

Education Information Management Advisory Consortium

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHIEFS

Action items for Chiefs:

- Chiefs, individually and collectively, should contribute to the public comment period on the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), including the proposed changes to the State Performance Plan, Annual Performance Report, and Section 618 data collections (early childhood education environments, dispute resolution). The EIMAC Special Education Subcommittee will draft recommendations for your consideration. The public comment period is open through November 21, 2008. More information for this posting can be located at, <http://edicsweb.ed.gov>. (Click on 'browse pending collections and click on 3870).
- Chiefs must advocate for continued funding for fulfilling federal data requirements and building statewide longitudinal data systems. EIMAC has been a partner in the creation and development of the ED*Facts* data system as well as a fierce advocate for longitudinal data system development and funding. EIMAC members appreciate the one year funding of the Data Coordination Task Order which will provide states with \$80,000 to help with the complete and timely reporting of ED*Facts* data. Before ED*Facts* was mandated states made steady progress but continued to struggle with the growing demands of ED*Facts* reporting. Since ED*Facts* is now mandated increased funding is essential to help states comply with the expanding requirements of this mandate. It is imperative that chiefs actively participate in sustainability efforts (e.g., funding, resources, stakeholder involvement) for their state's longitudinal data system. Chiefs must understand that sustaining a statewide longitudinal data system is essential not only to complying with federal requirements but more importantly for improving student outcomes.
- Chiefs are encouraged to support dialogue and studies with NCES, NAGB, and other stakeholders for investigation of promising practices for assessing college and work-force readiness of high school students.
- Reauthorization of two major federal programs—No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)—is approaching. Alignment of data collection, reporting, and usage requirements is 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 implementing regulations of each law. For example, assessment data for students with disabilities is required to be reported in two different formats using two different sets of reporting criteria. EIMAC recommends that Chiefs push for a change in the regulations to allow states the flexibility to collect Child Count and state membership data on the same date.
- Chiefs need to facilitate the exchange of data between the SEA and other state agencies that relate to student outcomes. To ensure that data is valid and reliable in collecting and reporting, Chiefs must establish an organizational function that ensures collaboration between program offices and the office responsible for information technology to meet

identified program requirements. Chiefs must facilitate the elimination of data silos both within state education agencies and higher education institutions.

- Chiefs should continue supporting the work of the cross-state collaborative project with the Association of Test Publishers (ATP) by making review of the draft best assessment operation practices document a priority for state assessment staff. The draft document is anticipated during the winter of 2008-09. The Assessment Subcommittee appreciates the funding provided to support this work and requests continued support of this project.

Action Items for CCSSO:

- The Education Information Management Advisory Consortium (EIMAC) supports the Council's draft white paper on Quality Data Systems and Usage. In that spirit, EIMAC should continue to play a central role in providing input to both the U.S. Department of Education and the State Education Data Center (SEDC) in their utilization of education data.
- The DSAC I and II are useful projects that need to be maintained. At least 25 states have been able to benefit from the survey and planning tool. We recommend ongoing leadership and support for DSAC so more states and districts can continue to benefit from the investment in this useful tool.

Federal Advocacy Items:

- EIMAC believes that the Uniformed Management Information and Reporting System, Title IV of NCLB lacks a clear and comparable definition of truancy rate. We recommend that the requirement of states to submit truancy rate data be suspended until a clear and comparable definition has been created.
- The EIMAC Assessment Subcommittee and the Permanent Standing Task Force on Assessment plan to send a letter to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) providing our perspective on a variety of potential issues related to the upcoming National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) assessments and reports. These issues include:

State NAEP Inclusion Report

- Make the report title and introduction reflect the two dimensions of inclusion—both status and improvement.
- More clearly state why there are differences in the state exclusion rates on NAEP and on state assessments under the No Child Left Behind Act. Report some detail on the characteristics of students who may be “opting out” of the assessment and the effect on validity of results.
- Contextualize information about state inclusion policies as compared to NAEP as well as the difference in the processes of determining participation in the assessments. This contextual information needs to be a prominent part of the introduction.
- Adequately address issues of teacher, school, NAEP coordinator, and state effects on inclusion.

Grade 12 State NAEP Pilot

- Reporting results in the context of this being a pilot of State NAEP for grade 12 and using the pilot to explore a variety of potential operational issues, e.g., motivation, characteristics of students opting out, validity of current SES measure for grade 12 students, etc.
- More clearly defining what is meant by “preparedness” in the context of interpretation of 12th grade NAEP results
- Operationalizing a clear definition of a grade 12 student.
- Conducting long-term follow up studies to track students two to three years beyond high school.
- Describing plans for developing Performance Level Descriptors and for setting achievement levels. Early and wide dissemination of this information will be valuable to states as they have discussions around “preparation.”

Students with Disabilities Reporting in NAEP

- Currently, and prior to NCLB, NAEP has reported students with disabilities as the group of students with Individualized Education Program (IEP) and Section 504 Plans. We support continued reporting of this group for trend purposes, but beginning a new, separate trend for the IEP group.

2007 NAEP Mapping Study

- Hosting a meeting for state assessment and policy leaders to review the draft 2007 mapping study and to provide input and feedback on the report and in preparation for the release.