.S. Department of Education with the preparations under way to automatically report EDEN data directly from its new data warehouse. These preparations include processes to translate state values to EDEN required values, extract data from the warehouse in EDEN file format, store EDEN data for verification and review, and handle annual EDEN requirement changes.

FRIDAY, JULY 28, 2006

Registration

7:30 – 12:00

State

Cyber Café and Demonstrations Open

(This room will close at 10:00 a.m.)

7:30 – 10:00

State

Morning Break

7:30 – 8:30

State/Georgia

Concurrent Session X Presentations

8:30 – 9:30

X-A Data Quality: SIF as a Catalyst of Change Grand Ballroom

Judith Barnett, Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit, Pennsylvania

Alex Jackl, ESP Solutions Group

Laurie Collins, Schools Interoperability Framework Association

Aziz Elia, Computer Power Solutions of Illinois

One of the consequences of implementing Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF) is confronting the cleanliness of your data—not as an abstract concept but as a stark reality. Automation and record-level reporting is changing the nature of data management. Implementing the SIF Specification becomes the catalyst for a change in how schools, districts, and states are managing their data.

This session will explore what we have found working with administrators and data clerks at all levels in the field, and the steps that schools, districts, and states must take to understand their current data business processes so they can begin this fundamental change.

We will discuss the processes we have found that help break down the communications barriers and workflows that are inherent with data responsibilities and how implementing SIF can streamline data management and bring about true data integrity and accuracy.

X-B Findings from The Condition of Education 2006 East

Michael Planty and Bill Hussar, National Center for Education Statistics

The Condition of Education was recently released. The report summarizes important trends and developments in education using the latest available data from many National Center for Education Statistics surveys and other sources. The report includes a special analysis on International Assessments. It also includes 50 indicators on participation in education, learner outcomes, student effort and academic progress, contexts of elementary and secondary education, and contexts of postsecondary education. This session will highlight key findings and issues.

FRIDAY, JULY 28, 2006

Concurrent Session X Presentations 8:30 – 9:30

- X-C Using XML in EDEN** **Chinese**
Ken Gu, Rhode Island Department of Education
Sue Amin, Pennsylvania Department of Education

The preferred option for submitting elementary and secondary education data to the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) is through XML. This session will review and clarify the EDEN XML file specifications and suggest innovative strategies to streamline the state submission of data to EDEN. Those states contemplating using XML in the submission of EDEN data are invited to join those states currently using XML.

- X-D Data Quality Roundtables** **Senate**
Data Quality Campaign Representatives

Glean the best thinking and practices from your colleagues from states and districts around the issues most on your mind. This participant-directed, interactive session of simultaneous roundtable discussions will touch on the topics that have been emerging in the efforts of the Data Quality Campaign (DQC). The DQC is a national, collaborative effort to encourage and support state policymakers to improve the collection, availability, and use of high-quality education data, and implement state longitudinal data systems to improve student achievement. The DQC will facilitate roundtable discussions on topics such as the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, data warehouses, data transfers among systems, relationships with vendors, hiring effective data managers, and other topics participants are burning to discuss.

- X-E Teacher Salary: Data Collection, Processes, and Calculations** **South Carolina**
Michelle Hussong and Matthew Danzuso, Ohio Department of Education

Issues such as the availability of highly qualified teachers, the sufficiency of teacher compensation, the attractiveness of the teaching profession, and the condition of public finance have increased national, state, and local interest in teacher salaries in recent years. In addition, the availability of school choice, such as charter schools, complicates data comparability and calculations for average teacher salary. Data collected by the Ohio Department of Education are examined for nuances that influence the calculation of average teacher salary, including distinctions among and between different types of public schools.

FRIDAY, JULY 28, 2006

Concurrent Session X Presentations 8:30 – 9:30

- X-F** **Data-Based Evidence of the Impact of Investment in Human, Social, and Physical Capital on Student Achievement** **Virginia**
Faith Crampton, University of Wisconsin Milwaukee

This study sought to test empirically the theory that investments in human, social, and physical capital impact academic achievement. The study utilized multivariate statistical techniques and national databases. Unlike much previous empirical research on the relationship between the physical environment and academic achievement, this study offers a theoretical base that contextualizes the contribution of the physical environment with other variables that affect student outcomes. This holistic approach is more likely to yield meaningful results. In addition, the research is the first study national in scope with broad implications for researchers, policymakers, and practitioners at all levels—local, state, and federal.

- X-G** **nySTART: Using the Data to Improve Instruction in New York** **Rhode Island**
Charlene Swanson, New York State Education Department
Jim Stewart, The Grow Network/McGraw-Hill

New York State and its partners will demonstrate the reporting capabilities of its individual student data warehouse and web-based reporting platform for nearly 3 million K-12 public and many non-public school students.

nySTART provides (a) parity in reporting capabilities for all schools, regardless of their technology infrastructure or economic status; (b) reports through a web browser without special hardware or software; (c) secure access for approximately 250,000 teachers and administrators to customized reporting and individual student data; (d) pre-defined and ad hoc reporting capabilities; (e) data extraction, verification, and storage processes; (f) public access to school report cards and query capability for the public reporting database; (g) individual student achievement reports with translation guides available in 10 languages; and (h) federal reporting for the Education Data Exchange Network.

FRIDAY, JULY 28, 2006

Concurrent Session X Presentations

8:30 – 9:30

X-H Size, Setting, and the Cost of Schools **Pennsylvania**
Hella Bel Hadj Amor, New York University

Widespread interest in the additional cost of educating children in diverse circumstances, and in the cost-cutting potential of size, is long-standing. Yet, despite increasing school-level accountability, much of the literature focuses on districts. School-level research is warranted because it can account for schools of different sizes being nested in districts of various sizes and structures, which may affect costs. Moreover, size is correlated with urban, suburban, or rural setting. The presenter untangles the school/district-size-setting relationships using rich Ohio panel data and examines how her own district-level results (that cost cutting begins in small districts, with fewer, larger elementary schools) are affected.

X-I Increase EDEN Data Quality by Eliminating Duplicate Students **New York**
in Your Data Warehouse Using Probabilistic Neural-Net Technology
Jim Boardman, Arkansas Department of Education
Jim Lair, The Center for Data Quality
Dennis Cribben, Metis Associates
Dan Hansen, Triand

Many of today's state student identification (SSID) systems do not appropriately handle historical student information causing state data warehouses to contain duplicate longitudinal records for the same student. Learn how state of the art Probabilistic Neural-Net Technology can longitudinally connect your student records enabling the longitudinal trends analysis required for today's policy decisions. Hear an in-depth detailed analysis of an existing working Probabilistic Neural-Net solution that currently longitudinally tracks over 4 million students, 20.5 million state assessments, 8.2 million district formative assessments, 6 million parents, and 470,000 teachers across 550 school districts and across 7 states.

X-J Simplifying the Measurement of Massachusetts **Massachusetts**
Communities' Ability to Pay
Roger Hatch, Massachusetts Department of Education

For many years, Massachusetts has struggled to find a way to combine both property wealth and personal income in its state education aid formula. The "aggregate wealth" model used in the FY07 aid calculations is a new approach. It ignores the complicated ratios of the past, in favor of a more transparent and straightforward measure of community ability to pay. Discussion will include whether or not income is a valid measure of local school funding capacity.

Break

9:30 – 9:45

FRIDAY, JULY 28, 2006

Concurrent Session XI Presentations

9:45 – 10:45

- XI-A The SIFA Organizational Profile Panel Discussion** **Grand Ballroom**
Laurie Collins and Mark Reichert
Schools Interoperability Framework Association
Aziz Elia, Computer Power Solutions of Illinois

As states begin to implement data integration solutions using the Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF) standard for vertical data interoperability, the SIF Association is attempting to lower barriers that might possibly result. Part of this solution is what is termed "Organizational Profile"—a customized profile that the state agency develops, in conjunction with the SIF Association, to create a standard for interoperability based on the state's data requirements. This session will cover the activities to date in developing an organizational profile, including state, district, and vendor responsibilities. Audience participation is necessary to help guide the process and provide feedback as we move forward in addressing the needs at the state and local education agency levels.

- XI-C EDEN: From a Federal Program Office Perspective** **Chinese**
Ross Santy, Louis Danielson, Ruth Ryder, Zollie Stevenson,
Jeanette Lim, Kathleen Leos, and Deborah Rudy
U.S. Department of Education

Program data experts from many of the principal program offices have been working closely with the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) team to develop methodologies to transition from multiple program collections to a shared agency data collection and usage process. They will discuss the process that was followed, the lessons learned, the current status of this collaborative effort, and the expectations for the future shared use of EDEN as a replacement for separate program office collections.

- XI-D Data Quality Roundtables** **Senate**
Data Quality Campaign Representatives

Glean the best thinking and practices from your colleagues from states and districts around the issues most on your mind. This participant-directed, interactive session of simultaneous roundtable discussions will touch on the topics that have been emerging in the efforts of the Data Quality Campaign (DQC). The DQC is a national, collaborative effort to encourage and support state policymakers to improve the collection, availability, and use of high-quality education data, and implement state longitudinal data systems to improve student achievement. The DQC will facilitate roundtable discussions on topics such as the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, data warehouses, data transfers among systems, relationships with vendors, hiring effective data managers, and other topics participants are burning to discuss.

FRIDAY, JULY 28, 2006

Concurrent Session XI Presentations

9:45 – 10:45

XI-E LDS Tri-State Partnership **South Carolina**

*Christopher Thorn and Robert Meyer
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Brian Wilmot, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
Margaret Ropp, Center for Educational Performance and Information
Cathy Wagner, Minnesota Department of Education*

The Tri-State Partnership will outline its progress to date in each state's individual focus areas and in areas of cross-state collaboration. State representatives will describe technology, roll-out plans, and the characteristics of “first movers.” Researchers from the Wisconsin Center for Education Research will outline the intersections between ongoing research projects and the needs of the various state partners. The win-win-win strategy of partnering will be grounded in these products produced collaboratively.

XI-F Issues and Solutions in the “Scale Up” of an Educator-Developed, Data-Driven Improvement System **Virginia**

*Sean Mulvenon, Charles Stegman, and Denise Airola
University of Arkansas
Edward Roeber, Michigan Department of Education*

Educators are challenged to identify effective solutions to improve student achievement. Often educators find isolated solutions that resist replication in other contexts. This session will highlight a scalable solution—a state-specific, online student performance evaluation system built by educators for educators. The drill-down functionality of the system was adapted to meet unique needs of each state’s educators. This session will present the multi-state solution, the process used to “scale up,” and reactions of state collaborators to the process and solution.

XI-G Creating a Sustainable Data Focus: Data Networks and Teams **Rhode Island**

Leigh Burgess, Lakota Local School District, Ohio

In this presentation, attendees will gain the knowledge and understanding around the research that has been collected on data-driven decisionmaking and its impact on student achievement; understand the conceptual framework of accessing, understanding, and utilizing data; understand the concept of a data network and its components; and be able to access and understand the process and templates for creating their own data teams. Data teams are data-driven collaborative partnerships among educational practitioners seeking quality and excellence throughout the teaching and learning environment.

FRIDAY, JULY 28, 2006

Concurrent Session XI Presentations

9:45 – 10:45

- XI-H Equalized Yield from Property Tax Effort and District Spending Decisions: The Vermont Experience** **Pennsylvania**
William Talbott and Vaughn Altemus, Vermont Department of Education

Vermont equalized the yields school districts receive for a level of property tax effort in FY 1999. A level of property tax effort produces the same amount of revenue per pupil in the district with the lowest property value per pupil as in the district with the highest. This presentation examines the effect of equalized yield on the variation in spending per pupil across districts from FY 1999 through 2006. An account of the incentives created in different years by transition provisions and statutory changes illustrates some of the problems confronting researchers comparing district per pupil spending among states.

- XI-I Forming a Multi-State Consortium to Achieve Cost Effective Online Student Testing** **New York**
Wanda Bamberg, Aldine Independent School District, Texas
Dan Hansen, Triand

The cost of providing online testing of students has proven to be beyond the capacity of many districts. Currently 110 districts from three states are loading their formative and state assessments into a shared system to deliver real-time results to teachers. Last year over 8 million formative assessments and 2 million state assessments from multiple vendors using automated web-based tools were uploaded into the system. Data are checked for quality and are Schools Interoperability Framework certified. Cost for the online student testing technology is shared between all participants and is adaptable to fit each district and state assessment.

Break

10:45 – 11:00

FRIDAY, JULY 28, 2006

Concurrent Session XII Presentations

11:00 – 12:00

XII-A Schools Interoperability Framework Roundtable Discussions

Grand Ballroom

Schools Comprehensive Data Model Forum Working Group

Moderators:

Larry Fruth and Vince Paredes

Schools Interoperability Framework Association

Kashka Kubzdela, National Center for Education Statistics

The newly formed Forum Schools Comprehensive Data Model Working Group is working toward the creation of a data framework “picture” of the school’s environment. Ideally this would make it possible to facilitate data transfer between applications and data storage within schools and districts; conceptualize how to streamline vertical reporting from the school to district, regional, state, and the federal level; and finally enable the development of tools educators and administrators need to both collect and analyze the data necessary to improve student performance. This roundtable session will provide a brief overview of the Working Group’s work to date and will probe with session participants the following questions: (a) *What are the top questions I would like to be able to answer in my state, district, and/or school that I cannot answer now?* and (b) *What are the top questions that need to be answered to inform instruction?*

Teaching and Learning Roundtable Discussion

Moderator: Jill Abbott, Schools Interoperability Framework Association

Enabling interoperability between applications is a vital step towards ensuring data quality, reducing burden, and progressing towards accountability. A need exists to now enable interoperability between teaching and learning applications to truly impact student achievement, facilitate decision support, and provide a comprehensive view of every student. This roundtable will include a brief overview of the Schools Interoperability Framework Association’s Teaching and Learning Framework. The main focus of this roundtable discussion is to gather feedback on the framework, the greatest needs for teaching and learning data, and the biggest barriers for enabling interoperability of teaching and learning applications.

Introducing the Enterprise Architecture: The Path to Sustainable Data-Driven Decisionmaking

Moderators:

Mark Reichert, Schools Interoperability Framework Association

Aziz Elia, Computer Power Solutions of Illinois

Alex Jackl, ESP Solutions Group

What does it take to put together the Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF) Enterprise Architecture to inform and sustain data-driven decisionmaking? This discussion topic and mini workshop is designed to help you begin to understand the decision process behind putting this architecture together, the personnel who should be involved, and some of the key questions that need to be addressed and answered. We will look at the process, not from a pure technical standpoint, but more at the core conceptual level of what you want to achieve. This working session will give you information to bring back to your organization and more insight into what it takes to do a SIF implementation and to design enterprise architecture.

FRIDAY, JULY 28, 2006

Concurrent Session XII Presentations

11:00 – 12:00

- XII-C EDEN 2006 Schedule: Discussion and Feedback** **Chinese**
Patrick Sherrill, U.S. Department of Education

This session will provide an opportunity to review in some detail the planned activities for the completion of the Office of Management and Budget paperwork clearance of the 2006–2007 school year data elements and the submission 2005–2006 school year data. There will be an opportunity for audience participation and suggestions concerning these milestones and objectives.

- XII-E Identifying Schools that “Beat the Demographic Odds”** **South Carolina**
William Murphy, Mary Ramirez, and Milad Elhadri
Pennsylvania Department of Education

Aggregated results for the 8th grade on the Pennsylvania State Assessment were examined to identify those schools that had high levels of proficiency for disadvantaged students. Proficiency levels for ethnic minorities, individualized education plan students, and limited English proficient students were also considered. Cluster analysis grouped schools based on high proficiency in the specific categories. The results demonstrated that we could identify effective schools using aggregate scores. Because the variables are collected routinely in the testing process, intrusive measures are unnecessary. The task of considering multiple sets of measures can be assisted by cluster analysis, which will seek out relationships between the measures.

- XII-H An Integrated Assessment of the Effects of Title I on School Behavior, Resources, and Student Achievement** **Pennsylvania**
Jordan Matsudaira, University of California at Berkeley
Adrienne Hosek (presenter), U.S. Department of Education
Elias Walsh, University of Michigan

Title I has been the largest Federal government program targeted towards elementary and secondary education for the past 40 years, yet there is still no consensus on whether it works. Building on the work of van der Klaauw (2005) and Gordon (2004), we examine the effects of Title I on school behavior, resources, and academic performance using a rich set of school finance and student-level achievement data from one large urban school district. The results of our regression discontinuity analysis suggest that Title I eligibility raises federal revenues of schools near the poverty eligibility cutoff by about \$460 per student. This increase appears to be partially offset by decreases in revenues from state categorical aid grants, so that the net increase to schools is probably about \$360 per student. Given the high variation in per pupil expenditures among even very similar schools, however, Title I eligibility results in no noticeable increase in total direct expenditures. We also find that Title I appears to have no impact on overall school-level test scores, and suggest that this is unsurprising given the small amounts of money involved. Even among the subgroups of students most likely to be affected by Title I, there appear to be no returns to federal funding in terms of higher achievement measured on end of year exams. A more tentative finding is that schools appear to respond to the incentives embedded in the Title I allocation process by manipulating the fraction of their students signed up for free lunch to secure more federal funds.

DATA CONFERENCE

DEMONSTRATION DESCRIPTIONS

**Washington, DC
July 26-28, 2006**

**National Center for Education Statistics
Institute of Education Sciences
U.S. Department of Education**

Demonstration Descriptions

ESP Solutions Group

Anne Marie Westmoreland and Joshua Goodman, ESP Solutions Group

ESP Solutions Group is solely dedicated to improving data management in K-12 education. We provide products and services for state education agencies in mission-critical areas such as data management, data collection and exchange, data analysis, and data reporting.

ESP personnel have advised all 52 education agencies as well as the U.S. Department of Education on the practice of K-12 school data management for state and federal reporting. We are regarded as leading experts in understanding the data and technology implications of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN), and the Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF).

Please stop by the ESP demonstration table to see our new products and services!

Statewide .net Student Information System

Willie McIntosh and Rick Whitehead, Third Day Solutions

Come visit Third Day Solutions' demonstration table to learn about our statewide development of Oklahoma student information system with Schools Interoperability Framework, how our development is leading to more accurate counts and faster reporting, what this development means to Oklahoma, and how other states and individual districts can use and benefit from our research and experience. New products and tools are available for implementation to co-exist within the state/district informational tracking system. We will show you how this works with Education Data Exchange Network and SIF requirements.

eScholar: Complete Data Warehouse Solution and Uniq-ID System for K-12 Education

Ron Streeter, Shawn Bay, and Wolf Boehme, eScholar

eScholar, the nation's leader in K-12 longitudinal data systems, provides the best possible data management, analysis, and reporting solutions for tracking and improving student achievement. The eScholar Complete Data Warehouse™ is the most comprehensive solution available for compiling, analyzing, and reporting on thousands of data elements. The powerful eScholar Uniq-ID™ System, incorporating ChoiceMaker Technology's matching capability, is the leader in generating, assigning, and locating statewide unique student identifiers. eScholar enables state education agencies and school districts to fully customize a solution to meet their own requirements, while maintaining Schools Interoperability Framework and National Center for Education Statistics standards. For more information about eScholar, please visit www.escholar.com.

Demonstration Descriptions

Innovations in Data Collection, Reporting, and Use

Gay Sherman, Aziz Elia, and Michelle Elia

Computer Power Solutions of Illinois

This demonstration shows the Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF)-based ETL tools available for collecting data on a district and state level and placing it in an operational and transactional data warehouse. We will also show how this data can be displayed with easy-to-use tools that can be viewed by teachers, parents, and administrators. The SIF Connect data warehouse solution is XML-based using the SIF standard and zone integration server. Additional SIF agent demonstrations for Identity Manager and Moodle will also be available.

Analyze, Verify, and Certify the Quality of Education Data Collections with C4DQ Certify[®] Software

Richard Paar, The Center for Data Quality

Ten state education agencies use the Center for Data Quality (C4DQ) Certify[®] software to analyze, verify, and certify the quality of data collections submitted to the U.S. Department of Education. C4DQ Certify[®] allows education agencies to pinpoint and view the sources of data quality problems, such as missing data, incomplete data, corrupted data, or misunderstood business rules. The software provides data quality metrics and customizable trend reports, so data owners, data stewards, and database administrators can observe data quality improvements over time. Real examples of K-12 data from selected state-level data quality programs will be demonstrated.

Transforming Data to Increase Academic Achievement

Alvin Crawford, SchoolNet

K-12 public school districts nationwide are partnering with SchoolNet for comprehensive, web-based Instructional Management Solutions (IMS) that transform data into a powerful tool to improve teaching and learning. This presentation will demonstrate the power of the IMS and its impact on meeting Adequate Yearly Progress goals, narrowing achievement gaps, enhancing teacher proficiency, and accelerating learning in some of the nation's largest school districts.

Demonstration Descriptions

EDSL: The Data Warehouse for Planning, Performing, and Publishing Results

Gary Policastro and Vincent Kelso, Fairfax County Public Schools, Virginia

Fairfax County Public Schools has taken the lead to publish school-level information as school profiles. The profiles are used to publicize school programs; school board strategic target measures; and demographic, performance, staffing, and safety of all of our schools. The profiles are an example of how to use the Education Decision Support Library (EDSL), an enterprise-wide decision support system, to support publication.

This demonstration will illustrate the importance of a decision support system for ease of reporting for school planning purposes, administrative planning, state reporting, and how school board members can easily provide appropriate school-level information to their constituents.

Using eGrants to Facilitate Better Planning and Accountability

Dan Carier and Eric Lindenberg, MTW Solutions

Districts and states invest significant effort in developing district improvement plans. For those plans to be effective, state education agencies (SEAs) must ensure the appropriate needs are funded, and results measured. MTW has built Grant Management Systems for 7 SEAs. Let us demonstrate how these states are integrating improvement plans with grant applications on through measuring results. Recent enhancements have tied these results back into future grant applications, leading to continuous improvement.

Pearson School Systems: Taking Data Collection to Analysis to Action

Merna Smith, Pearson School Systems

Geno Callens and Anna Palacios, Cal Data Systems

Discover how your school district can explore new ways to improve student achievement and make the most of existing technology resources. Over 16,000 U.S. schools use Pearson School Systems solutions to collect, consolidate, analyze, and report on district, school, and student data. AllOneSystem™ allows districts to make the most of their existing data systems while streamlining operations, reducing redundant data entry, and creating real-time connectivity and data sharing among any new or existing application. This demonstration will show how districts are utilizing this suite of solutions to manage performance and improve student achievement.

Demonstration Descriptions

What Can SIF Do For You? How to Automate State Data Collection, Unique Student Identification, and Data Warehouse Integration through SIF

Gary Johnson and Sandra Richards, Edustructures

Increasingly, states and districts thinking about state reporting, unique student identification, and data warehouse integration are relying on the Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF). The SIF vertical reporting, student locator, and application integration frameworks are reliable and cost-effective. Several state departments of education such as South Carolina, Virginia, Utah, and Wyoming are employing SIF. We will explain *how* at the Edustructures demonstration.

GIS Matters in Education

Chuck Roberts, George Dailey, and Tosia Shall, ESRI

Geographic information system (GIS) technology and processes are more commonplace every day. Their application to planning and decisionmaking is evident in numerous fields and industries as they address challenges and provide solutions. This includes education. The use of GIS in classroom instruction and school administration has been growing for more than a decade. The application of this technology and its methods to education research and policy is just unfolding. Here, GIS provides a geographical way to tackle data-driven decisionmaking, allowing users to explore patterns and relationships not visible in tables and charts alone. Stop by to learn more.

Emergency Operations Planning for Schools

Aimée Barnes and Diane Cornwell, Texas Engineering Extension Service

The Texas Engineering Extension Service has developed an online tool that guides school/district personnel through the development of a comprehensive emergency operations plan. The user develops each section of the plan by answering simple questions regarding their school or district. The plan is based upon established federal emergency management principles for jurisdictions, but simple enough for a novice to understand.

The demonstration will show an overview of the contents of a comprehensive plan, the functionality of the online tool, examples from use within the state of Texas, and the potential data that can be mined from the tool.

Educator Credentialing System (ECS)

Dean Hupp, Hupp Information Technologies

Hupp Information Technologies has worked with the Illinois State Board of Education to completely revamp their teacher certification and professional development systems. The new ECS system improves data quality, educator compliance, and educator renewal. Illinois educators now have more tools than ever to manage their credentials and the credentialing process.

Demonstration Descriptions

Triand: Integrated System Data Solutions

Brad Duggan, Dan Hansen, and Sylvia McMullen, Triand

Triand is the leader in integrated solutions for student improvement and accountability, providing automatic Schools Interoperability Framework certified data connectivity. We deliver on-time data directly to the desktop to over 53,000 users in 550 districts through aligned curriculum, an electronic student record exchange system, student graduation planning, and certified data quality audits for statewide reporting. The system contains over 4 million student records, 8 million assessments, and 350,000 aligned lesson plans and resources.

Triand will demonstrate the automated process for the nationwide unique student identifier using the secure, integrated data solution.

Using and Tracking Utility Data from LEA to the State: SC SAVE\$

*Roger Young, Roger Young and Associates
Mitch Perkins, South Carolina Energy Office*

This demonstration highlights how energy and other utility data are collected at the school district level and rolled up to the state energy office in order to benchmark energy consumption and costs.

SC SAVE\$ (South Carolina Schools and Agencies Verify Energy Dollars), a program developed by the South Carolina Energy Office, was recently selected as the state winner of the 2006 Southern Growth Policies Board Innovator Award.

Technology innovations improve productivity and provide measurable results to assist schools in controlling their energy costs.

DATA CONFERENCE

TOPICAL INDEX TO SESSIONS

**Washington, DC
July 26-28, 2006**

**National Center for Education Statistics
Institute of Education Sciences
U.S. Department of Education**

Topical Index to Sessions

AYP

I-J

Adequacy Studies

I-H

Assessment

VIII-J

IX-B

XI-F

XI-I

X-G

XII-E

XII-H

Benchmarking

V-J

Common Core of Data

IV-B

IV-C

V-B

VI-B

Census

VI-E

Condition of Education

X-B

Data Quality

III-E

IV-J

X-D

X-D

XI-G

Data Quality Campaign

II-I

III-I

Data Systems, various topics in

II-F

V-B

V-I

V-F

V-G

VII-E

VII-F

VII-G

VIII-E

VIII-G

IX-E

IX-G

X-E

X-F

XI-F

XI-I

Decision Support

VII-I

XI-F

XI-G

IX-F

X-G

Disaster Recovery

VI-I

Drug, Violence, and Discipline Data

VI-J

EDEN Track

I-G

II-G

III-G

IV-C

V-C

VI-C

VII-C

VIII-C

IX-C

X-C

XI-C

XII-C

Topical Index to Sessions

EDEN, other

IV-B
VI-F
VIII-I
IX-I
X-I

Effective Schools

XII-E

Enrollment

X-B

Facilities Management

I-I
III-I

Fiscal Track

I-H
II-H
III-H
IV-H
V-H
VI-H
VII-H
VIII-H
IX-H
X-H
XI-H
XII-H

Fiscal, Other

I-I
VII-B
X-F
X-J

FERPA

II-E

Evaluation

III-F

GIS, Geospatial, Geocoding

IV-E
V-E
VI-B

Internet2

VIII-F

LEA, presentations by

I-D (CO)
I-F (MO)
II-D (CA)
II-F (WV, ID, MN)
III-E (PA)
IV-J (FL)
V-A (PA)
VI-A (OK)
VII-D (OK)
VII-E (PA)
VII-I (VA)
VII-J (NY)
VIII-IX-E (PA)
IX-A (PA)
X-A (PA)
XI-G (OH)
XI-I (TX)

Locale Codes/Framework

V-E
VI-B

Longitudinal Data Systems Track

I-D
II-D
III-D
IV-D
V-D
VI-D
VII-D
VIII-D
IX-D
X-D
XI-D
XII-D

Topical Index to Sessions

Longitudinal Data Systems, other

II-I
III-I
IV-I
XI-E

Mapping

IV-E
IV-F

Methodology

V-J

Online Systems and Tools

I-E
II-E
II-I
V-B
VII-F
VIII-G
X-G
X-I
XI-I

Partnerships

II-F (NC & MI)
IV-I (LEA & Higher Ed)
XI-E (WI, MI, MN)
XI-G

SCED Codes

II-A
III-A

School, Report Cards

IX-G

School Reform/Improvements

VI-I
VII-G

School, District Boundaries

VIII-B

SEA, presentations by

I-D (AK)
I-F (MO)
I-J (SD)
II-D (TN)
II-E (GA)
II-F (NC)
III-D (WA)
III-E (IA)
III-F (DE)
IV-D (FL, PA)
IV-F (DE)
V-A (VA)
V-C (MO)
V-D (TN, GA)
V-F (CA)
V-G (RI, AK, SC, IA)
VI-C (FL)
VI-D
VI-F (CA)
VI-G (NM)
VII-E (PA)
VII-G (SC)
VIII-A (VA, SC, WY, OK)
VIII-D (FL, LA)
VIII-G (SD)
VIII-I (MA)
VIII-J (MS)
IX-G (NV)
IX-I (NE)
X-C (RI, PA)
X-E (OH)
X-G (NY)
X-I (AR)
X-J (MA)
XI-E (WI, MI, MN)
XI-F (MI)
XI-H (VT)
XII-E (PA)

Topical Index to Sessions

SIF Track

IV-A
V-A
VI-A
VII-A
IX-A
X-A
XI-A
XII-A

SIF, other

VII-J

Special Education

II-F
VIII-J

Student, Achievement/Performance

IV-G
IV-I
VII-I
VIII-E
X-B

Student Information Systems

I-E
I-F
VIII-G
IX-J

Student Privacy

II-E

Staff, Information Systems

VIII-I

Staff Development

III-E

Supplemental Education Services

III-F

Transcript

II-A
III-A

Title I

VIII-B
XII-H

Value-Added

IV-I

XML

II-A
III-A
X-C