SECURITY

- The main problem is that there are so many stakeholders.
- Security needs to be phased in, starting with a small number of users.
- MS Active Directory is alright for the K-12 arena, but not for parents or researchers.
  - It is not for identity management; it is not adequate; and does not work well with other applications.
- KY & WI talked about passing the responsibility for security on-to the district, school, parents, etc. WI said that this has worked well using their regional centers.
- This idea of offloading security to the LEAs was embraced and was said to be a policy issue.
- Bringing in a security consultant was recommended.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

- There is a need to build leadership into the LEAs. They need to know how to ask questions and interpret the answers.
- FL has Cognos. They will be buying additional licenses and building cubes.
  - The focus, starting with the governor's office and on down, will be to prevent inappropriate analysis, as well as how to access and use data.
- OH plans to train the teachers to use data at the regional centers, using a train-the-trainer model.
- KY plans to train the district assessment coordinators, who in turn, will train the districts and schools.
- The idea of starting with HE teacher training programs was welcomed.

DATA MODEL

- AK, KY, and WI discussed using a Business Reference Model.
- WI thought that the data dictionary and data model should be marketed together.
- Nobody seemed to find this topic interesting enough to continue, so we got completely off the subject and talked in length about many other things, including LEA involvement.

DATA QUALITY TABLE

- WI – learned a lot about data quality with the introduction of the student ID (SID). There are lots of silos that know their constituencies, but the system folks needed to learn about them too.
- FL – characteristics that aren't funding-related or are gathered outside of funded data collections don't get lots of data quality attention. They are exploring different streams of data collections and looking at automating teacher documentation.

- MI – they deal with data quality after the fact – after they find an error. They update inaccurate historical data.
- TX – Nancy described Special Data Inquiry Unit at TEA that examines data outliers, districts with questionable data through data analysis (ex: excessive absences on test day, excessive exemptions, large numbers of underreported leavers, etc) that does desk audits and some on-sight visits.
- FL – source system data doesn't change, but they do correct data in the warehouse
- MI – need to audit, but don't have staff
- WI – have duplicate ID issues – they resolve duplicates at the state level
- SC – use SIF – find near match – school selects the appropriate ID after receiving an email from SEA. They match on 9-10 different fields
- FL – Iterative process of matching records, especially across other agencies (TANF, work, etc.)

LINKING STUDENT DATASETS

- FL – described their datasets across various agencies
- KY – what do people use for teacher id?
- FL – main link to teacher is course, not an ID – they do collect SSN for staff (all staff, not just teachers). In the data warehouse, the staff is assigned an anonymous ID. They have common course number for both secondary and postsecondary
- AK – can't get health and human services to use ID for PreK
- CT – wouldn't use/collect SSN if they could
- FL – data warehouse cost $7.2 million over 3 years. Have an annual budget of $12 million for longitudinal system including warehouse, k-12, university, workforce, local support, etc.

VERTICAL REPORTING

- SC – daily reporting – Collect data every 45 days. Have centralized data bases. Email reports. NCS Pearson doesn't do all appropriate edits on elements. They are adding horizontal movement of data.
- CA – something has to happen with data – there is too much churning and edit checks
- TN – Regional zone will use intermediary edits, and not just have SEA do quality control checks. District reports occur every 30 days.
- MN – large datasets with enrollment; XML makes those even larger
- TN – 6-10 million lines twice a week (Fri midnight – Sunday AM) – massive errors create huge files
- CA – what about state certification process? – minimal list of elements for vertical reports? Can someone create NCES-like data handbooks for each element – whether and which appropriate edit checks should be run on incoming data. Would like to see some talk of data quality from federal level

- SC – has state K-12 tech committee – he puts budget to them – they can give all money to SEA or share with schools. About $15 million per year (?)

STUDENT IDENTIFIERS

- Different states discussed in general where they are with student identifiers. MI noted that they collect unique student identifiers on core data. They do not collect special education data. The special education data comes through general education. MI also noted that they do not have a common vendor for student data. The data is refreshed three times per year. The grant will allow for realignment of the student data system.
- SC noted that all their data is in the Student Information System. The SIS is in all districts. The student ID is tied to any data stored in SASI that is used for collecting all information for State and Federal reporting. They use an off-the-shelf SASA that is modified for SC use. There is a SC module for pre-coding for testing purposes. They can add data elements annually. Districts cannot change elements except in certain fields. There is a field for districts to add an alternate ID to the State. Districts bear the expense if they add other fields. SC will be looking at these ID fields this summer. Their model assigns ID at the point of enrollment. Now SASI does not allow district-to-district exchanges. SC is looking at transcript transfers and how they can transfer records between school districts.
- For all the states, there was a concern for how FERPA regulations relate to Student ID and transfers between states and state agencies.

DATA DICTIONARY/METADATA

- MI indicated that their data dictionary was their first tool. They have hired a data architect and are trying to map to SIF and EDEN. They have built in XML and modified to their own needs. They have an organizational type of data dictionary that starts at the higher level.
- FL noted that IBM has a new product that generates technical metadata. They indicated that there is no product out there currently that meets all the needs. They found a need for a data administrator for new definitions and data definitions from different departments to determine if they are collecting the same kinds of data.
- MI noted that they require programs to designate a person to the policy-based group for input.
- In TN, there is an Advisory Council for data governance in K-12 and they are working with higher education. They have a charter for the group.
- The states noted that it would be helpful to have which vendors are being used and copies of RFPs on the website.

DATA WAREHOUSE AND DECISION SUPPORT TOOLS

- CT has a searchable database that is interactive for their Report Card, student and teacher data. They hope to link data and put it in a warehouse using graphical software. They currently have a Sequel database.
- Alaska has put an RFP out for a data warehouse. It currently does not include decision support. They will use ORACLE.
- The states expressed concern on decision support tools and whether they should build their own.
- They were also concerned about the continuous nature of data and sustainability.
- There was a concern on good evaluation models and the cost.
- They would like to know if there are good decision support models to meet the different needs of districts.
- It was noted that large urban districts have different need from smaller districts. The engagement in use of data depends on the level of staff in local districts.
- It was noted that educator training institutions should build data use into their programs.

AUTOMATED TRANSCRIPTS

- The group began by attempting to define what is meant by automated transcripts. There was common agreement that it was the capability of sending/receiving electronic transcripts via one of four methods:
  - School-to-School
  - High School-to-Post Secondary
  - High School to State for dissemination
  -
  - Researchers
- There was discussion regarding concerns that FERPA may not allow SEA's to host exchanges of student transcripts.
- The point was made that there are some state education agencies providing this service currently and no issues have arisen.
- There has been a great deal of interest expressed from both K12 and Postsecondary to have the facility of electronic transcripts available to them.

HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS

- This topic was requested because managing data on this has been challenging for many states.
- Some states are attempting to gather data in order to calculate the numbers; others are just following the honor system and trusting the numbers provided by the districts.
- The most difficult data analysis issue is getting a link between teachers, students, courses, and then checking the certification files. Most states do not collect granular enough course enrollment information and there needs to be a link between certification and course subject areas in order to assess whether teachers are truly HQT.

FUNDING

- Funding for education is getting tighter every year. In states where the economy is not thriving, there is a trend where they are losing a significant number of students each year. These families are moving to places where they can be gainfully employed.
- There was discussion on strategies for getting policy makers to recognize the value that a state longitudinal data system will have for them. They must be viewed as an important stakeholder from the beginning of the project with plans being targeted towards bringing them on-board.
- Another challenge for the states is that top-level executive support may not be consistent. While some leaders recognize the importance of having readily accessible decision support; others do not.

DATA SERVICES TO DISTRICTS

- States began by asking what this really means. Ideas were:
  - Making data available to the states…giving it back
  - Discussed the situation in Wyoming where they gather data on the student level such as getting schedules on the student level.
- CT – Wants to build out so teachers can access schedules, items for assessment, etc.
- SC – Looking at tools that they can give to districts so they can do their own analysis, rather than always sending data to the state for analysis.
- WCER – One concern is that teachers don't have the skills to do the analysis. Not even leadership programs provide that. How do you put analyitical tools in the hands of teachers?
- KY – Perception is much of the problem – breaking down that barrier helps in the professional development of teachers
- Really trying to develop standards for data interoperability.
- SC – Created software for own analytics called "Planet Ed." Has simple wizards for creating graphs, etc.
- WI – Would like to ask locals what they want and need. They often know what they want, but don't know its available.
- KY – Yes, but they often want to know more, test less, and have it faster.
- Short discussion of online testing and the problems associated with it.

DESIGNING CORE ELEMENTS WITH LOCALS

- Some states felt this was intimidating, the one local rep there asked why?
- Some states feel skeptical that they could get the necessary time commitment.
- MN – use staff development groups and service cooperatives/regional entitites.
- Some felt that locals see the state help as another "big brother" thing – telling the locals what they can do and how it will be easier for them and make their jobs easier, when in fact, that is not generally the case.

- OH – working on a value-added system
- PA – has adopted the same system – one developed by William Sanders
- What are priority elements? Especially in ways of developing systems that reduce workload? How can reports be consolidated to eliminate entering one element 75 times?
- How did states choose their value-added model?
- OH – Battelle Corp. Non profit using Bill's model