

Final Report

Instructional & Technical Field Considerations for the Use of Data to Improve Student Achievement in Oregon

*Oregon Department of Education
Education Enterprise Steering Committee*

February 5, 2008

Submitted by:

Carmichael Consulting

Creswell, Oregon

jennycarmichael@centurytel.net

For further information contact:

Baron Rodriguez

Chief Information Officer

Oregon Department of Education

baron.rodriguez@state.or.us

Mickey Garrison

Director of School Improvement

Education Enterprise Steering Committee

mickey.garrison@douglasesd.k12.or.us

Instructional & Technical Field Considerations For the Use of Data To Improve Student Achievement in Oregon

February 5, 2008

Oregon Department of Education and the Education Enterprise Steering Committee

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Oregon DATA Project

In June of 2007, the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences awarded Oregon a \$4.7 million grant to support the Oregon DATA Project, a statewide initiative to improve student achievement by collecting, analyzing and using longitudinal data to inform individual instruction.

The Oregon DATA Project was designed to build upon Oregon's ongoing investments in data quality by strengthening data systems and providing stakeholders with comprehensive training in effective use of data. As one of the Oregon DATA Project's first steps, a competitive award was made to Carmichael Consulting to assess the "as-is" use of data across the state, to gather ideas for improving the use of data, and to identify barriers blocking effective use of data. This report summarizes those findings.

Research Methodology

Field research was conducted through the use of 1) a written survey, and 2) focus group interaction. Using resources from the National Center for Education Statistics, researchers identified a set of questions for the written survey, and another set appropriate for focus group discussions. The question sets were piloted in the field for effectiveness and clarity, and revised accordingly. The written survey was administered during focus group meetings, which were held separately for instructional and technical staff members.

From November 2007 through January of 2008, 15 focus groups met in eight locations throughout the state. A total of 184 people participated from all educational sectors, including superintendents, principals, teachers, curriculum directors, information technology directors, and classified staff.

It is worth noting here that, while the direct purpose of the meetings was to obtain information to guide DATA Project activities, it quickly became apparent that the sessions also contributed to an atmosphere of collaboration and goodwill. Participants uniformly expressed their appreciation for being invited, and were complimentary that "the state" had traveled to their region to hear what they had to say. The sessions were also useful in providing participants with an opportunity to learn what their peers were doing with data collection and interpretation.

Upon completion of this phase, Carmichael Consulting compiled written survey results and created transcripts of the focus group discussions. These products were analyzed to identify patterns, trends and themes. Carmichael Consulting then identified macro-themes for the entire effort, which are identified below in the "Summary of Needs" section. Comprehensive details are presented in the full report.

Summary of Needs

This field research phase of the project was broadly designed to elicit answers to one overarching question: **What do we need to improve the use of data to advance student achievement in Oregon?** Participants were surprisingly unified in identifying needs, the highlights of which are detailed below.

1. STATEWIDE APPROACH AND MINIMUM TRAINING REQUIREMENTS

Research results clearly demonstrated a lack of understanding about appropriate use of student data to improve student learning. Participants wanted a K-12 assessment literacy culture within each district so educators clearly understand how to design formative measures and then use that information to influence instruction. Participants felt the need for a statewide approach to assessment, as well as a minimum level of training so staff members in every district are equipped with skills to implement the statewide approach.

2. TRAINING DELIVERY

Participants wanted to leverage the regional power of their ESDs to develop and then provide needed assessment training. They wanted training to be tailored to specific audiences and to be provided as locally as possible.

3. A CENTRAL REPOSITORY OF STUDENT DATA

Focus groups asked for a central repository of student data so the information is not stored in silos and is easily retrieved; so redundant reporting requirements are eliminated; and so quality of data is enhanced. Participants who currently use regional warehouse services felt that those services are successful, and should be considered as the vehicle for the central repository.

4. COMMON TECHNICAL DATA POLICIES AND TOOLS

Participants want to standardize technical data policies and tools (data definitions, business rules, security and confidentiality policies, and file formats). They also felt it was vital to resolve bandwidth and connectivity issues.

5. STATE POLICIES AND LEADERSHIP

Participants felt that the state needs to step up its role in providing policy and leadership. In addition to the statewide strategies already described, specific needs include a template for Continuous Improvement Plans (CIPs) and a manageable number of core power standards.

Next Steps

The findings detailed in this report will be used by the statewide Data Quality Work Group to inform the development and execution of the Oregon DATA Project. The DQWG—the organization charged with leading the project—is comprised of representatives from ODE, EESC, ESD, K12 and Higher Ed.

This report will be reviewed at the February 5 meeting of the Oregon Department of Education management team, and, on February 11, Carmichael Consulting will present its findings to members of the Data Quality Work Group.

**Instructional & Technical Field Considerations
For the Use of Data
To Improve Student Achievement in Oregon
FINAL REPORT**

Table of Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	2
A. The Oregon DATA Project	5
B. Research Methodology	6
C. Summary of Needs	8
1. Statewide Approach, Minimum Training Requirements	8
2. Training Delivery	9
3. Central Repository of Student Data	10
4. Common Technical Data Policies and Tools	11
5. State Policies and Leadership	12
D. Next Steps	12
E. Attachments Table of Contents	13
1. Instructional Focus Group Questions	14
2. Technical Focus Group Questions	16
3. Written Survey Questions	17
4. Focus Group Invitation	19
5. The Oregon DATA Project Fact Sheet	20
6. Focus Group Demographics	21
7. Guide to Organization of Focus Group and Survey Responses in the Raw Data Report	24
8. Assessments Focus Group Participants Use Today	31

Instruction & Technical Field Considerations For the Use of Data To Improve Student Achievement in Oregon

February 5, 2008

Oregon Department of Education and the Education Enterprise Steering Committee

FINAL REPORT

The Oregon DATA Project

In June 2007, the Oregon Department of Education received a \$4.7 million, three-year grant from the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) to improve the use of data to advance student achievement in Oregon. Grant monies, which came from the USDOE's Institute of Education Sciences, support the Oregon DATA (Direct Access to Achievement) Project.

The Oregon DATA Project is designed to leverage the investment that ESDs and districts are making in professional development for educators, and to build upon ongoing Oregon investments in data quality. Following is a brief summary of these activities.

- School districts and regional Education Service Districts are beginning to build regional data warehouses and train teachers and administrators to use data to inform instruction.
- The Oregon Legislature is making an \$8.4 million investment in a project that facilitates compliance reporting and the movement of standardized student transcripts horizontally across the state. The Pre-Kindergarten thru Grade 16 Integrated Data System (KIDS) is an enterprise-level data warehouse with standardized business rules for transporting, securing, managing and using data.
- The Legislature has committed an additional \$1.8 million to begin building the Longitudinal Growth Model.
- Other statewide efforts include school improvement strategies such as Regional School Improvement Coordinators (RSIC), Teaching and Learning Communities (TLC), Response to Intervention (RTI), and Positive Behavior Support (PBS), as well as the Integrated Data Transfer System (IDTS) project, the Cross-Office Data Management program, and the Oregon Virtual School District.

A first step for the Oregon DATA Project was to examine the “as-is” use of data across the state. A request for proposals was released to independent consultants to make this assessment using focus groups and a written survey. Consultants were tasked with assessing how data is being used in schools today, identifying ideas for improving the use of data, and identifying perceived barriers to effective use of data. From this competitive process, the firm of Carmichael Consulting was selected. This report summarizes the research findings.

Research Methodology

Field research for the Oregon DATA Project was conducted through two methods: a written survey and focus groups. Following is a description of the approach used to develop and administer both tools.

FOCUS GROUPS, WRITTEN SURVEYS. The goal of Oregon DATA Project administrators was to obtain formal and informal input from a broad cross-section of K-12 staff distributed across the state. In order to elicit this input, two sets of questions were needed: one for the written survey, and one to guide the group discussions. The development process began with a survey developed by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) and used on a statewide basis elsewhere in the country. Project administrators and Carmichael Consulting consultants identified questions that would work well in a focused discussion group setting, and others that could be asked more effectively in a written survey document. The questions were pre-tested in the field, and feedback gathered on the clarity of the questions, the length of response time, and the effectiveness in eliciting the information sought. Based on this feedback, several improvements were made. In order to ensure an adequate number of responses, it was decided to administer the survey as part of the focus group meetings. The testing feedback also indicated that it would be advantageous to conduct separate focus groups for instructional and technical staff.

- See Attachment 1 for the written survey document
- See Attachment 2 for instructional focus group questions
- See Attachment 3 for technical focus groups questions

EIGHT SITES, 15 FOCUS GROUPS. Invitations were sent to ESDs, and district and school staff members throughout the state. Seven ESD sites were chosen to host the focus group meetings: Lane, Willamette, Southern Oregon, High Desert, Umatilla-Morrow, South Coast, and Northwest Regional. Two focus group meetings were planned at each site, one for instructional staff and one for technical staff. Each focus group was to be limited to 15 participants to provide adequate opportunity for discussion while allowing as much participation as possible. It became apparent that a second instructional focus group would be needed in the Portland area. As a result, an additional focus group meeting for instructional staff was added, at Multnomah ESD.

- See Attachment 4 for the focus group invitation
- See Attachment 5 for an informational flier
- See Attachment 6 for a demographic summary of the focus groups

All 15 focus group sessions were conducted between Nov. 15, 2007 and Jan. 9, 2008. In all, 184 participants attended the focus groups and completed the written survey. Participants represented nine disciplines across the educational spectrum: superintendents, principals, teachers, curriculum directors, information technology staff, special education administrators, data administrators, data coaches, and classified staff. A total of 65 school districts and 18 ESDs were represented. The highest attendance in any single focus group was 20 and the lowest was eight. The average attendance at the eight instructional sessions was 14 participants, while the average attendance at the seven technical focus groups was 11. All meetings were scheduled for 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. with a half hour lunch break. The first half hour was devoted to completing the written survey, and participants spent the remaining time in group discussion. Lunches were provided by the Oregon DATA Project, and participants covered their own travel costs.

FOCUS GROUP FORMAT. Each meeting began with an introduction to the Oregon DATA Project, an explanation of the session’s purpose, and individual introductions. Jenny Carmichael moderated the instructional group and Steve Carmichael led the technology group.

Within each group, the facilitator posted questions on a 5x12-foot adhesive wall, which was also used to record responses. In addition, participants were asked to verbally provide clarity about the points they offered, for focus group and facilitator understanding.

A manager from the Oregon DATA Project observed each focus group meeting. Mickey Garrison, School Improvement Director for the Education Enterprise Steering Committee, attended all but one of the instruction focus groups; Art Anderson from the Northwest Regional Education Service District filled in for her there. Baron Rodriguez, Chief Information Officer for the Oregon Department of Education, attended all of the technical focus groups. Both Garrison and Rodriguez sat in a spot in the room removed from group interaction.

FIELD RESPONSE. Participant feedback regarding the focus group sessions and written survey was quite positive. In particular, respondents liked the pacing of the meetings and the adhesive wall methodology. They felt the wall “involved all participants,” “allowed anonymous contributions,” “helped us look with a different set of eyes,” and provided a “great collaborative process.” At every session participants expressed their appreciation for being asked to contribute, were grateful “the state” had come to their region to get their opinions, and acknowledged the value of third party facilitation and reporting. The written survey was also well received. Many of the participants requested a copy of the survey to help them assess use of data in their office environment. On the minus side, several participants indicated the invitation and expectations of the day could have been clearer and that more people should have participated. Others indicated that it was not clear that there would be both technical and instructional sessions.

While the purpose of the meetings was to obtain information for the Oregon DATA Project, the focus groups also built goodwill and an atmosphere of a partnership between the state, the ESDs, and the school districts. They also provided a good opportunity for respondents to hear what other districts are doing. A frequent comment was “I learned a lot.”

ANALYSIS. Upon completion of the focus groups and written surveys, Carmichael Consulting compiled the following records and analyses:

- Instructional focus group transcript
- Technical focus group transcript
- Written survey results for all respondents
- Guide to the organization of focus group and survey responses in the raw data report (“the Guide”)
 - See Attachment 7 for this document
- Assorted lists, graphs, and charts of written survey data
- Consolidated data report
- Acronym guide

These documents make up the raw material used by Carmichael Consulting to prepare this final report, and can be obtained from Oregon DATA Project administrators.

The transcripts for both the instructional and technical focus groups include all questions and answers supplied by participants during the meetings. The survey forms were collected by Carmichael Consulting and entered into the Survey Monkey software program for data storage, analysis, and retrieval.

The purpose of the focus group and written survey questions was to identify consistent themes across the state regarding a variety of topics. Together, the two tools provided a wealth of data that were analyzed to reveal patterns, trends and themes. Carmichael Consulting prepared a guide to the organization of focus group and survey responses in the raw data report (“the Guide”) to allow consolidation of questions covering similar topics.

Since the focus group information was recorded in narrative form, it is not possible to statistically analyze results. Nevertheless, themes were clearly identifiable as topics and opinions were repeated, both within a group and across the state. Carmichael Consulting assigned a sub-theme to each focus group answer. This was done for every focus group question. Sub-themes identified by 5% or more of the respondents were then reported in a raw data summary document that followed the organization of the Guide. Within the raw data summary, written survey data was graphically represented in tables and charts. An acronym guide was also prepared to facilitate communication.

Using the results of these analyses, Carmichael Consulting identified macro-themes—a collection of sub-themes around a specific topic—for the entire effort. The section that follows identifies the macro-themes and summarizes the statewide discussion related to them.

Summary of Needs

This field research phase of the project was broadly designed to elicit answers to one overarching question: **What is needed to improve the use of data to advance student achievement in Oregon?** Participants were surprisingly unified in identifying needs, the highlights of which are detailed below.

1. STATEWIDE APPROACH AND MINIMUM TRAINING REQUIREMENTS

Research results clearly demonstrated a lack of understanding about appropriate use of student data to improve student learning. Participants wanted a K-12 assessment literacy culture within each district so educators clearly understand how to design formative measures and then use that information to influence instruction. Participants felt the need for a statewide approach to assessment, as well as a minimum level of training so staff members in every district are equipped with skills to implement the statewide approach.

Each focus group participant reported efforts under way in their schools to help students master state standards and to improve their school’s state performance scores. The way in which participant schools are doing that, however, varies widely. Some districts have made a substantial effort toward moving beyond statewide assessment results to pinpoint student learning needs, design instruction to meet those needs, and then assess progress. Other districts, however, reported lack of buy-in to using data and student achievement standards. Still others reported fear, resistance, and rejection at both the administrative and teacher levels. Many schools are not using assessment technologies because they don’t know what to use, they don’t know what is worth investing in, or they don’t have the resources to implement them. Even schools that have made investments indicate they do not know how to translate assessment results into effective instruction.

Participants expressed significant concern that each school or district seems to be creating its own approach. Many assessment tools are privatized packages; the schools themselves develop others. Each district—and sometimes even individual schools—is free to select the tools it will use. The result is a wide array of assessment data and data systems throughout Oregon.

- Focus group participants identified 135 distinct instruments; see Attachment 8 for details.

Participants expressed their desire for a single statewide approach to assessments to improve student learning. They want to know the best methodologies for improving student achievement and also want the state to require minimum training statewide to implement the approach. Focus groups asked for training that would result in:

- A K-12 assessment literacy culture within each district that clearly understand how to design formative measures and then use that information to influence instruction.
- Leaders who understand the benefits of an assessment approach to student achievement, who know how to implement the approach in their districts and schools, and know how to effectively communicate with all stakeholders.
- Teachers who understand the benefits of an assessment approach to student achievement, their role in implementing it, how to make improved student achievement happen, and how to communicate assessment strategies with each other, students, and parents.
- Curriculum and assessment directors and teachers who seamlessly blend core power standards and assessment technologies into curriculum.
- Professional development programs that teach the state’s student achievement platform in a tailored way to targeted audiences.
- Classified staff members who understand their role with data and how their work contributes to student achievement.
- Clarity about the state’s core power standards and how they can be unwrapped to improve instruction.

2. TRAINING DELIVERY

Participants wanted to leverage the regional power of their ESDs to develop and provide needed assessment training. They wanted training to be tailored to specific audiences and to be provided as locally as possible.

Once a statewide policy is in place to require assessment literacy training and a statewide assessment approach is established, participants felt the state should use ESDs to develop and deliver the training. Focus group participants emphasized that the content of the training needs to be tailored to specific audiences, i.e., administrators will need to be trained from their perspective, teachers from theirs, classified staff from theirs. They also felt that training will be successful only if it is provided as locally as possible. Focus group participants said they would like ESDs to be the front-line service provider for data management and training; it should be the job of the ESDs to equip districts and schools with the knowledge they need to improve student achievement.

Participants also offered these ideas on making training sessions logistically possible and sustainable:

- Provide different levels of training so attendees can start at a level that matches their knowledge
- Provide regular opportunities for new staff to get on board
- Use a “trainer of trainers” model

- Train more than one trainer per school
- Report the impact of training on student achievement
- Provide incentives to attend training (for example: credit, advancement, credentials, money, recognition)
- Provide more professional development days (paid release time) to attend training
- Use multiple training modes: in-classroom sessions, online resources, review, group, coaching, actual computer use, training bites, and newsletters
- Use multiple training times: half-day, part of the regular school day, summer institute, existing training times, and existing conferences
- Provide training to school teams
- Use technology in the training

3. A CENTRAL REPOSITORY OF STUDENT DATA

Focus groups asked for a central repository of student data so the information is not stored in silos and is easily retrieved; so redundant reporting requirements are eliminated; and so the quality of data is enhanced. Participants with access to regional warehouses felt they are successful now, and should be considered as the vehicle for the central repository.

No silos. When asked to name the single most important change needed in both state and district data systems, survey respondents said: “Give me one place to go for data,” “Make it easier to access and use,” and “Make it easier to do queries and generate commonly used reports.” This message was repeated loud and clear in every focus group. To find information on one student or a group of students, users must access many data sources, locate the information they need, and then manipulate the data to get results. Every day, in every school and district, people attempt to use multiple, inaccessible, incomplete and overlapping data systems. Trainers, coaches, and technical staff, instead of focusing on their core work, spend time helping users figure out which system to use, how to find the information, and how to extract it. The redundancies and frustrations of these efforts equate to significant costs in time and money, do not move the use of data forward, and ultimately, do not move student achievement forward either.

Easily retrieved data. The answer, said focus group participants, is a central repository for current and historical state and local data. That doesn’t mean the data would need to all be in one place—it would just need to look like that to the end users. Participants would like the single place they go for information to provide graphic displays of commonly requested information and reports: district, school, classroom, department, grade, subject, or individual student. Teachers would like to see a single summary page on each student that shows both current and past performance information. Users should also be able to query ad-hoc reports with ease. Another area of interest was in making student achievement information more accessible to students and parents and the community.

Eliminate redundant reporting. A frequent concern in every focus group was the number of reports requested from ODE that could be accessed directly by state departments if:

- districts could supply one set of raw data to the state; and
- the state data system was configured to allow ODE departments to produce specialized reports from that data.

Currently, multiple ODE departments ask districts to draw on district data systems to configure state-required reports. This requires staff within the districts to massage their data into many different formats to meet state requirements. Participants believe it would be much easier for the districts to submit all required data once, in one format. Then, the various ODE departments could request the data they need for all school districts from the comprehensive statewide data source. This would eliminate the time and knowledge required in every school district to configure the reports as they are needed by the state.

Regional warehouses. Participants currently using a regional data warehouse indicated that its single most important benefit is easy access to state and multiple local data in one place, including longitudinal data. They are also able to obtain better and more versatile local reports.

They felt the state should leverage both the regional warehouses and the ESDs as possible vehicles for providing and managing the central repository and providing training and support for data use. Participants would like ESDs to be the front-line service provider for data management and training. Technical staff in ESDs should equip districts and schools with the knowledge and support they need to access and use data effectively.

4. COMMON TECHNICAL DATA POLICIES AND TOOLS

Participants want to standardize technical data policies and tools (data definitions, business rules, security and confidentiality policies and file formats). They also felt it was vital to resolve bandwidth and connectivity issues.

When asked how they would best be able to sustain potential improvements, technical participants' most prominent answer was this: standardization of state, region and district data policies and tools in the following areas:

- Common data definitions
- Common business rules
- Common security and confidentiality policies: FERPA, access, passwords, retention, etc.
- Common and proven low-maintenance tools sets
- Common development platforms
- Common formats
- Technology replacement cycle

Both technical and instructional participants are concerned there is too much “re-invention of the wheel” in all of these areas around the state. Lack of standardized practices has staff in every school and district scurrying to develop what should be basic, common tools. Take the issue of accessing demographic and test data on a student when he or she is transferred to another district. Members of technical staff are asked many times to access this information. Lack of a consistent statewide policy makes obtaining the data very difficult and time-consuming. Some participants suggested that a student's data should transfer to the school he or she is currently attending.

Technical participants recommended development of appropriate standardized policies at the state, regional and district levels. Once these policies are established, staff should be trained, the policies should be enforced, and an annual audit should be conducted.

About 20 of the 65 districts participating in the focus groups said they struggle with bandwidth and connectivity issues that affect the transport of data within their district. A similar number struggle with bandwidth and connectivity issues that affect the transport of data from their district to the state. Both rural and urban districts reported these issues.

5. STATE POLICIES AND LEADERSHIP

Participants felt that the state needs to step up its role in providing policy and leadership. In addition to the statewide strategies already described, specific needs include a template for Continuing Improvement Plans (CIPs) and a manageable number of core power standards.

CIP Template. Presently, districts are given a great deal of leeway to develop their district's CIP, requiring each of them to develop their own process, guessing at what a good CIP looks like. Participants would like the state to provide a template process and product for the CIP.

Manageable Core Power Standards. Participants indicated their districts are developing core power standards for all K-12 subjects on their own because there are too many standards provided by the state to teach to. The state is in the best position to write a manageable number of core power standards that are expected of every district. This would eliminate a lot of duplicate effort throughout the state and also create consistency. Data validity would also be enhanced because grades, terms, definitions, measurements of student growth, and course expectations would be consistent throughout the state.

Next Steps

Next steps in the DATA Project include a review of this report at the February 5 meeting of the Oregon Department of Education management team. The Oregon DATA Project's Baron Rodriguez, who serves as project director, and Mickey Garrison, the project's training director, will attend this meeting.

Following review by the management team, Carmichael Consulting will present this report at a meeting of the statewide Data Quality Work Group on February 11 for general discussion. Technology and instructional representatives on the work group will then meet separately to select Oregon DATA Project implementation priorities and activities, develop an implementation strategy and timeline, assign work-group responsibilities and schedule subsequent meetings. This report and the results of the DQWG meeting will then be circulated to all focus group participants.

**Instructional & Technical Field Considerations
For the Use of Data
To Improve Student Achievement in Oregon**

FINAL REPORT

Attachments Table of Contents

	Page
Attachments	
1. Instructional Focus Group Questions	14
2. Technical Focus Group Questions	16
3. Written Survey Questions	17
4. Focus Group Invitation	19
5. The Oregon DATA Project Fact Sheet	20
6. Focus Group Demographics	21
7. Guide to Organization of Focus Group and Survey Responses in the Raw Data Report	24
8. Assessments Focus Group Participants Use Today	31

Attachment 1: Instructional Focus Group Questions

- a. What assessments and other data are collected on a regular basis to analyze and improve student learning (in addition to those listed by prior focus groups)?
- b. Do these assessments and data provide you with the information you need?
- c. What is helpful about these assessments and data that should be kept?
- d. What other assessments/data would be helpful?
- e. What methods/practices do you (or your customers) use to analyze student achievement data?
- f. Do these methods/practices provide you with the information you need?
- g. What is helpful about these methods/practices that should be kept?
- h. What other methods/practices would be helpful?
- i. How do you (or your customers) use data to set academic goals/improve student learning?
- j. Do these approaches provide you with the information you need?
- k. What is helpful about these approaches that should be kept?
- l. What other ways could data be used to set academic goals/improve student learning that would be helpful?
- m. What kinds of professional development do you need to become a more effective user of data?
- n. Please offer suggestions on training logistics that would make training attendance possible.
- o. Please offer suggestions to make training sustainable.
- p. What are your (your customers) major issues/roadblocks around using data?
- q. What are the major issues about data related to access and equity?
- r. Please rate the readiness of your district's personnel to use student data to improve student achievement on a scale of 1 – 10 with 10 high. Discuss your reasons for this rating.
- s. What decisions regarding student data are you involved in and how are you involved?
- t. Is your district doing something with data that you are proud of?

- u. Think back to 10:00 this morning. Is there any idea/topic you hoped to discuss that has not been addressed?
- v. What worked well in this focus group, what could be done better?

Attachment 2: Technical Focus Group Questions

- a. What data do your customers need that they currently cannot access?
- b. What barriers prevent your customers from accessing the student data they need?
- c. What steps could be taken to improve access?
- d. What infrastructure (system or tools) do you need to more effectively collect, manage, analyze, and communicate student information to improve student achievement?
- e. What student data-related training do you provide now? Who do you train? Does this training provide your customers with the training they need? What else would be helpful?
- f. What type of data requests do you receive from your customers?
- g. What capacity do you have to sustain these improvements once grant funding has ended?
- h. What steps do you take to ensure confidentiality of student data? What additional steps could be taken to improve confidentiality?
- i. Is there something your district is doing with student data that you are really proud of?
- j. What student information do your customers presently use to improve student achievement?
- k. What additional information would be helpful?
- l. What decisions regarding student data are you involved in and how are you involved?
- m. We expect that three years from now we will have a well-functioning, interconnected student data system that will consist of state level components, regional components, and local components. What do you believe the focus and purpose of each of these components will be?
 - 1) Local Student Data Components:
 - 2) Regional Student Data Components:
 - 3) State Student Data Components:

Attachment 3: Written Survey Questions

Participant Document Question Number	<i>Survey Analysis Question Number</i>
2-1	Q1. What is the location of the focus group you are attending? Please darken the circle next to your selection.
2-2	Q2. Are you participating in the INSTRUCTION focus group or the TECHNICAL focus group today?
2-3	Q3. Please mark the selection below that most closely identifies your work discipline:
2-4	Q4. Please check the region of the state that you work in:
2-5	Q5. Please check the school district OR educational service district you work for:
3-1	Q6. A variety of job duties related to student data are listed below. Please mark any job duty YOU CURRENTLY PERFORM as part of YOUR job.
3-2	Q7. Several training topics are listed below. If you would like to receive more training in a particular subject, please mark the subject. Mark as many as you are interested in.
4-1	Q8. A variety of job duties related to student data are listed below. Please mark any job duty YOU CURRENTLY PERFORM as part of YOUR job.
4-2	Q9. Several training topics are listed below. If you would like to receive more training in a particular subject, please mark the subject. Mark as many as you are interested in.
5-1	Q10. Please check the selection that identifies the situation in your district.
5-2	Q11. If your district has a data steward/owner, please write the name(s) of the data steward(s)/owner(s) and the areas he/they are responsible for (data entry, validation, collection, reporting, analysis, other).
6-1	Q12. Who enters student data in your district?
7-1	Q13. Three training tools are listed below. Please read the statement about the training tool and decide which of the choices to the right best describes your opinion. Mark the selection that matches your opinion.
8-1	Q14. Various data related policies are listed below. Please read each statement and decide which of the choices to the right best describes your opinion. Mark the selection that matches your opinion.
9-1	Q15. Various aspects of student data are listed below. Please read each statement and decide which choice to the right best describes your opinion. Check the selection that matches your opinion.
10-1	Q16. Do you personally use the ODE state data system to obtain student information.
10-2	Q17. If your answer to the previous question was "no" or "I don't know please skip to the next section of the survey (section 11). If your answer to the previous question was "yes" please answer the following question and the remaining questions in this section. What is the greatest benefit you experience from using the ODE state data system?"
10-3	Q18. What single change in the ODE data system would make it more useful to you?
10-4	Q19. Please share any other comment you would like to offer regarding the ODE state data system.
11-1	Q20. Is your district affiliated with a regional data warehouse? If your answer is "no or "I don't know" please proceed to question 6 below. If your answer is "yes" please proceed to

question 2 below.

- 11-2 Q21. The regional data warehouse my district is affiliated with is located:
11-3 Q22. How much do you currently use the regional data warehouse?
11-4 Q23. What is the greatest benefit you experience by using the regional data warehouse?
11-5 Q24. What single change in the regional data warehouse would make it more useful to you?
11-6 Q25. Are you interested in learning more about accessing a regional data warehouse?
11-7 Q26. Please share any further comment you would like to make about your regional data warehouse.
Q27. How much do you currently use your district's student data system? (If you do not use your district's student data system select the choice "not at all" below and proceed to the next question in this section.
12-1 Q28. What is the greatest benefit you experience by using your district's student data system?
12-2 Q29. What single change in your district's student data system would make it more useful to you?
12-3 Q30. How should data be captured in your district's student data system to help you the most?
12-4 Q31. Please share any father comment you would like to make about your district's student data system.
12-5 Q32. QUERYING TOOLS are software that allows a user to create and direct specific questions to a database. Are QUERYING TOOLS used by your district to obtain student data
13-1 Q33. REPORTING TOOLS are a database query tool used to create ad hoc reports that do not require the knowledge and use of programming. Are REPORTING TOOLS used by your district to report student data
13-2 Q34. ANALYSIS TOOLS are software that systematically applies statistical and logical techniques to describe, summarize, and compare data. Are ANALYSIS TOOLS used by your district to analyze student data
13-3 Q35. A DASHBOARD is a user interface that organizes and presents information in a way that is easy to read. Does your district use a DASHBOARD to present student information
13-4 Q36. Which business intelligence tool system(s) does your district use?
14-1 Q37. Do you struggle with bandwidth/connectivity issues that affect the transport of data within your district?
14-2 Q38 If your answer is "yes" please describe the bandwidth/connectivity issues you are experiencing related to transport of data within your district."
14-3 Q39. Do you struggle with bandwidth/connectivity issues that affect the transport of data from your district to the state?
14-4 Q40. If your answer is "yes" to the previous question please describe the bandwidth/connectivity issues you are experiencing related to transport of data from your district to the state.
14-5

An invitation

The Oregon DATA Project is sponsoring a series of focus group meetings, and we want to hear from you!

One of the essential steps in developing a statewide data system is assessing the way educators are collecting, reporting and using data today.

You can help us gather that critical information by participating in a facilitated focus group meeting in your ESD area.

Participants will take a close look at a number of issues: how their ESD, school or district handles data entry today; which tools they are using now; and the status of data training for staff members.

Instructional, assessment and technology staff are encouraged to

attend. Instructional and assessment staff will provide direction on training needs related to data and its use in improving student learning.

Technology staff will supply information on current tool sets and use, data systems, quality and data use policy.

Groups will also look at the data “culture” of their organization, including standards and guidelines, as well as assess their school or district readiness.

The information gathered will be used to guide the development of a statewide longitudinal data system.

What is The Oregon DATA Project?

The Oregon DATA (Direct Access to Achievement) Project is a multi-year effort to establish a longitudinal data system.

This statewide initiative is designed to improve student achievement by collecting, analyzing and using data to inform individual instruction.

The system will include a network of regional data centers, along with

professional development for teachers and administrators to effectively use the data to improve student learning.

At the district and classroom levels, teachers will be able to use formative data to design effective curricula for their students.

The project is supported by a \$4.7 million grant by the U.S. Department of Education.

DATES:

Thursday, Nov. 15
LESD

Friday, Nov. 16
SOESD

Monday, Nov. 19,
WESD

**Monday, Dec. 3,
HDES**

Tuesday, Dec. 4,
UMESD

Friday, Dec. 7,
SCESD

Wednesday, Dec. 12,
NWRES

Time:

**10 a.m.–2 p.m.
Lunch provided!**

RSVP to:

Nigel Crowhurst
Nigel.Crowhurst@state.or.us
503-947-5858

Please include names of person(s) attending, role, and contact info.

**RSVP TODAY-
limited capacity!**

The Oregon DATA Project: Direct Access to Achievement FACT SHEET

- **What is the Oregon DATA Project?**

The Oregon DATA Project is a statewide initiative designed to improve student achievement by collecting, analyzing and using longitudinal data to inform individual instruction. At the district and classroom levels, teachers will be able to use formative data to design effective curricula for their students.

- **Why does Oregon need the DATA Project?**

Oregon school districts currently collect information about students and staff into electronic databases. Portions of these data are delivered to the state Department of Education in order to meet compliance requirements. In most cases, however, that is the limit of the use of these data. Data are not aggregated, shared, analyzed or effectively used as a part of improving student achievement.

- **What is being done now?**

School districts and regional Education Service Districts are beginning to make investments in regional data warehouses and starting to train teachers and administrators how to use data to inform instruction. The Oregon Legislature is making an \$8.4 million investment in a project that facilitates compliance reporting and the movement of standardized student transcripts horizontally across the state. The Pre-Kindergarten thru Grade 16 Integrated Data System (KIDS) is an enterprise-level data warehouse with standardized business rules for transporting, securing, managing and using data. In addition, the legislature has committed to an additional \$1.8 million each to begin building a longitudinal growth model and to continue to fund the Oregon Virtual School District, a web portal designed to facilitate the collaboration of teaching resources.

- **How will the DATA Project fit in?**

The Oregon DATA Project (Direct Access to Achievement) is intended to add significant value to the foundation being built through the state's ongoing investments in data quality. It will do so by strengthening the structure of the longitudinal data system that is growing already at the state level, and by providing stakeholders with comprehensive training and informed access to data. The Oregon DATA Project will examine the "as-is" use of data across the state, capitalize on best practices within districts and schools, coordinate with other ODE data quality initiatives, and provide a roadmap for improving instruction through collaboration with Enterprise Education Steering Committee (EESC).

- **What will The DATA Project look like?**

The outcomes of the project will include a system of regional data warehouses containing highly aggregated local and state level data, coupled with professional development that will allow teachers and administrators to effectively engage in ad-hoc query and analysis of instructionally relevant student-level data from nearly anywhere in the state.

Attachment 6: Focus Group Demographics

<u>Who Attended</u>	<u>Count</u>
Instruction	105
Technical	<u>78</u>
answered question	183
did not identify which group	1

<u>Disciplines Represented</u>	<u>Count</u>
Information Technology Staff	59
Other	31
Curriculum Staff	29
Assessment Staff	23
School Principal	15
Teacher	11
Superintendent	9
Special Education Staff	4
Special Education Teacher	<u>3</u>
answered question	184

<u>Regions Represented</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Count</u>
Southwest Oregon	29.1%	53
Northwest Oregon	19.8%	36
Western Oregon	18.1%	33
Eastern Oregon	17.6%	32
Central Oregon	15.4%	<u>28</u>
answered question		182
skipped question		2

<u>Number of Attendees at Focus Groups</u>	<u>Technology</u>	<u>Instructional</u>
Lane ESD	8	11
Southern Oregon ESD	12	19
Willamette ESD	15	10
High Desert ESD	11	17
Umatilla ESD	11	20
South Coast ESD	9	8
NW Regional ESD	11	16
Multnomah ESD	Not held	12
Highest attendance	15	20
Lowest attendance	8	8
Average attendance	11	14

School Districts Represented

Beaverton School District, Beaverton	5	Springfield Public Schools, Springfield	2
Crook County School District, Prineville	5	Brookings-Harbor School District, Brookings	1
Bend/LaPine School District, Bend	4	Central Curry School District, Gold Beach	1
Medford School District, Medford	4	Condon School District, Condon	1
Ontario School District, Ontario	4	Coquille School District, Coquille	1
Redmond School District, Redmond	4	Dallas School District, Dallas	1
Canby School District, Canby	3	Days Creek School District, Days Creek	1
Forest Grove School District, Forest Grove	3	Douglas County Schools, Douglas County	1
Phoenix-Talent School District, Phoenix	3	Elkton School District, Elkton	1
Portland Public Schools, Portland	3	Eugene School District, Eugene	1
Sisters School District, Sisters	3	Fern Ridge School District, Elmira	1
Ashland School District, Ashland	2	Grants Pass School District, Grants Pass	1
Baker School District, Baker	2	Greater Albany Public Schools, Albany	1
Bethel School District, Eugene	2	Gresham-Barlow School District, Gresham	1
Cascade School District, Turner	2	Ione School District, Ione	1
Centennial School District, Portland	2	Jewell School District, Jewell	1
Central Point School District, Central Point	2	La Grande School District, La Grande	1
Coos Bay Public Schools, Coos Bay	2	Marcola School District, Marcola	1
Corvallis School District, Corvallis	2	Milton-Freewater School District, Milton-Freewater	1
Eagle Point School District, Eagle Point	2	Morrow County School District, Lexington	1
Falls City School District, Falls City	2	Newberg School District, Newberg	1
Hillsboro School District, Hillsboro	2	North Wasco County School District, The Dalles	1
Hood River County School District, Hood River	2	Riddle School District, Riddle	1
Imbler School District, Imbler	2	Rogue River School District, Rogue River	1
Jefferson County School District, Madras	2	Roseburg School District, Roseburg	1
Klamath Falls City Schools, Klamath Falls	2	Santiam Canyon School District, Mill City	1
Lebanon Community Schools, Lebanon	2	Scio School District, Scio	1
Mt. Angel School District, Mt. Angel	2	Silver Falls School District, Silverton	1
North Bend School District, North Bend	2	South Lane School District, Cottage Grove	1
Pendleton School District, Pendleton	2	Three Rivers School District, Grants Pass	1
Pilot Rock School District, Pilot Rock	2	Umatilla School District, Umatilla	1
Salem-Keizer Public Schools, Salem	2	Woodburn School District, Woodburn	1
South Umpqua School District, Myrtle Creek	2		
		School District	
		Participants	118
		Districts	65

ESDs Represented	Count
Lake ESD, Lakeview	1
Linn-Benton-Lincoln ESD, Albany	1
Multnomah ESD, Portland	1
North Central ESD, Condon	1
Region 18 ESD (Wallowa County), Enterprise	1
Southern Oregon ESD, Medford	11
Willamette ESD, Salem	6
Lane ESD, Eugene	5
Umatilla-Morrow ESD, Pendleton	5
Malheur ESD, Vale	4
South Coast, Coos Bay ESD (North) & Gold Beach ESD (South)	4
Clackamas ESD, Marylhurst	3
Douglas ESD, Roseburg	3
High Desert ESD, Redmond	3
Grant ESD, John Day	2
NW Regional ESD, Hillsboro	2
Region 9 ESD, The Dalles	2
Union/Baker ESD, Baker City	2
	ESD
	Participants
	57
	ESDs
	18

Attachment 7: Guide to Organization of Focus Group and Survey Responses in the Raw Data Report

I. How was the information in this report developed?

Report Source:

<i>Instruction Focus Group</i>	<i>Technical Focus Group</i>	<i>Written Survey</i>
# of Participants	# of Participants	Demographics (Q 2 – 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

II. What Did We Learn?

A. What student data is collected today? Is more data needed?

Report Source:

<i>Instruction Focus Group</i>	<i>Technical Focus Group</i>	<i>Written Survey</i>
a – What’s collected	a – info customers need, can’t access	--
b – do they provide what you need?	f – type of data requests rec’d	--
c – What is helpful and should be kept	j – info customers use to improve student achievement	--
d - what else would help?	k – what add’l info would help?	--

INSTRUCTION Focus Group Questions

- a. What assessments and other data are collected on a regular basis to analyze and improve student learning (in addition to those listed by prior focus groups)?
- b. Do these assessments and data provide you with the information you need?
- c. What is helpful about these assessments and data that should be kept?
- d. What other assessments/data would be helpful?

TECHNICAL Focus Group Questions

- a. What data do your customers need that they currently cannot access?
- f. What type of data requests do you receive from your customers?
- j. What student information do your customers presently use to improve student achievement?
- k. What additional information would be helpful?

B. What methods are used to analyze student data today? Are more methods needed?

Report Source:

<i>Instruction Focus Group</i>	<i>Technical Focus Group</i>	<i>Written Survey</i>
e – Methods to analyze data	--	--
f – do they provide what you need?	--	--
g – What is helpful and should be kept	--	--
h - what else would help?	--	--

INSTRUCTION Focus Group Questions

- e. What methods/practices do you (or your customers) use to analyze student achievement data?
- f. Do these methods/practices provide you with the information you need?
- g. What is helpful about these methods/practices that should be kept?
- h. What other methods/practices would be helpful?

C. What methods are used to set academic goals? Are more methods needed?

Report Source:

<i>Instruction Focus Group</i>	<i>Technical Focus Group</i>	<i>Written Survey</i>
i – How do you set academic goals?	--	--
j – do they provide what you need?	---	--
k – What is helpful and should be kept	--	--
l - what else would help?	--	--

INSTRUCTION Focus Group Questions

- i. How do you (or your customers) use data to set academic goals/improve student learning?
- j. Do these approaches provide you with the information you need?
- k. What is helpful about these approaches that should be kept?
- l. What other ways could data be used to set academic goals/improve student learning that would be helpful?

D. What data system improvements and tools are needed?

Report Source:

<i>Instruction Focus Group</i>	<i>Technical Focus Group</i>	<i>Written Survey</i>
--	d – infrastructure needs to improve student achievement	State Data System (Q10-1,2,3,4) I,T,AR
--	m – 3 years from now: focus and purpose of state, regional, local components	Regional Data Warehouse (Q11 – 1,2,3,4,5,6,7) I,T, AR
--	--	Local Data System (Q12-1,2,3,4,5) I,T,AR
--	--	Data Tools (Q13-1,2,3,4) I,T,AR
--	--	Technical Tools – Technical (Q14-1,2,3,4,5) AR

TECHNICAL Focus Group Questions

- d. What infrastructure (system or tools) do you need to more effectively collect, manage, analyze, and communicate student information to improve student achievement?
- m. We expect that three years from now we will have a well-functioning, interconnected student data system that will consist of state level components, regional components, and local components. What do you believe the focus and purpose of each of these components will be?
 - 1) Local Student Data Components:
 - 2) Regional Student Data Components:
 - 3) State Student Data Components:

E. What successes have occurred using data to improve student learning?

Report Source:

<i>Instruction Focus Group</i>	<i>Technical Focus Group</i>	<i>Written Survey</i>
r – readiness (also in issues)	i – something district doing re: data – proud of	--
s – something your district doing you're proud of	--	--

INSTRUCTION Focus Group Questions

- r. Please rate the readiness of your district's personnel to use student data to improve student achievement on a scale of 1 – 10 with 10 high. Discuss your reasons for this rating. (also in barriers)
- s. Is your district doing something with data that you are proud of?

TECHNICAL Focus Group Questions

- i. Is there something your district is doing with student data that you are really proud of?

F. What student data roles are needed?

Report Source:

<i>Instruction Focus Group</i>	<i>Technical Focus Group</i>	<i>Written Survey</i>
t – decisions you are involved in	l – decisions you are involved in	Job Duties Currently Performed – Instruction (Q3-1) AR
--	--	Job Duties Currently Performed – Technical (Q3-2) AR
--	--	Data Steward/Owner (Q 5 – 1, 2) AR
--	--	Student Data Entry (Q6-1) AR

INSTRUCTION Focus Group Questions

- t. What decisions regarding student data are you involved in and how are you involved?

TECHNICAL Focus Group Questions

1. What decision regarding student data are you involved in and how are you involved?

G. What barriers prevent effective use of data to improve student learning?

Report Source:

<i>Instruction Focus Group</i>	<i>Technical Focus Group</i>	<i>Written Survey</i>
p – major roadblocks around using data	b – barriers that keep customers from accessing data	Data Policies (Q8-1) AR
q – major issues re: access & equity	c – steps that could improve access	Data Quality (Q9-1) AR
r – readiness ranking and why (also in successes)	g – capacity to sustain improvements	--
	h – how ensure confidentiality of student data? Additional steps?	--

INSTRUCTION Focus Group Questions

- p. What are your (your customers) major issues/roadblocks around using data?
- q. What are the major issues about data related to access and equity?
- r. Please rate the readiness of your district’s personnel to use student data to improve student achievement on a scale of 1 – 10 with 10 high. Discuss your reasons for this rating. (in successes also)

TECHNICAL Focus Group Questions

- b. What barriers prevent your customers from accessing the student data they need?
- c. What steps could be taken to improve access?
- g. What capacity do you have to sustain these improvements once grant funding has ended?
- h. What steps do you take to ensure confidentiality of student data? What additional steps could be taken to improve confidentiality?

H. What data-related training is needed?

Report Source:

<i>Instruction Focus Group</i>	<i>Technical Focus Group</i>	<i>Written Survey</i>
m – Training needed	e – training you provide now, who do you train? Is it the training they need? What else would help?	Training Topics of Interest – Instruction (Q3-2) AR
n – logistics to make attendance possible	--	Training Topics of Interest – Technical (Q4-2) AR
o – suggestions to make training sustainable	--	Data Training Tools (Q7-1) AR

INSTRUCTION Focus Group Questions

- m. What kinds of professional development do you need to become a more effective user of data?
- n. Please offer suggestions on training logistics that would make training attendance possible.
- o. Please offer suggestions to make training sustainable.

TECHNICAL Focus Group Questions

- e. What student data-related training do you provide now? Who do you train? Does this training provide your customers with the training they need? What else would be helpful?

I. What other points were made?

Report Source:

<i>Instruction Focus Group</i>	<i>Technical Focus Group</i>	<i>Written Survey</i>
u – topics not raised yet	--	--
v – what worked well, what better?	--	--

INSTRUCTION Focus Group Questions

- u. Think back to 10:00 this morning. Is there any idea/topic you hoped to discuss that has not been addressed?
- u. What worked well in this focus group, what could be done better?

Attachment 8: Assessments Focus Group Participants Use Today

Responses to Instruction Focus Group Question #1:

What assessments and other data are collected on a regular basis to analyze and improve student learning?

Note: column categories below were created in the first focus group at Lane ESD and used with all subsequent focus groups. Category choices may be incomplete and best efforts have been made to place assessments in the correct category.

SUMMATIVE	BOTH Summative & Formative	FORMATIVE (Instructional Decision Making)					OTHER
		Reading	Math	Available in One or More Subjects (Math, Reading, Writing, etc.)	Behavior and Attendance	English Language Proficiency	
<u>ADDED BY LESD</u> Oregon Assessment of Knowledge & Skills (OAKS) – Fall and Spring Statewide Assessments Stanford Achievement Test – Hearing Impaired (SAT HI) Oregon Healthy Teens	<u>ADDED BY LESD</u> Dynamic Indicators of Basic Literacy Skills (DIBELS) <u>ADDED BY WESD</u> Skills tutor.com – reading and math Primary Literacy Assessment	<u>ADDED BY LESD</u> Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) Oral Reading Fluency CLOZE Burns & Roe MAZE (Grades 6-8) <u>ADDED BY SOESD</u> Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) Grades 7-8 Accelerated Reader	<u>ADDED BY LESD</u> Aimsweb (Progress Monitoring) K-1 Oral Math – universal screener District Math Test, K-8, F S W Universal Screens	<u>ADDED BY LESD</u> Aimsweb Curriculum Based Measures (CBM) STAR (early literacy, math and reading) <u>ADDED BY WESD</u> Curriculum- based collaborative formative assessments – all subjects	<u>ADDED BY LESD</u> PBS/IPBS/ School-Wide Information Systems (SWIS) - Referral, Quiet Room, Check, Connect, Targeted Interventions <u>ADDED BY WESD</u> Suspension/ Expulsion Data Behavioral Assessment Scale for Children (BASC)	<u>ADDED BY HDES</u> English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA) Speech- Language Screens (Joliet, etc.) Language Proficiency Scores Idea Proficiency Test (IPT) English	<u>ADDED BY LESD</u> Grade Data Class Size Data Instructional Minutes Work Sample Data (Mastery In Motion) Program Placement Tests Early Learner Data <u>ADDED BY SOESD</u> Technical Skill Attainment Raven-Intellectual Assessment

<u>ADDED BY WESD</u> Communities That Care (CTC) Survey ACC Reading Quiz – Pace District Pre and Post Tests Woodcock-Johnson Work Sample Results ODE SET Report <u>ADDED BY HDESD</u> Oregon Extended Assessments SAT -10 (Grades 1-3) <u>ADDED BY UESD</u> Woodcock-Munoz~	(District – level assessment) READ 180 Performance (adolescent literacy software) County-wide writing assessments (prior to state writing assessment) Classroom-based assessments <u>ADDED BY NWRES</u> IDELS (Dibels in Spanish)	Gates McGinty Phonics Inventories Voyager/Passporte End of chapter assessment <u>ADDED BY WESD</u> Kindergarten Screening Assessment Running Records District Reading Assessment (K-3) Accelerated Reader (AR) Selection Assessments from Reading Program <u>ADDED BY HDESD</u> Individual Reading Inventories <u>ADDED BY SCESD</u> Phonics Survey (Reading) <u>ADDED BY NWRES</u> GRADE+ - Comprehensive Secondary Reading GRADE for Striving Readers Grant	<u>ADDED BY SOESD</u> Accelerated Math (AM) - K-6 Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) - Math <u>ADDED BY WESD</u> Key Math <u>ADDED BY UESD</u> Accelerated Math (AM) – K-6 <u>ADDED BY NWRES</u> Curriculum Based Method (CBM) - Mixed Computation 2-5 CBM – Missing Number, K-1	<u>ADDED BY SCESD</u> ASSET College Placement May 10 th (Reading, Math, Writing) <u>ADDED BY NWRES</u> Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) for reading & math, grades 1 – 12, alternate program OR Plus, Grades 1-2 <u>ADDED BY MESD</u> Short Cycle Classroom/ team formative assessments (all subjects K-12)	Attendance data Boehm Concepts (Primary) Alcohol and Drug Education Prevention Team (ADEPT) – English Language Learner (ELL) Student survey – drug and alcohol use <u>ADDED BY SCESD</u> Early Leaver Report – Dropout Data <u>ADDED BY NWRES</u> ESP Behavior Screener (developed by the U of O) <u>ADDED BY MESD</u> Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA – Formal)	Language Proficiency Test <u>UESD</u> Language Assessment Scale (LAS) Basic Language Acquisition (Skills Tool) <u>ADDED BY SCESD</u> Language Sample Woodcock-Munoz - English as a Second Language (ESL) <u>ADDED BY MESD</u> Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) – Evaluacion del desarrollo de la lectura (EDL) - Spanish Marie Clay for Spanish early literacy La Bateria – Woodcock Johns in Spanish	Climate Survey American College Testing Exam - College Entrance Plan and Explore. Pre ACT tests, grade 9 Armed Services Vocation Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) – 11 th grade 5 year growth data by cohort group and sub-group: poverty, talented and gifted (TAG), English language learner (ELL), Special Education, etc. Career/Technical Skills Assessment (CTSA) President’s Physical Fitness Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test (NNAT) - diagnostic for TAG Vision & Hearing Screening Dial R (Special Education) Scholastic Aptitude Test (PSAT) Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test (PSAT) – Grade 9 <u>ADDED BY WESD</u> Program enrollment - ELL, Bilingual, Special Education, TAG
--	--	---	--	---	---	---	---

		<p>Degrees of Reading Power – Grade 9</p> <p>Rigby</p> <p>Aprenda – Spanish Reading Assessment</p> <p><u>ADDED BY MESD</u> Early Reading Intervention (ERI)</p> <p>Qualitative Reading Inventory (QRI, 4-8)</p> <p>Aural Reading Inventory (ARI – fluency measure)</p> <p>Earobics (phonemic awareness preK-4, progress monitoring)</p> <p>Rewards (progress monitoring, reading 4-12)</p> <p>Read Naturally: 2 - 4 progress monitoring</p>	<p>Common in district midterm/ final in High School Math</p>		<p>FBA – Informal, 1-12</p>	<p><u>ADDED BY UESD</u> Help One Student To Succeed (HOSTS) – LA, ELL, Math</p> <p>Specialist Assessments</p> <p><u>ADDED BY SCESD</u> Systems Performance Review & Improvement (SPR-I) – Special Education</p> <p>Career Information Systems (CIS) Inventories</p> <p>Title Program has assessments built into curriculum</p> <p><u>ADDED BY NWRES</u> Advance Placement (AP) Test Results used as formative.</p> <p>Common Literacy Assignment: English-Language-Arts (ELA), Science, Social Studies – district developed</p> <p>Cognition Ability Test (CogAT) for TAG</p> <p>IBTS/COGAT for TAG Identification</p> <p>Course Taking Related to Test Scores</p> <p>TERA NOVA – Screening for TAG, Grade 7</p> <p>N-NAT – TAG, grade 2</p> <p>Nagleri-NonVerbal Intelligence Test, grade 3</p>
--	--	---	--	--	-----------------------------	--

						<p>6-traits, scoring rubric for writing</p> <p>Otis-Lenno, TAG screener</p> <p>SRI, Grades 2-10</p> <p>Stanford Achievement Test – 10 (SAT), grade 5</p> <p>Common in district formative assessments</p> <p>District Writing, all grades (note: not tested at the state level)</p> <p>UNIT – Special Education</p> <p>DAS</p> <p>WIAT</p> <p>CONNERS’ rating scales</p> <p><u>ADDED BY MESD</u> Kaufman Test of Education Achievement (K-TEA)</p> <p>Picture Peabody (preK&K oral language)</p> <p>Data to measure Individualized Education Plan (IEP) progress</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---