The Data Quality Campaign (DQC) is a national, collaborative initiative to encourage and support state policymakers, practitioners, and educators in leveraging data to improve student achievement.}
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To ensure that investments in statewide longitudinal data systems are designed and used for continuous improvement, state policymakers need to identify and focus on the critical questions that are necessary to effectively manage their education system and improve student achievement.

The questions below, though not exhaustive, demonstrate how statewide longitudinal data systems can inform critical policy questions facing state leaders today:

1. Are my state’s policies and data systems aligned to ensure that expectations in P–12 support student success in postsecondary education and in the workplace?
   - What percentage of students graduate, according to the four-year cohort graduation rate required by the 2008 federal regulations?
   - What percentage of students require remediation in postsecondary institutions?
   - What percentage of students have taken the necessary coursework and exams to prepare them for college and work, and what were their achievement levels?
   - What achievement levels in grades 3 through 7 indicate that a student is on track for later success?

2. Is my state holding schools and districts accountable for student growth?
   - Do we know what factors contribute to the highest amount of growth?
   - How many students are achieving at least one year’s academic growth every year?

3. Do my state’s policies ensure a measurably effective educator workforce?
   - Are these efforts evaluated to ensure that every student has an effective teacher?
   - Which educator preparation pathways and institutions produce more effective teachers as measured by student performance?
   - What percentage of students were assigned an ineffective teacher two or more years in a row as measured in part by a value-added model?
   - Which professional development programs have the greatest impact on the effectiveness of teachers as measured by student performance?
   - What percentage of principals increased the overall effectiveness of their teachers and schools as measured by student performance?

4. Does my state prioritize resources to target programs and practices that improve student achievement?
   - In which classes, grades and schools does class size have a measurable impact on student achievement?
   - Which teachers are most effective with larger classrooms?
   - How do the achievement levels and outcomes of students enrolled in online/virtual courses compare to those of students enrolled in traditional courses?
   - How does dual enrollment affect student outcomes?
### 10 Essential Elements of a Longitudinal Data System

1. A unique statewide student identifier that connects student data across key databases across years (52 states report having this Element, up from 37 in 2005)
2. Student-level enrollment, demographic and program participation information (52 states, up from 40 in 2005)
3. The ability to match individual students’ test records from year to year to measure academic growth (52 states, up from 33 in 2005)
4. Information on untested students and the reasons they were not tested (51 states, up from 27 in 2005)
5. A teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students (44 states, up from 14 in 2005)
6. Student-level transcript information, including information on courses completed and grades earned (41 states, up from 8 in 2005)
7. Student-level college readiness test scores (50 states, up from 7 in 2005)
8. Student-level graduation and dropout data (52 states, up from 36 in 2005)
9. The ability to match student records between the P–12 and postsecondary systems (49 states, up from 12 in 2005)
10. A state data audit system assessing data quality, validity and reliability (52 states, up from 23 in 2005)

### 10 State Actions To Ensure Effective Data Use

#### Expand
- Ensure that data can be accessed, analyzed and used, and communicate data to all stakeholders to promote continuous improvement.
- Build the capacity of all stakeholders to use longitudinal data for effective decisionmaking.

#### Ensure
- Link state K–12 data systems with early childhood, postsecondary education, workforce, social services and other critical state agency data systems. (11 states report this Action, as of 2011)

#### Build
- Create stable, sustained support for robust state longitudinal data systems. (27 states)
- Develop governance structures to guide data collection, sharing and use. (36 states)
- Build state data repositories (e.g., data warehouses) that integrate student, staff, financial and facility data. (44 states)

#### Implement
- Implement systems to provide all stakeholders timely access to the information they need while protecting student privacy. (2 states)
- Create progress reports with individual student data that provide information educators, parents and students can use to improve student performance. (29 states)
- Create reports that include longitudinal statistics on school systems and groups of students to guide school-, district- and state-level improvement efforts. (36 states)

#### Develop
- Develop a purposeful research agenda and collaborate with universities, researchers and intermediary groups to explore the data for useful information. (31 states)
- Promote strategies to raise awareness of available data and ensure that all key stakeholders, including state policymakers, know how to access, analyze and use the information. (23 states)

Data for Action 2011: DQC’s State Analysis was released in December 2011. Visit www.DataQualityCampaign.org to see how many of the 10 Essential Elements and 10 State Actions your state has.
Ensuring Your State Has a Plan for Success

To help ensure that the right people, policies and processes are in place to maximize federal funding to support your state’s agenda:

- Identify agencies and specific individuals in your state who are in charge of each of the programs and funding sources illustrated in this roadmap.
- Establish and leverage data governance teams within the state education agency and across agencies — with policy leaders, program staff, and data and technology specialists — to develop coherent, coordinated applications for federal funds.
- Seek broad stakeholder input to create a list of priority questions that your state needs to answer to effectively manage its human capital strategy.
- Leverage federal funds to ensure that your statewide longitudinal data systems include the necessary data to answer those priority questions and to implement the Data Quality Campaign’s (DQC’s) 10 Essential Elements and 10 State Actions To Ensure Effective Data Use.
- Consider collaborating with other states to use federal funds to achieve interoperable systems that can answer appropriate questions about students who move across state lines.

Maximizing Federal Funding for the P–20/Workforce Data Pipeline

The federal government funds numerous programs and activities, administered by different departments and agencies, that states can leverage to further develop and coordinate various statewide data systems and promote actions that would lead to the effective use of data. This roadmap (and the continuously updated web version at www.DataQualityCampaign.org/Roadmap) identifies federal funding opportunities that states can maximize to support activities to collect and use longitudinal data to improve student outcomes. It provides a starting point for states’ planning by identifying federal funding sources that can be used for data-related activities.

This DQC analysis includes current funding information and a “tip” for how states might be able to maximize funds to support activities aimed at collecting and using longitudinal data to improve student outcomes. This information is drawn from federal legislation, statute, guidance or program information.

### U.S. Department of Education (ED)

#### (a) Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement (Title I)

- **Eligible Entities:** State Education Agencies; Subgrants to Local Education Agencies
- **Formula Grants**

  Title I of the Carl D. Perkins and Technical Education Act of 2006 established grants for states to expand and improve career and technical education in high schools, technical schools, and community colleges. Perkins requires states to collect and report student outcome information from both K–12 and postsecondary activities. States may reserve 10 percent of funds for leadership activities that "may include developing and enhancing data systems to collect and analyze data on secondary and postsecondary academic and employment outcomes" and 5 percent for administrative activities. **Data tip:** States should use this funding to leverage or coordinate activities with existing investments in statewide longitudinal data systems.

- **2011 Appropriation:** $1.1 billion

#### (b) IDEA Part B (Ages 3–21) — Grants to States

- **Eligible Entities:** State Education Agencies; Subgrants to Local Education Agencies
- **Formula Grants**

  The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B, Section 611 provides formula grants to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the secretary of the interior, outlying areas and the freely associated states. These grants help states meet the excess costs of providing special education and related services to children with disabilities ages 3–21.

  IDEA authorizes ED to use a portion of these funds to help states meet their data collection requirements. FY2011 funding included a $25 million set-aside. ED will likely use some of the nonobligated funds from this set-aside to make investments in data systems for Part C of IDEA (see below), data collection resources for federal IDEA data requirements and technical assistance for data analysis to help states and local education agencies improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The investments in Part C data systems will likely be used to help states develop data systems that collect, analyze and report infant and toddler outcome data and develop modified assessment measures of student growth to be used in growth-based accountability models. At this time, eligible entities have not been determined for these investments. **Data tip:** States should use these Part B funds to leverage or coordinate data collection or data systems activities with existing investments in statewide longitudinal data systems and ensure appropriate linkages between early childhood and K–12 data.

- **2011 Appropriation:** $11.5 billion

#### (c) IDEA Part C (Ages 0–3) — Grants to States

- **Eligible Entities:** State Education Agencies; Subgrants to Local Education Agencies
- **Formula Grants**

  The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C provides formula grants to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, the secretary of the interior and outlying areas to help states identify and serve infants with disabilities during their first three years of life. Under Part C of IDEA, states must maintain and implement a statewide system to help identify infants and
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The Data Quality Campaign (DQC) is a national, collaborative initiative to encourage and support state policymakers’ efforts to improve the availability and use of high-quality education data to improve student achievement. The campaign will provide tools and resources that will help states implement and use longitudinal data systems, while providing a national forum for reducing duplication of effort and promoting greater coordination and consensus among the organizations focused on improving data quality, access and use.

Visit www.DataQualityCampaign.org for more about the:

- 10 Essential Elements and the 10 State Actions required to establish, maintain and use a quality longitudinal data system;
- Data for Action 2011: DQC’s State Analysis, which shows where your state stands on the 10 Essential Elements and the 10 State Actions;
- Tools, materials, meetings and information that can aid states and interested organizations seeking to ensure increased quality, accessibility and use of data; and
- Information on how your organization can partner with the DQC to generate the understanding and will to build and use state longitudinal data systems.

www.DataQualityCampaign.org