

**Notes from Meeting on Student Tracking and Data Warehouse Information
December 7, 2005**

Present: J.C. Baker (DCPCSB), Robert Cane (FOCUS), Deborah Gist (SEO), Steve Kapani (BOE PCS), Glenda Partee (SEO), Ariana Quinones-Miranda (Public Charter School Association), Rebecca Sibia (Resources & Strategies) representing the Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCTO), J.B. Walker (DCPCSB).

Purpose:

- To update charter school representatives on the SEO's efforts to develop a citywide student tracking system and our ultimate goal for a data warehouse system.
- To understand and clarify the respective expectations for data collection, analysis and reporting from the view point of charter representatives and their constituents.
- To understand the goals and timeframe for OCTO's Ed SMP (Systems Modernization Project)

Partee provided a short chronology of SEO efforts over the last six months and a brief update on plans for a "stop-gap" approach to tracking students. This approach has been developed as a short-term response to Council Patterson's request to have this type of data available to policymakers so that we know when and where students are enrolled/not enrolled within our system of public schools (DCPS and charters). Partee indicated that this is the SEO's first step in the larger effort to set up a data warehouse (to be developed in partnership with OCTO), to make data on student demographics and mobility, as well as other student achievement information, more accessible to the public and policymakers.

Rebecca Sibia, speaking on behalf of OCTO, described the SMP project as an inter-agency effort with a long-term goal of integrating systems—education, health, foster care, juvenile justice—that touch our residents. She indicated that we should think of Ed-SMP as a broad approach that obviates a lot of stop gap measures designed to capture various types of information.

For the stop-gap, the SEO is considering focusing on a narrow set of data elements, potentially identifying elements in DC STARS (since it has data definitions) and a consistent set of data elements to request from the charter schools (via OLAMS). Walker suggested using NCES Data Elements as opposed to those in STARS. He also indicated that the SIF compliance group is putting together a data elements dictionary that we should look at. The SEO should also consider joining the group.

At this point, Robert Cane introduced the report, *Creating a Longitudinal Data System: Using Data to Improve Student Achievement*, by the Data Quality Campaign, 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.¹ He stressed that there is a national consensus around the need for longitudinal data systems to measure education results and that we should look to embrace this framework as we move forward. He indicated that charter school advocates are particularly interested in knowing how students are faring in a school choice environment. Also, every parent needs easily accessible data, especially longitudinal data that shows how schools are doing over time. This type of data is important at the school as well as the policy level.

The group briefly reviewed the report and tentatively agreed that this did in fact provide a workable framework encompassing 10 essential elements; however, a decision needs to be made whether we embrace all 10 elements. We should also establish the logistics of implementing them. (See Attachment A for a list of the 10 elements.)

Partee indicated that the first two essential elements (unique statewide student identifier; and student-level enrollment, demographic and program participation information) capture our immediate student tracking concerns, whereas the other elements begin to tie the basic demographic data to student achievement, progress over time (and potentially into postsecondary education), as well as teacher success—the needs articulated by Cane. Having the extended set of elements also begins to address many of the questions the SEO is asked routinely and would greatly inform many of our programmatic components (e.g., tracking cohorts of students in GEAR-UP and participating in Higher Education Financing). The 10th element deals with monitoring and oversight of the data quality without which the data system cannot be considered valid or reliable.

Ariana Quinones shared a handout which focused on three levels or areas of influence in data collection and analysis:

1. State Level (coordination, reliability, transparency and access)
2. School Level (school's capacity to capture and manage data)
3. Classroom Level (use of data for instruction and student improvements)

She stressed that the use of appropriated funds (\$300,000) for data collection and analysis for the charter schools should focus on the consumer level and address information for parents: (1) how the child is doing in school; and (2) how school A is doing and how it compares to school B.

She indicated that software cannot be sold unless it is SIF compliant so the need for compatibility and standardized systems become less important. She indicated that the charter schools are looking at and/or using various software systems (all of which can contribute to a data mart) including:

¹ Founding partners include: Achieve, Inc. Alliance for Excellent Education, Council of Chief State School Officers, The Education Trust, National Center for Educational Accountability, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, National Governors Association, Schools Interoperability Framework Association, Standard & Poor's School Evaluation Services; and the State Higher Education Executive Officers.

- **Edusoft**, a standards-based assessment platform to enable public schools immediate access to online student performance results and customized instructional tools based on the automatic scoring of *plain paper* answer sheets. <http://www.edusoft.com/>
- **SchoolNet**, comprehensive, Web-based Instructional Management Solutions that transform data for decision-making solutions by allowing school districts to integrate, access and analyze student demographic and performance data across their district, school, classroom, as well as individual student.
- **Scantron**, providing K-12 technology-based assessment solutions for the immediate, accurate, and reliable capture of student performance data, backed by customer service and technical support.

Cane suggested that we take the Data Quality Campaign paper: (a) modify it and use it as a model to market to the LEAs about where we'd like to go in establishing a longitudinal data system; (b) get LEA input on the 10 elements, including what may be missing; and (c) get their buy-in. This would provide the framework for the type of data that needs to go into the data warehouse and provide OCTO a starting point for negotiating the business practices and commitments required from participant stakeholders. We would have to explore the kind of products and services the schools/LEAs need as a result. (For example, see the American Institutes for Research (AIR) products: Family Score Report, for parents detailing how an individual child performed with respect to the standards; Class Score Report, for teachers detailing how their class performed on the standards; School Score Report, for principals, detailing how the school performed on the standards; and District Score Report, for superintendents.)

Sources of Funds

SEO/OCTO have requested capital funds to get the process started. Currently, the SEO has \$300K for data and analysis for the charter schools in the \$13m from Congressional appropriations.

Next Steps

1. The SEO will solicit general agreement regarding the Data Quality Campaign approach from LEA stakeholders.

The SEO will put together a summary of this approach and circulate for comment, including identification of missing elements. (In a later conversation, R. Sibilia for OCTO offered to put together a prospectus—a statement of the problem, requirements of the proposed system, the end result, as well as the roles of the SEO and OCTO, and a timeline—to help flesh out the summary and approach.)

2. SEO and stakeholders will create a running list of what needs to be funded re: IT needs (e.g., personnel, hardware, wiring, software).

3. OCTO will be the technical partner. Note: the OCTO timeframe is about 3 years from start to completion of an Ed SMP, but the consultative process with the stakeholders to discuss requirements and business practices can begin fairly soon.

Attachment A

Essential Elements of a State Longitudinal Data System²

1. A unique statewide student identifier
2. Student-level enrollment, demographic and program participation information
3. The ability to match individual students' test records from year to year to measure academic growth
4. Information on untested students
5. A teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students
6. Student-level transcript information, including information on courses completed and grades earned
7. Student-level college readiness test scores
8. Student-level graduation and dropout data
9. The ability to match student records between the PreK–12 and higher education systems
10. A state data audit system assessing data quality, validity and reliability

² Data Quality Campaign. *Creating a Longitudinal Data System: Using Data to Improve Student Achievement*.