

A large graphic consisting of a thick vertical black bar and a thick horizontal grey bar intersecting at the top left, forming a cross shape.

K-12 Education Data Governance and Statewide K-12 Longitudinal Education Data System

Report to the Legislature



SEPTEMBER 2010

K-12 Education Data Governance and Statewide K-12 Longitudinal Data System

Final Report

Prepared by
Bill Huennekens, Data Governance Coordinator
Public Policy and Planning
Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction

Randy I. Dorn
Superintendent of Public Instruction

Ken Kanikeberg
Chief of Staff

Robert Butts
Assistant Superintendent
Public Policy and Planning

September 2010

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	
I. Legislative Background	1
II. Introduction	1
III. Public Consulting Group Recommendations.....	3
A. Twelve Components of the Data System	3
B. System Recommendations.....	4
IV. Update on ESHB 2261 Activities	6
A. Data Governance Group	6
B. Data Management Committee.....	8
C. Data Analysts' Work	10
D. Reports Required on the Internet	10
E. Student Records Exchange.....	12
V. K-12 Statewide Longitudinal Data System Grant (K-12 SLDS) Project.....	12
VI. Budget Recommendations	13
A. Continued Maintenance Level Funding	13
B. Suspension and Expulsion Study	13
VII. Conclusion\Data Governance Work Plan.....	14

Appendices

Appendix A – Washington’s Statewide Proposed K-12 Longitudinal Education Data System	
Appendix B – Executive Summary of the Research and Policy Questions Analysis	
Appendix C – Data Quality Campaign State Profile	
Appendix D – OSPI Response to the Twelve Data System Component Recommendations by PCG	
Appendix E – Implementation Guidelines for K-12 Data Governance System	
Appendix F – Reports Required on the Internet	
Appendix G – Discussion of a Common, Standardized Structure for Reporting the Costs of Programs at the School and District Level	
Appendix H – Explanation of the Proposal for Separate Accounting of State, Federal and Local Revenues and Costs	

Executive Summary

Through the work of state and district student, educator and fiscal data owners, and in collaboration with Information Technology and Policy and Planning divisions, a maturing data governance process is now in place for the K-12 educational environment. As a result of this data governance process and with the support of federal grant funding and state resources, significant progress is being made toward a statewide K-12 longitudinal education data system that will transform the use of education data in Washington from an allocation and compliance system to an education data improvement system (*See Appendix – A for a diagram of Washington’s Statewide K-12 Longitudinal Education Data System*).

Significant progress was made through the work of a consultant Public Consulting Group (PCG) to identify critical research and policy questions and to document the associated data gaps needed to address the questions. Further, PCG made recommendations for each of the 12 expectations in ESHB 2261 for the statewide K-12 longitudinal education data system and developed six recommendations for consideration.

ESHB 2261, passed during the 2009 legislative session, set in motion several process and actions surrounding statewide K-12 longitudinal education data system. With the Data Governance Group and Data Management Committee meetings occurring on a regular basis more coordination across program areas is occurring. The data analysts funded through budget provisos connected to ESHB 2261 are mapping and linking data across various systems and extracting data for a variety of user ranging from the University of Washington, Education Northwest and the Education Research and Data Center in the Office of Financial Management. Data analysts have further worked on the reports required to be posted on the internet in ESHB 2261 to add to the thirteen reports currently available on the K-12 website.

Using K-12 Statewide Longitudinal Data System grant funding from the federal Department of Education, technical infrastructure and a framework for a data warehouse will be built. The warehouse will be a repository for data that will be made available from a web portal with access for educator, administrators, policy makers, researchers and the general public to view reports, dashboards and alerts. Many states have already invested in these types of solutions and our approach is to secure a system that is already implemented in another jurisdiction.

Another product that has resulted from the data governance process and focus on the statewide K-12 longitudinal education data system is the newly developed student record exchange system. The student record exchange system, which is to be delivered to districts in September, will provide districts access to state collected data on students transferring into their districts in a timely manner. This work product is an excellent example of the progress being made with data in the

K-12 environment and how data can be used to support educators in the work they do on a daily basis for the betterment of students across the state.

In order for this progress to continue maintenance of data governance and data analyst funding for the next biennium is critically necessary. Data governance provides the oversight and coordination for successful execution of solutions and data analysts do the hands-on work with the data making it available for education improvement.

I. Legislative Background

The 2009 Legislature established its intent to create a K-12 education data improvement system for financial, student, and educator data. The objectives in the legislation for the system include to monitor student progress, have information on the quality of the educator workforce, monitor and analyze the costs of programs, provide for financial integrity and accountability, and have the capability to link across these various data components by student, by class, by teacher, by school, by district, and statewide. The vision of the system is to enhance Washington's statewide K-12 longitudinal data system so it will inform school district, state and federal decision-makers; help educators improve the performance of all students; and provide information to parents and the public regarding our efforts to prepare students to live, learn, and work in the 21st century. Simply put, the effort is aimed at transformation from data for allocation and compliance to using data to improve our education system.

In addition to establishing the overall direction for the data system, Part 2 of Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2261:

- Identified 12 specific components that the Legislature intends to have included in the system. (Section 202);
- Created a K-12 Data Governance Committee to identify critical research and policy questions, identify needed reports, conduct a gap analysis that analyzes the current status of the data system compared to the Legislature's intent, and define the operating rules and governance structure for K-12 data collections. (Section 203); and
- Listed a number of reports to be posted on the internet to the extent data is available for the reports. (Section 203)

This report, required in ESHB 2261, will cover each of these areas in detail, provide an update on current activities, highlight budget recommendations and outline a data governance work plan. Much of this report is drawn from the work of Public Consulting Group (PCG) that produced a Data Gap Analysis in June (A copy of the report can be found at:

<http://www.k12.wa.us/K12DataGovernance/Objectives.aspx>) and Research and Policy Questions Report in March (See *Appendix – B for a copy of the Executive Summary of the Research and Policy Questions Analysis*) (A copy of the full report is available at <http://www.k12.wa.us/K12DataGovernance/Objectives.aspx>).

II. Introduction

Washington State has one of the most comprehensive statewide K-12 longitudinal education data systems in the country. Washington is one of only 12 states to be recognized by the Data Quality Campaign (DQC) as having all 10 essential elements for a longitudinal data system. (See *Appendix – C for Data Quality Campaign State Profile*) Washington's Comprehensive Education Data and Research System (CEDARS) includes the following data elements: Student enrollment and demographics, course catalog, student grade history, student and staff schedules, and program participation (e.g., gifted, bilingual and special education programs). CEDARS contains the records of two million students

dating back to the 2002-2003 school year. The building blocks for this system were formed when the state legislature authorized the use of a unique student identifier in the 2003-2004 school year.

Implemented in August 2009, CEDARS collects 13 data files submitted by each district at least monthly, but weekly by most. The system captures pre-kindergarten to grade 12 enrollment. Students' statewide identification numbers and teachers' certification numbers allow linking student course enrollment and outcome data to teacher preparation and assignment data. Teacher certifications, endorsements, and preparation history are all maintained with the unique certification number. Post assignment information such as salaries and National Board Certification status can also be tracked with the certification number.

Statewide assessment data are also maintained at the individual student record level, allowing longitudinal analyses of participation and performance, linked with enrollment and program participation history. Reasons for students not participating in the assessments, as well as the types of alternate assessments used, are maintained in the assessment files. The use of statewide course codes, based on the National Center for Education Statistics Secondary Classification of Education Data coding schema, was implemented as part of CEDARS in the 2009-2010 school year. This allows easier analysis of schools' course offerings and students' course taking patterns, in addition to analyses of teacher assignment data and determinations of Highly Qualified Teacher status.

Further, extensive fiscal data is currently available on the School Apportionment & Financial Services section of the K-12 website (<http://www.k12.wa.us/SAFS/default.asp>). Additional reports and financial data views will result from the work to implement SHB 2776 passed during the 2010 Legislative Session. Among the items included in SHB 2776 is a new formula for allocation general apportionment moneys to school districts. Various models showing staffing units funded under the prototypical school model, and crosswalk models between the current funding formula and the new formula under SHB 2776 can be found at: <http://www.k12.wa.us/safs/INS/2776/2776.asp>.

An important component of the statewide K-12 longitudinal education data system in Washington is the Education Data and Research Center (ERDC), which was created in 2007. The ERDC was established through legislation to integrate early childhood, K-12, post-secondary and workforce data for longitudinal research analysis and reporting. Each education agency, including OSPI, provides unit-level records to the ERDC. ERDC then matches and analyzes the data, emphasizing the transitions between systems. (i.e., from early childhood daycares to Kindergarten, from high school to a two-year community college, from community college to employment or four-year university, and on to the workforce.) The ERDC collaborates with the following agencies and institutions:

- Department of Early Learning;
- Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction;
- Professional Educator Standards Board;
- State Board of Education;
- Higher Education Coordinating Board;
- Council of Presidents (Presidents of public four-year higher education institutions);
- Independent Colleges of Washington;
- State Board for Community and Technical Colleges;
- Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board; and
- Employment Security Department.

III. Public Consulting Group Recommendations

In order to carry out several of the activities required in ESHB 2261, a consulting firm was retained through a Request for Proposal process. The selected firm, Public Consulting Group (PCG), was tasked with three specific deliverables.

- Identification of research and policy questions priority ranked and based on the analysis and conclusion from stakeholder interviews, focus groups, and surveys.
- A data systems gap analysis report based on the results of a data audit to include catalogued spreadsheets of data systems metadata and narrative with an analysis of OSPI data systems and needs.
- A technical systems gap analysis of school and district need for technology.

A. Twelve Components of the Data System

ESHB 2261 specified twelve components that the Legislature intends to have included in the system. PCG provided extensive analysis on each of these components in the Data Gap Analysis Report (page 17-26) (the Data Gap Analysis Report is available at: <http://www.k12.wa.us/K12DataGovernance/Objectives.aspx>.) (See Appendix – D for OSPI Response to the Twelve Data System Component Recommendations by PCG). While many of the expectations revolve around objectives, system capabilities or processes, PCG also identified key data gaps and missing linkages needed to meet each of these 12 legislative expectations.

During its August 12, 2010, meeting, the Data Governance Group conducted an initial review and discussion of the PCG recommendations in each area. During its September 21, 2010, meeting, the group examined additional areas in depth.

The twelve components are:

1. Comprehensive educator information, including grade level and courses taught, building or location, program, job assignment, years of experience, the institution of higher education from which the educator obtained his or her degree, compensation, class size, mobility of class population, socioeconomic data of class, number of languages and which languages are spoken by

students, general resources available for curriculum and other classroom needs, and number and type of instructional support staff in the building;

2. The capacity to link educator assignment information with educator certification information such as certification number, type of certification, route to certification, certification program, and certification assessment or evaluation scores;

3. Common coding of secondary courses and major areas of study at the elementary level or standard coding of course content;

4. Robust student information, including, but not limited to, student characteristics, course and program enrollment, performance on statewide and district summative and formative assessments to the extent district assessments are used, and performance on college readiness tests;

5. A subset of student information elements to serve as a dropout early warning system;

6. The capacity to link educator information with student information;

7. A common, standardized structure for reporting the costs of programs at the school and district level with a focus on the cost of services delivered to students;

8. Separate accounting of state, federal, and local revenues and costs;

9. Information linking state funding formulas to school district budgeting and accounting, including procedures:

- (i) To support the accuracy and auditing of financial data; and
- (ii) Using the prototypical school model for school district financial accounting reporting;

10. The capacity to link program cost information with student performance information to gauge the cost-effectiveness of programs;

11. Information that is centrally accessible and updated regularly; and

12. An anonymous, nonidentifiable replicated copy of data that is updated at least quarterly, and made available to the public by the state.

B. System Recommendations

Through the course of its work on the “Research and Policy Questions Analysis,” “Technical Capacity Gap Analysis,” and “Data Gap Analysis” PCG synthesized the following recommendations for Washington’s statewide K-12 Longitudinal Data System.

Table A – Public Consulting Group Recommendations

PCG Recommendation	OSPI Response/Next Steps
<p>1. Use the SharePoint workbook created through this project as the common data dictionary to guide development of the OSPI K-12 and ERDC P-20 SLDS data warehouses and data marts.</p>	<p>OSPI plans to migrate all existing metadata, including the workbook created by PCG, into a new metadata repository that is being procured through federal grant funding. The procurement process for this tool is now underway.</p>
<p>2. Enable valid teacher effect calculations based on student growth percentiles.</p>	<p>OSPI is participating in a multi-state collaborative effort to create common data visualizations and conduct research and development that will build upon the Colorado Growth Model. Under the agreement, each participating state agrees to use the current version of the Colorado Growth Model to calculate growth percentiles in the same manner to allow common cross state comparisons, and to participate in the development of a second version of the Model that will include postsecondary metrics, multiyear visualization and animation, teacher identifiers, multiple axis selection, and enhanced mapping functionality.</p>
<p>3. Develop student dropout / early warning prevention and reporting module using the ABC indicators recommended by the National Governors Association which includes absence, behavior, course grade, and over age for grade.</p>	<p>ESSB 6403, passed during the 2010 legislative session, defines a Dropout Early Warning and Intervention System and requires implementation recommendations to the Legislature and Quality Education Council for the development of a comprehensive dropout prevention intervention and reengagement system in local communities throughout the state. The K-12 Data Governance Group is guiding the data work on this issue.</p> <p>The Data Governance Group and Data Management Committee, as appropriate, will further examine data collections regarding student attendance attributes and disciplinary incidents, which are components of a dropout early warning system.</p>

<p>4. Replace teacher certification system with one capable of collecting all required educator information including post secondary performance and relevant major.</p>	<p>OSPI is proposing an educator data system that will 1) make it easier and quicker for individuals to apply for state required educator certification; 2) result in a reduction in the processing time for educator certificates; 3) reduce the number of emergency, temporary permits currently issued because of the processing backlog; 4) efficient collection of educator data, including professional development credits, that are not in a paper application or survey; and 5) enhance the connection of teacher data with other databases to start analysis models of teacher effectiveness. The request also includes funds to replace the current outmoded microfiche archival system with a document imaging system.</p>
<p>5. Commit to a feasibility study to use CEDARS data to drive apportionment. Run multiple models approximating apportionment FTEs with CEDARS head counts. Determine variance. Design legislative action as needed.</p>	<p>The Data Governance Group and stakeholders groups of the apportionment process will explore the feasibility for CEDARS data to drive apportionment.</p>
<p>6. OSPI should establish a database of record for each data element in the federal EDFacts collections depending on the required reporting period. Those data can then be published to the data warehouse as the official record of the submission.</p>	<p>This information is intended to be maintained in the metadata repository discussed in #1 above.</p>

IV. Update on ESHB 2261 Activities

ESHB 2261 required a number of activities related to the development and management of a statewide K-12 Longitudinal Data System. This section updates the progress on these activities and establishes the next steps for improvement, expansion and increased usefulness of the statewide K-12 Longitudinal Data System.

A. Data Governance Group

To assist in the design and implementation of the statewide K-12 Longitudinal Data System, the Legislature created a K-12 Data Governance Group. Membership of the group includes representatives of OFM’s Education Research and Data Center, OSPI, the Legislative Evaluation and Accountability Program Committee, the Professional Educator Standards Board, the State Board of

Education, school district staff, the Washington School Information Processing Cooperative, the Washington State Institute for Public Policy, the University of Washington and the Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession, and the Center for School Effectiveness.

Table B – Data Governance Group Required Actions

The legislation requires the Data Governance Group to take the following six actions:

Data Governance Required Actions	Status\Next Steps
<p>1. Identify the critical research and policy questions that need to be addressed by the K-12 education data improvement system.</p>	<p>PCG conducted an analysis to determine critical research and policy questions. (See <i>Appendix – B for a copy of the Executive Summary of the Research and Policy Questions Analysis</i>) The Data Governance Group did an initial review of the recommendations in the report during its August 12 meeting and will continue with a more in depth examination during its September 21 meeting.</p>
<p>2. Identify reports and other information that should be made available on the internet.</p>	<p>The identification of reports and information on the web site is being done as part of the K-12 Statewide Longitudinal Data System (K-12 SLDS) Project. On July 22, 2010, the project team released a Request for Proposal (RFP) to procure a vendor to build out a data warehouse, implement an extract, transform and load process, and provide reports for the internet.</p>
<p>3. Create a comprehensive needs requirement document detailing the specific information and technical capacity needed by school districts and the state to meet the Legislature's expectations for a K-12 education data improvement system.</p>	<p>The needs requirement document detailing the specific information needed by school districts and the state is contained in the PCG Data Gap Analysis. The comprehensive needs requirement document detailing the specific technical capacity needed by school districts is contained in the PCG Technical Gap Analysis Report. The technical needs of the state data system are a component of the K-12 SLDS grant. Funding in the grant will support the purchase of needed software and hardware components.</p>

<p>4. Conduct a gap analysis of current and planned information compared to the needs requirement document, including an analysis of the strengths and limitations of an education data system and programs currently used by school districts and the state.</p>	<p>The data gap analysis conducted by PCG contains an analysis of ESHB 2261 Expectations and Gaps, analysis of American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Expectations and Gaps, Data Dictionary Gaps, ED Facts Granular Data Gaps and the gaps in data needed to address critical Research and Policy Questions.</p>
<p>5. Focus on financial and cost data necessary to support the new K-12 financial models and funding formulas.</p>	<p>During the December 16, 2009 meeting, the Data Governance Group hosted a panel of school business managers. Financial and cost data were explored at that time. OSPI has worked with the School District Accounting Advisory committee to identify accounting changes needed to support the new K-12 funding formula. In future meetings, the Data Governance Group will focus on the K-12 financial models and funding formulas.</p>
<p>6. Define the operating rules and governance structure for K-12 data collections, ensuring that data systems are flexible and able to adapt to evolving needs for information, within an objective and orderly data governance process for determining when changes are needed and how to implement them. Strong consideration must be made to the current practice and cost of migration to new requirements. The operating rules should delineate the coordination, delegation, and escalation authority for data collection issues, business rules, and performance goals for each K-12 data collection system.</p>	<p>The definition of operating rules and governance structure for K-12 data collections were established in the <u>"Implementation Guidelines for K-12 Data Governance System,"</u> (See Appendix – E for a copy of the Implementation Guidelines for K-12 Data Governance System). This document outlines the data governance system for establishing the data management policies and priorities for all K-12 data. The guidelines were adopted by the Data Governance Group during the December 16, 2009, meeting.</p>

B. Data Management Committee

ESHB 2261 established the Data Governance Group and broadly outlined the membership of the group to include many stakeholders and users of the statewide K-12 Longitudinal Data System. Through adoption of the "Implementation Guidelines for K-12 Data Governance System," (See Appendix – E for a copy of the Implementation Guidelines for K-12 Data Governance System) the Data Governance Group established the Data Management Committee. This committee includes individuals from programs throughout OSPI

who are responsible for the collection and reporting of data in their programs, and four school district representatives. The guidelines outline the responsibilities for data stewards and data owners.

The goals of the Data Management Committee include:

- Improve data quality;
- Increase accountability for data accuracy;
- Eliminate redundancy in data collection;
- Improve understanding of data within OSPI and among districts;
- Facilitate transformation of data into information for wise decision-making;
- Increase use of data to make program and policy decisions; and
- Improve data reporting capability and timeliness of reporting.

The objectives of the Data Management Committee include:

- Identify the owner of every data element;
- Define all data elements;
- Document all data processes;
- Standardize data processes from year-to-year;
- Reduce manual manipulation of data;
- Articulate roles of authority for collecting, accessing and reporting data;
- Identify the official source of data for all data reporting;
- Eliminate redundant data collections;
- Allow districts to review their data before it is externally reported;
- Communicate all data decisions/changes to districts;
- Increase the use of student-level data external reporting; and
- Establish data access protocols and procedures.

The duties of the Data Management Committee include:

- Establish standard processes, policies, training and associated communication plans for coordinated data collection, management, dissemination, and use;
- Serve as a source of knowledge and advocacy for data management and initiatives;
- Approve all new OSPI data collections from districts;
- Maintain and enforce a current data collection calendar;
- Approve all new data applications;
- Identify, track, and resolve critical data issues; and
- Communicate critical data issues that cannot be solved internally to individuals that can influence change.

The Data Management Committee meets on a monthly basis and agendas for each of the meetings can be found at:

<http://www.k12.wa.us/K12DataGovernance/DataManagement.aspx>.

C. Data Analysts' Work

Budget proviso funding for ESHB 2261 in FY10 and FY11 supported the hiring of data analysts. These analysts are engaged in a number of activities with the new data collected in the CEDARS system and linking data across various systems.

Specific work activities include:

- Analysis of the currently available data on the OSPI web site and improving its accessibility;
- Summarizing data from CEDARS to determine completeness and reasonableness;
- Documenting CEDARS business rules and system bugs;
- Mapping data systems and linkages across the various systems (e.g., CEDARS, eCERT and Personnel);
- Extracting data from CEDARS for various OSPI program staff (e.g., On-line Learning, Career and Technical Education, Assessment, Fiscal, etc.) and outside researchers (e.g., UW study related to teacher preparation and assignment, Education Northwest study of math course taking patterns and teacher certifications), BERG group evaluation of CTE programs, etc.);
- Extracting data from CEDARS and other systems for the Education Research and Data Center;
- Reviewing course schedules and grade history data to design data processes for the upcoming End-of-Course assessments in math (2011) and science (2012); and
- Designing and quality control verification of user-interface reports.

Analysts have also worked on the reports required by ESHB 2261 to be posted on the internet discussed below. In particular they are responsible for the five new reports posted in August.

D. Reports Required on the Internet

ESHB 2261 also specifies a list of fiscal, student, class size and data accuracy reports that OSPI is to post on the internet to the extent data is available, these reports are to include the following: *(See the table in Appendix – F for a discussion/status of the Reports Required on the Internet).*

(a) The **percentage of data compliance and data accuracy** by school district;

(b) The **magnitude of spending per student, by student** estimated by the following algorithm and reported as the detailed summation of the following components:

- (i) An approximate, prorated fraction of each teacher or human resource element that directly serves the student. Each human resource element must be listed or accessible through online tunneling in the report;
- (ii) An approximate, prorated fraction of classroom or building costs used by the student;

- (iii) An approximate, prorated fraction of transportation costs used by the student; and
- (iv) An approximate, prorated fraction of all other resources within the district. District-wide components should be disaggregated to the extent that it is sensible and economical;

(c) The **cost of K-12 basic education, per student, by student, by school district**, estimated by the algorithm in (b) of this subsection, and reported in the same manner as required in (b) of this subsection;

(d) The **cost of K-12 special education services per student, by student** receiving those services, by school district, estimated by the algorithm in (b) of this subsection, and reported in the same manner as required in (b) of this subsection;

(e) **Improvement on the statewide assessments computed as both a percentage change and absolute change** on a scale score metric by district, by school, and by teacher that can also be filtered by a student's length of full-time enrollment within the school district;

(f) **Number of K-12 students per classroom teacher** on a per teacher basis;

(g) **Number of K-12 classroom teachers per student** on a per student basis;

(h) **Percentage of a classroom teacher per student** on a per student basis;
and,

(i) The **cost of K-12 education per student** by school district sorted by federal, state, and local dollars.

As shown in Appendix F, there are a total of 17 different reports required to be posted.

- For 13 of these reports, data/information is currently posted on the internet.
 - These are available on the web site either at:
<http://www.k12.wa.us/safs/> under the financial history reports link, <http://www.k12.wa.us/safs/PUB/PER/0809/ps.asp>, or at <http://www.k12.wa.us/DataAdmin/default.aspx>.
- One report on data compliance and accuracy will be posted by the end of October.
- For reporting on statewide assessments OSPI is currently collaborating in a multi-state effort for presenting assessment results in a growth model format that will result in extensive and robust reporting. The details and time frames for this work are currently being established.

- Finally, two of the reports need further clarification to determine what data could be pulled together to satisfy the requirements.

Further, OSPI is taking steps to make these reports, other reports and data files more easily accessible on the K-12 web site.

E. Student Records Exchange

After many panel presentations to the Data Governance Group, it became clear that district access to data collected by the state was an important system enhancement. In particular the Data Governance Group heard from a panel of school districts counselors that information on transferring students was a particular need. To support district and school staff in the registration of transfer students, the Data Governance Group prioritized the development of a tool to appropriately share state-held student information and facilitate the request of official records between districts. The OSPI subsequently worked with a consultant to draft specification documents for the solution and undertook a development effort. The tool is currently in the OSPI test environment and is planned to be available for district use in late September or early October.

Features of the tool include:

- Ability to search for a student in the CEDARS database;
- Ability to view and download information about the student; and
- Ability to make a formal request for records via email.

V. K-12 Statewide Longitudinal Data System Grant Project (K-12 SLDS)

In September 2008, the state of Washington applied for and was subsequently awarded \$5.9 million in round three of the K-12 Statewide Longitudinal Data System grants. The directives contained in ESHB 2261 and the works specified in the K-12 Statewide Longitudinal Data System grant are complementary.

The eight objectives of the project include:

Objective #1: Build a warehouse for storing statewide longitudinal education data.

Objective #2: Structure data in the warehouse to ensure efficient reporting.

Objective #3: Develop processes for extracting, transforming, and loading (ETL) data into the warehouse.

Objective #4: Load historical data into the warehouse.

Objective #5: Develop a Web-based portal for accessing data in the warehouse.

Objective #6: Provide a feature-rich reporting tool that allows users to generate and view reports from data in the warehouse.

Objective #7: Provide training, documentation and licensing requirements for all processes, structures and tools developed or provided.

Objective #8: Transfer maintenance and operation of the system to OSPI staff.

The following two activities are major deliverables of this particular project.

Technical Infrastructure/Framework for Data Warehouse: A central data repository or warehouse will be created to store the extensive data collected from Washington's 295 school districts through CEDARS and data from other internal and external sources. Also, the central data repository will include assessment data, financial data and additional educator data. This warehouse will allow for the efficient delivery of the tools and reports. These tools and reports will fulfill many of the Data Quality Campaign 10 actions (*See Appendix – C – Data Quality Campaign State Profile*).

Tools and Reporting: The Comprehensive Education Data and Research System will generate reports available through web portals(s) that will provide feedback to educators, administrators, policy makers, researchers and the general public. These tools and reports will take the form of data dashboards, alerts, formatted reports and extracts.

Washington State is not alone in this endeavor. Many states are working toward transforming from allocation based operating systems to performance driven systems, per guidance from the US Department of Education and their state legislatures. In order to implement the technical infrastructure/framework for a data warehouse and tool and reporting components as described above, the OSPI has released a Request for Proposal to purchase a system that can be transferred from another jurisdiction. Responses to the RFP were received September 1, 2010.

VI. Budget Recommendations

A. Continued Maintenance Level Funding

While significant progress has been made to fully transition from an allocation and compliance based data system to an education improvement data system, much work remains. Continued state funding at the level-appropriated in FY11 of the 2009-11 biennium will allow the current work to be completed and new products to be developed and implemented. The total maintenance level amount for the 2011-13 biennium is \$2,090,000.

B. Suspension and Expulsion Study

The most consistent requests for a new data collection at the state-level are for suspension and expulsion data. The need to collect this data was highlighted by PCG and is one of the core elements of a dropout early warning and intervention system. In order to better understand a potential collection of this data at the state level, it is recommended that the Legislature fund a study of K-12 student suspensions and expulsions. The study shall analyze available statewide data in comparison with a sample of school district data, identify alternative education options accessed by suspended and expelled students in a sample of school

districts, examine school district suspension and expulsion policies, and include recommendations to improve statewide suspensions and expulsions data collection. The estimated cost of the study is \$55,000.

VII. Conclusion\Data Governance Work Plan

With the launching of enhanced data collections with CEDARS in 2009, the governance processes initiated in 2009, and the work underway with the K-12 SLDS grant, significant strides have been taken to move Washington's data systems toward the vision of a comprehensive statewide K-12 longitudinal data system. The vision of the system is that it informs school district, state and federal decision-makers; helps educators improve the performance of all students; and provides information to parents and the public regarding our efforts to prepare students to live, learn, and work in the 21st century. In order to realize this vision, much work remains to be done for the Data Governance Group, including:

- Making additional reports, inquiry tools and data available to educators, decision makers and the public.
- Advising and consultation on the Federal K-12 Statewide Longitudinal Data System Grant Project to make data available for educational improvement via reports, dashboards, alerts and data.
- Review and action on the recommendations by PCG on the 12 components of the data system.
- Review and action on the data gap analyses identified by PCG including:
 - ESHB 2261 Expectations and Gaps;
 - Critical Research and Policy Questions Data Gaps;
 - American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Expectations as developed in the National Education Data Model Expectations and Gaps;
 - Data Dictionary Gaps; and
 - ED Facts Granular Data Gaps.

While much of this work revolves around the examination and identification of potential new data collections, an important part of the work for data governance is examining existing collection to ensure redundancies are eliminated and collections that are no longer necessary are discontinued. Likewise, much work remains to be done surrounding data quality and professional development.

Data governance has a role in each of these activities by bringing an organized and collaborative approach to the management of data and the development of data systems. While in its infancy in Washington, data governance in the K-12 system is beginning to guide the development of systems and processes to transform our data collection from an allocation and compliance based system to an education improvement systems.

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
Old Capitol Building
P.O. Box 47200
Olympia, WA 98504-7200

For more information about the contents
Of this document, please contact:
Bill Huennekens, OSPI
E-mail: bill.huennekens@k12.wa.us
Phone: (360) 725-6174

To order more copies of this document,
please call 1-888-59-LEARN (1-888-595-3276)
or visit our Web site at <http://www.k12.wa.us/publications>

Please refer to the document number below for quicker service:
10-0019

This document is available online at:
<http://www.k12.wa.us/>

This material is available in alternative format upon request.
Contact the Resource Center at (888) 595-3276, TTY (360) 664-3631.



Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
Old Capitol Building
P.O. Box 47200
Olympia, WA 98504-7200
2010