



# Education Information Management Advisory Consortium

## **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHIEFS**

MAY 2009

### *Action Items for Chiefs:*

Chiefs should **advocate for innovation and data sharing among agencies and across state lines for the purpose of improving student achievement, developing teachers, and informing parents.**

Chiefs should **advocate for timely guidance and clarity from the U.S. Department of Education on national definitions and data requirements** in order to ensure that states meet the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act assurances.

EIMAC urges Chiefs to **establish policy priorities in order to implement the Data Quality Campaign's Ten State Actions to Ensure Effective Data Use** in each state.

EIMAC would like Chiefs to be aware that proposed changes to the educational environment data collection for early childhood special education students (ages 3-5) has the potential to negatively affect IDEA state determinations regarding timely and accurate data submissions. EIMAC urges Chiefs to **support their staff in requesting that OSEP omit this data submission from the evaluation of timely and accurate data for state determinations under IDEA for 2010 and 2011.**

Chiefs are encouraged to **support the use of 2007 math and reading national and state NAEP data on the 2008-2009 state and district report cards.** Due to the delay in reporting the 2009 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade NAEP reading data, reporting the 2007 data is more consistent and appropriate.

Due to timelines already communicated by the U.S. Department of Education EIMAC requests that Chiefs **support requiring LEAs to submit data to their SEA on time and ensuring it is of high quality.**

Chiefs must **advocate for and actively participate in sustainability efforts** (e.g., funding, resources, stakeholder involvement, etc) for their state's longitudinal data system. The chiefs must understand that this sustainability is imperative for both program offices and IT.

### *Federal Advocacy Items:*

Few, if any, states are collecting data relating to teacher and administrator evaluations. It remains unclear how these indicators are tied to the requirements of the America Competes Act/the Ten Essential Elements. It appears that moving from Highly Qualified to Highly Effective teachers represents a yet to be defined mandate, and raises many questions of how this data connects with the expected outcomes of ARRA. **EIMAC urges the U.S. Department of Education to fully explain the purpose of each indicator requested.**

There is significant burden involved in developing a data system to collect the elements required by the America Competes Act, including the metrics found in the April 1, 2009 letter from Secretary Duncan to Governors. These data are not always available from state systems, are not well defined or maintained, and often have questionable utility. **EIMAC**

**urges the U.S. Department of Education to leverage the data they already have and make sure any new items to be collected are relevant and add value at the local level.** Chiefs, Governors, and the Federal Government need to be aware that it takes 2-3 years to develop a system to collect all of these new items. Requiring states to report available information by the September 1, 2009 deadline will have a significant impact on states, will negatively compete for states' staff time and financial resources and will conflict with existing accountability reporting and timelines.

IDEA Reauthorization is scheduled to occur in 2010. EIMAC would like the Chiefs and CCSSO to **support and advocate for the revision to statutory language related to significant disproportionality.**

**EIMAC encourages the U.S. Department of Education to publish policy notes to accompany the release of NCLB Title I Graduation Rates to help consumers of data differentiate the graduation rates.** At a minimum the policy notes should include the basis for counting students in a particular subgroup, information about the establishment of 9<sup>th</sup> grade cohort (whether at the end of 8<sup>th</sup> grade year or beginning of 9<sup>th</sup> grade year), types of diplomas that are considered regular by state law, whether or not the graduation rate is an extended adjusted cohort, and how state policies vary on what documentation is sufficient evidence to document students that transfer out.

The reauthorization of two major federal education programs (NCLB and IDEA) is approaching. The alignment of data collection, reporting, and usage requirements is of utmost important to promote data credibility, clarity and efficiency. **EIMAC would like Chiefs to be aware of the redundancies and conflicts between state reporting requirements under the implementation regulations for each law and urge them to advocate for better alignment of these data collections during the reauthorization process.** Significant inconsistencies in the definitions of weapons and serious bodily injury in IDEA and the Safe and Drug Free Schools data, for example, cause an undue burden on data collection and inconsistent and often confusing reports using these data.

*Action Items for CCSSO:*

**EIMAC invites the National Validation Committee of the Common Core Standards initiative to include the EIMAC Assessment Subcommittee in the development of common standards** and all future discussions about common assessments.

Further more, EIMAC would like to **encourage states participating in the Common Core Standards initiative to involve their assessment staff,** as well as standards staff, in the work.