

OMB#: 1850-0877

Expiration Date:

Charting the Progress of Education Reform: An Evaluation of the Recovery Act's Role

Survey of State Education Agencies

Spring 2011



Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1850-0877. The approximate time required to complete this data collection is estimated to be 75 minutes. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC 20202-4651. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, 555 New Jersey Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20208.

Notice of Confidentiality

Information collected from the surveys comes under the confidentiality and data protection requirements of the Institute of Education Sciences (The Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, Title I, Part E, Section 183). Information that could identify an individual or institution will be separated from the survey responses submitted, kept in secured locations, and be destroyed as soon as they are no longer required. Survey responses will be used only for research purposes. States may be identified but only in reporting composite measures of education reform. The reports prepared for the study will summarize survey findings across individuals and institutions and will not associate responses with a specific LEA, school, or person. We will not provide information that identifies state education agency, local education agency, or school respondents to anyone outside the study team, except as required by law.

Introduction

This survey and the larger study of which it is a part are supported under a contract from the United States (U.S.) Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences (IES). The overall purposes of the study are to examine (1) ongoing education reform efforts, (2) the uses of funds available under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Act) to support these reforms, and (3) the challenges associated with the reforms. Your SEA's responses are critical to informing ongoing federal efforts to support education reform. In addition, your responses will help inform policy makers, educators and researchers at the local, state, and national levels of reform efforts underway and challenges being encountered.

- The survey includes five sections and covers the topics listed in the table below. Given the scope of topics covered in this survey, we anticipate that several members of the SEA staff will contribute responses.
- We will not report individual SEA responses to any survey items. States may be identified on composite measures of education reform implementation; however, these measures will draw on responses to multiple survey items and will simply provide a broad picture of state-level activity.
- The study, including this survey, is being conducted by Westat and its partners, Policy Studies Associates, the University of Wisconsin, and Chesapeake Research Associates. IES is providing technical direction.
- Once your SEA's survey is complete, please use the following chart to indicate which SEA staff contributed to the SEA's response and estimate of the number of minutes they spent on the survey.

Survey Section	For Each Person(s) Who Responded to Survey Questions		
	Position Title	Number of Years in the Position	Estimated total minutes to respond
I. Implementation of new or revised state content standards and new state assessments aligned with the standards			
II. Education workforce development and human resource management			
III. Support for improving low-performing schools			
IV. SEA reform priorities for the 2011-2012 school year			
V. SEA Recovery Act spending for reforms			

I. Implementation of New or Revised State Content Standards and New State Assessments Aligned with the Standards

1. Did your state adopt the Common Core State Standards in mathematics and/or English language arts?

<i>(Check one box only.)</i>	
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

► Skip to Question 3.

► Continue to Question 2.

2. Did your state adopt other new or revised content standards in mathematics, reading/English language arts, science and/or social studies in the 2009-2010 or 2010-2011 school years?

<i>(Check one box only.)</i>	
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

► Continue to Question 3.

► Skip to Question 8.

3. For which subjects did your state adopt the Common Core State Standards or other new or revised state content standards in 2009-2010 and/or 2010-2011?

Subjects for which your State Adopted the Common Core State Standards or Other New or Revised State Standards	Common Core State Standards <i>(Check all that apply.)</i>	Other New or Revised State Content Standards <i>(Check all that apply.)</i>
Mathematics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reading/English language arts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Science		<input type="checkbox"/>
Social studies		<input type="checkbox"/>

4. For which subjects did your SEA require local education agencies (LEAs) to begin implementing new or revised state content standards in 2010-2011, and for which subjects will this be required for 2011-2012?

Subjects for which the SEA Required LEAs to Work on Implementing New or Revised State Content Standards	Required for LEAs in 2010-2011 <i>(Check all that apply.)</i>	Will be Required for LEAs in 2011-2012 <i>(Check all that apply.)</i>
Mathematics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reading/English language arts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Science	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Social studies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5. Indicate whether your SEA supported the implementation of any new or revised state content standards in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, or plans to in 2011-2012.

SEA Role to Support the Implementation of Any New or Revised State Content Standards	Had This Role in 2009-2010 (Check all that apply.)	Had This Role in 2010-2011 (Check all that apply.)	Expected to Have This Role in 2011-2012 (Check all that apply.)
Provide statewide professional development on standards:			
In-person	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
On-line	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Support/oversee LEA-designed professional development on standards by providing:			
LEAs with specific funding for this purpose	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
“Train the trainers” sessions to lead LEA staff, who will, in turn, train teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Guidance and technical assistance to LEAs on the design and implementation of professional development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Identify, develop and/or distribute instructional materials (e.g., curriculum guides, pacing guides, textbooks) aligned with standards that:			
LEAs are <u>required</u> to use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
LEAs are <u>not required</u> to use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provide resources or technical assistance to help LEAs map curriculum taught (scope and sequence) to the new or revised content standards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. What is the current status of your SEA’s efforts to develop new assessments aligned with the new or revised state content standards?

<i>(Check one box only.)</i>	
Our SEA:	
Has no current plans in this area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is a member of a federally-funded assessment consortium	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is working independently to develop new aligned assessments	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is a member of a federally-funded assessment consortium and is also working independently to develop new aligned assessments	<input type="checkbox"/>

► Skip to Question 10.
 } Continue to Question 7.

7. For which subjects was your SEA developing new assessments aligned with the new or revised state content standards in 2010-2011?

Subjects for which your SEA was Developing New Assessments Aligned with New or Revised State Content Standards	As a Member of a Federally-funded Assessment Consortium (Check all that apply.)	Working Independently to Develop New Aligned Assessments (Check all that apply.)
Mathematics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reading/English language arts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Science	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Social studies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. When are your LEAs expected to begin using the new state assessments?

Assessment areas	Used in 2010-2011 (Check all that apply.)	Expected to Begin Using in 2011-2012 (Check all that apply.)	Expected to Begin Using in 2012-2013 or Later (Check all that apply.)	Too Soon to Tell
Mathematics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reading/English language arts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Science	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Social studies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

9. Indicate whether your SEA supported the implementation of new assessments and uses of new or already existing assessment data in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, or plans to in 2011-2012.

SEA Role to Support the Implementation of New Assessments and Uses of New or Already Existing Assessment Data	Had This Role in 2009-2010 (Check all that apply.)	Had This Role in 2010-2011 (Check all that apply.)	Expected to Have This Role in 2011-2012 (Check all that apply.)
Provide statewide professional development or guidance and technical assistance to LEAs' professional development on:			
Implementation of <u>new</u> state assessments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Development of <u>new</u> local assessments aligned with <u>new</u> state assessments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strategies and procedures for LEA staff to use in accessing <u>new or existing</u> state assessment data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use of <u>new or existing</u> assessment data by teachers to improve instruction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use of <u>new or existing</u> assessment data by principals and school leaders in school improvement planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Assist <u>LEA-designed</u> professional development on <u>new or existing</u> assessments by providing:			
LEAs with specific funding for this purpose	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
"Train the trainers" sessions to lead LEA staff, who will, in turn, train teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provide LEAs with funding specifically to support their local assessment data systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Facilitate access to <u>new or existing</u> assessment data by:			
Providing educators with key LEA, school and student indicators through report cards, data dashboards, or other feedback and analysis systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Establishing and maintaining state data systems that share longitudinal data on students with local data systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

¹ Interim assessments are tests given periodically to check student progress, including standardized and diagnostic assessments but not including teacher-developed tests.

10. Indicate to what extent, if at all, your SEA encountered these challenges when implementing new or revised state content standards and new state assessments aligned with these content standards in the 2010-2011 school year.

Challenges when implementing new or revised state content standards and new state assessments	Extent of Challenge in 2010-2011 (Check one box in each row.)			
	Not Applicable	Not a Challenge	Minor Challenge	Major Challenge
Lack of SEA staff capacity or expertise to provide districts with professional development and/or technical assistance on:				
Implementing new or revised state content standards				
Implementing new state assessments				
Accessing and using assessment data				
Developing instructional materials aligned with the new or revised state content standards				
Developing interim/formative assessments to measure student mastery of the new or revised state content standards				
Opposition from educators or other groups to the new or revised:				
State content standards				
State assessments				
Lack of instructional materials aligned with the new or revised state content standards				
Lack of assessments to measure student mastery of the new or revised state content standards				
Current data systems limit district and school access to new assessment data				

II. Educator Workforce Development and Human Resource Management

11. Indicate whether your SEA supported the induction of new teachers (i.e., those in their first year of teaching experience) in any of the following ways in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, or plans to in 2011-2012.

SEA Role to Support Induction of New Teachers	Had This Role in 2009-2010 (Check all that apply.)	Had This Role in 2010-2011 (Check all that apply.)	Planning to Have This Role in 2011-2012 (Check all that apply.)
Administers a statewide new teacher induction program in which:			
LEA participation is required	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
LEA participation is optional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Assists <u>LEA-designed</u> new teacher induction programs by:			
Providing LEAs with specific funding for this purpose	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Setting standards and guidelines that LEA-designed programs:			
Are required to meet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
May choose to meet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Providing guidance and technical assistance to LEAs on the design and implementation of their programs, including providing model induction programs that LEAs may choose to use all or in part	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Requiring LEAs to submit induction design and implementation plans for SEA approval	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Requiring LEAs to report on their induction program operations and effectiveness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If you have not checked any boxes in Question 11, skip to Question 13; otherwise continue to Question 12.

12. Indicate whether your SEA included the components below in your statewide program or in your SEA's standards, guidelines and/or technical assistance for new teacher induction programs in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, or plans to include them in 2011-2012.

Components Included in Statewide Program or Standards, Guidelines and/or Technical Assistance for New Teacher Induction Programs	Included in 2009-2010 (Check all that apply.)	Included in 2010-2011 (Check all that apply.)	Planned for 2011-2012 (Check all that apply.)
Alignment with clearly defined state teacher standards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mentor or coach specifically assigned to each new teacher	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Observations and feedback from mentor or other experienced educators	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Induction support for one year for all new teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Additional support for those who may need help after the first year	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ongoing training and support for mentors/coaches	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

13. Indicate whether your SEA supported the induction of new principals (i.e., those in their first year of principal experience) in any of the following ways in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, or plans to in 2011-2012.

SEA Role to Support Induction of New Principals	Had This Role in 2009-2010 (Check all that apply.)	Had This Role in 2010-2011 (Check all that apply.)	Planning to Have This Role in 2011-2012 (Check all that apply.)
Administers a statewide new principal induction program in which:			
LEA participation is required	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
LEA participation is optional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Assists <u>LEA-designed</u> new principal induction programs by:			
Providing LEAs with specific funding for this purpose	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Setting standards and guidelines that LEA-designed programs:			
Are required to meet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
May choose to meet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Providing guidance and technical assistance to LEAs on the design and implementation of their programs, including providing model induction programs that LEAs may choose to use all or in part	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Requiring LEAs to submit induction design and implementation plans for SEA approval	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Requiring LEAs to report on their induction program operations and effectiveness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If you have not checked any boxes in Question 13, skip to Question 15; otherwise continue to Question 14.

14. Indicate whether your SEA included the components below in your statewide program or in your SEA's standards, guidelines and/or technical assistance for new principal induction programs in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, or plans to include them in 2011-2012.

Components Included in Statewide Program or Standards, Guidelines and/or Technical Assistance for New Principal Induction Programs	Included in 2009-2010 (Check all that apply.)	Included in 2010-2011 (Check all that apply.)	Planned for 2011-2012 (Check all that apply.)
Alignment with clearly defined standards for school leadership	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Observations and feedback from experienced educators	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mentor or coach specifically assigned to each principal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Induction support for one year for all new principals and additional support for those who may need help after the first year	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ongoing training and support for mentors and/or coaches	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

15. Indicate whether your SEA supported the evaluation of teacher performance in the following ways in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, or plans to in 2011-2012.

SEA Role to Support the Evaluation of Teacher Performance	Had This Role in 2009-2010 (Check all that apply.)	Had This Role in 2010-2011 (Check all that apply.)	Planning to Have This Role in 2011-2012 (Check all that apply.)
Administers a statewide teacher evaluation system in which:			
LEA participation is required	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
LEA participation is optional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Assists <u>LEA-designed</u> teacher evaluation systems by:			
Providing LEAs with specific funding for this purpose	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Setting standards and guidelines that LEA-designed systems:			
Are required to meet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
May choose to meet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Providing guidance and technical assistance to LEAs on the design and implementation of their systems, including providing model teacher evaluation systems that LEAs may choose to use all or in part	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Requiring LEAs to submit teacher evaluation design and implementation plans for SEA approval	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Requiring LEAs to report on their teacher evaluation system operations and effectiveness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If you have not checked any boxes in Question 15, skip to Question 17; otherwise continue to Question 16.

16. Indicate whether your SEA included the components below in your statewide system or in your SEA's standards, guidelines and/or technical assistance for teacher evaluation systems in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, or plans to include them in 2011-2012.

Components Included in Statewide System or Standards,	Included in	Included in	Planned for
---	-------------	-------------	-------------

Guidelines and/or Technical Assistance for Teacher Evaluation Systems	2009-2010 (Check all that apply.)	2010-2011 (Check all that apply.)	2011-2012 (Check all that apply.)
A rating scale or rubric that defines three or more performance levels to evaluate classroom instruction or practice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
At least two yearly observations of classroom instruction with written feedback	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Multiple observers (such as master teachers, coaches, or peers) as well as school administrators	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student achievement gains in NCLB grades/subjects used in determining individual teacher performance ratings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student achievement gains in other grades/subjects used in determining individual teacher performance ratings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teachers are provided with specific suggestions for professional development activities designed to help them improve in the areas covered by the evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Required training and certification of teacher evaluators	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use of student achievement gains or growth in making decisions on teacher placement or dismissal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

17. Indicate whether your SEA supported the evaluation of principal performance in the following ways in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, or plans to in 2011-2012.

SEA Role to Support the Evaluation of Principal Performance	Had This Role in 2009-2010 (Check all that apply.)	Had This Role in 2010-2011 (Check all that apply.)	Planning to Have This Role in 2011-2012 (Check all that apply.)
Administers a statewide principal evaluation system in which:			
LEA participation is required	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
LEA participation is optional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Assists LEA-designed principal evaluation systems by:			
Providing LEAs with specific funding for this purpose	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Setting standards and guidelines that LEA-designed systems:			
Are required to meet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
May choose to meet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Providing guidance and technical assistance to LEAs on the design and implementation of their systems, including providing model principal evaluation systems that LEAs may choose to use all or in part	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Requiring LEAs to submit principal evaluation design and implementation plans for SEA approval	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Requiring LEAs to report on their principal evaluation program operations and effectiveness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If you have not checked any boxes in Question 17, skip to Question 19; otherwise continue to Question 18.

18. Indicate whether your SEA included the components below in your statewide system or in your SEA's standards, guidelines and/or technical assistance for principal evaluation systems in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, or plans to include them in 2011-2012.

Components Included in Statewide System or Standards, Guidelines and/or Technical Assistance for Principal Evaluation Systems	Included in 2009-2010 (Check all that apply.)	Included in 2010-2011 (Check all that apply.)	Planned for 2011-2012 (Check all that apply.)
State standards for school leaders	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Multiple observers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
A rating scale or rubric that defines three or more performance levels	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student achievement gains or growth used in determining principals' performance ratings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
At least two yearly observations of leadership activities with written feedback	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Principals are provided with specific suggestions for professional development activities designed to help them improve in the areas covered by the evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Required training and certification of evaluators prior to conducting evaluations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use of student achievement gains or growth in making decisions on principal placement or dismissal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

19. Indicate whether your SEA supported differentiated teacher compensation systems in the following ways in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, or plans to in 2011-2012.

SEA Role to Support Differentiated Teacher Compensation Systems	Had This Role in 2009-2010 (Check all that apply.)	Had This Role in 2010-2011 (Check all that apply.)	Planning to Have This Role in 2011-2012 (Check all that apply.)
Administers a statewide differentiated teacher compensation system in which:			
LEA participation is required	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
LEA participation is optional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Assists <u>LEA-designed</u> differentiated teacher compensation system by:			
Providing LEAs with specific funding for this purpose	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Setting standards and guidelines that LEA-designed systems:			
Are required to meet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

May choose to meet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Providing guidance and technical assistance to LEAs on the design and implementation of their systems, including providing model differentiated teacher compensation systems that LEAs may choose to use all or in part	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Requiring LEAs to submit differentiated teacher compensation design and implementation plans for SEA approval	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Requiring LEAs to report on their differentiated teacher compensation program operations and effectiveness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If you have not checked any boxes in Question 19, skip to Question 21; otherwise continue to Question 20.

20. Indicate whether your SEA included the components below in your statewide system or in your SEA's standards, guidelines and/or technical assistance for differentiated teacher compensation systems in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, or plans to include them in 2011-2012.

Components Included in Statewide System or Standards, Guidelines and/or Technical Assistance for Differentiated Teacher Compensation Systems	Included in 2009-2010 (Check all that apply.)	Included in 2010-2011 (Check all that apply.)	Planned for 2011-2012 (Check all that apply.)
Base pay increases, add-ons, or stipends to teachers based in part on:			
Ratings of classroom observations of teaching practice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Achievement gains of students in individual teachers' classes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Serving as master teachers or instructional specialists	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Demonstrating higher levels of instructional skills via National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification or a similar state performance assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
One-time bonuses for:			
Achievement gains of students in individual teachers' classes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Achievement gains of students served by teacher grade-level or other teams	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Average achievement gains of students school-wide (e.g., same bonus provided to all teachers in the school)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Higher starting salaries, add-ons, stipends, or signing bonuses for:			
Teachers who move to low-performing schools*	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Science, technology, engineering, and/or mathematics (STEM) teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Special education teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teachers qualified to teach in other shortage areas	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Loan forgiveness or tuition support for:			
Teachers who move to low-performing schools*	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Teachers qualified to teach in shortage areas, including STEM or special education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Non-financial incentives (e.g., smaller class size, planning time) for teachers in hard-to-staff subjects, low-performing schools*, or those serving as master teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

* For the purposes of this survey, a low-performing school is (a) any Title I eligible school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or (b) any high school (regardless of Title I status or funding) that has a cohort graduation rate (percent of 9th graders who graduate within 4 or 5 years) that is less than 60 percent over the past several years.

21. Indicate whether your SEA supported differentiated principal compensation systems in the following ways in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, or plans to in 2011-2012.

SEA Role to Support Differentiated Principal Compensation Systems	Had This Role in 2009-2010 (Check all that apply.)	Had This Role in 2010-2011 (Check all that apply.)	Planning to Have This Role in 2011-2012 (Check all that apply.)
Administers a statewide differentiated principal compensation system in which:			
LEA participation is required	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
LEA participation is optional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Assists <u>LEA-designed</u> differentiated principal compensation system by:			
Providing LEAs with specific funding for this purpose	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Setting standards and guidelines that LEA-designed systems:			
Are required to meet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
May choose to meet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Providing guidance and technical assistance to LEAs on the design and implementation of their systems, including providing model differentiated principal evaluation systems that LEAs may choose to use all or in part	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Requiring LEAs to submit differentiated principal compensation design and implementation plans for SEA approval	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Requiring LEAs to report on their differentiated principal compensation program operations and effectiveness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If you have not checked any boxes in Question 21, skip to Question 23; otherwise continue to Question 22.

22. Indicate whether your SEA included the components below in your statewide system or in your SEA's standards, guidelines and/or technical assistance for differentiated principal compensation systems in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, or plans to include them in 2011-2012.

Components Included in Statewide System or Standards, Guidelines and/or Technical Assistance for Differentiated Principal Compensation Systems	Included in 2009-2010 (Check all that apply.)	Included in 2010-2011 (Check all that apply.)	Expected in 2011-2012 (Check all that apply.)
Performance evaluation ratings used to determine base pay increases	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bonuses or stipends for remaining in or transferring to hard-to-staff or low-performing schools*	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bonuses for improvement or gains in student achievement in principal's school	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

* For the purposes of this survey, a low-performing school is (a) any Title I eligible school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or (b) any high school (regardless of Title I status or funding) that has a cohort graduation rate (percent of 9th graders who graduate within 4 or 5 years) that is less than 60 percent over the past several years.

23. Indicate whether your SEA issued any of the standards and guidelines listed below, related to educator certification, licensure, and/or educator preparation programs, in 2009-2010 or 2010-2011, or plans to issue guidelines in 2011-2012.

SEA strategies to shape educator certification, licensure, and/or educator preparation programs (including university-based and alternative pathway preparation and certification programs)	Issued in 2009-2010 (Check all that apply.)	Issued in 2010-2011 (Check all that apply.)	Will issue in 2011-2012 (Check all that apply.)
Simplified and/or shortened process of obtaining full licensure/certification (e.g., require fewer credit hours):			
For state university based teacher preparation programs			
For alternative pathway teacher preparation programs			
Aligned licensure/certification requirements with new or revised state standards			
Issued standards or guidelines to pre-service <u>teacher</u> preparation programs to promote:			
Alignment with new or revised state content standards			
Alignment with state teacher standards			
Provision of training on practices specifically related to improving low-performing schools			
Tracking of effectiveness of graduates based on student achievement gains and make this data publically available			
Issued standards or guidelines to pre-service <u>principal/school leader</u> preparation programs to promote:			
Alignment with new or revised state content standards			
Alignment with state teacher standards			
Provision of training on practices specifically related to improving low-performing schools			
Tracking of effectiveness of graduates based on student achievement gains and make this data publically available			

Authorized independent providers (not associated with institutions of higher education) to provide teacher training			
---	--	--	--

24. Indicate to what extent, if at all, your SEA encountered these challenges when working with LEAs and others to develop and manage a skilled educator workforce in the 2010-2011 school year.

Challenges related to developing and managing a skilled educator workforce	Extent of Challenge in 2010-2011			
	<i>(Check one in each row.)</i>			
	Not Applicable	Not a Challenge	Minor Challenge	Major Challenge
Lack of SEA staff capacity or expertise to:				
Develop reliable and fair methods for statewide system of educator performance evaluation based partly on student achievement				
To provide districts with professional development and/or technical assistance on educator recruitment, hiring, and induction				
To provide districts with professional development and/or technical assistance on differentiated teacher compensation systems				
To provide districts with professional development and/or technical assistance on educator recruitment, hiring, and induction				
Restrictions in rules and regulations on:				
How educators can be evaluated				
How educators can be compensated				
Linking of student data to individual teachers				
Lack of clear federal guidance/support on educator compensation or evaluation systems				
Current data systems make linking student test data to individual teachers difficult				
Concerns or opposition from educators about:				
Evaluating educators based, at least in part, on student achievement				
Performance based compensation				
Difficulty in measuring student growth for teachers of non-tested subjects				
Resistance from colleges and universities to modifying educator preparation programs to changing state reform priorities				

III. Support for Improving Low-Performing Schools

For this survey, we define a **low-performing school** as (1) any Title I eligible school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and (2) any high school (regardless of Title I funding or status) that has had a cohort graduation rate (percent of 9th graders who graduate within 4 or 5 years) that is less than 60 percent over the last several years.

25. Indicate whether your SEA provided the types of support below to assist LEAs efforts to improve low-performing schools in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, or plans to provide them in 2011-2012?

Types of Support Provided to Assist LEAs Efforts to Improve Low-Performing Schools	Provided in 2009-2010 (Check all that apply.)	Provided in 2010-2011 (Check all that apply.)	Planned for 2011-2012 (Check all that apply.)
Provide technical assistance and guidance on:			
Implementing the four school intervention models defined by ED ¹	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Re-organizing low-performing schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conducting needs assessments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Using technology in the schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Screen and disseminate information on:			
Education management organizations (EMOs) and charter management organizations (CMOs)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Information on school intervention experts or whole school program models	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Best practices on instructional strategies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strategies to engage parents in the community in school improvement efforts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provide professional development (either directly or through external providers) on:			
Instructional strategies for working with students in low-performing schools to teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strategies to improve low-performing schools to principals and other school leaders	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provide funding specifically for:			
Extending the regular school year, week, or day	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Using technology in low-performing schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Collaborate with LEAs to establish statewide mechanisms for recruiting skilled teachers and principals to work in low-performing schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Change collective bargaining provisions to facilitate the movement of high-performing teachers to low-performing schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use data from local educator evaluation systems to monitor the deployment of effective educators² in low-performing schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Identify and eliminate state level impediments to:			
Conversion to charter schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Autonomy in staffing and/or budgeting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

¹The four school intervention models are: (1) a turnaround model where the LEA replaces the principal and rehires no more than 50 percent of the staff at a school; (2) a transformation model where the LEA replaces the principal (except in specified situations), implements a rigorous staff development and evaluation system, institutes comprehensive instructional reform, increases learning time, and provides greater operational flexibility and support for the school; (3) a restart model where the LEA converts or closes then reopens a school as a charter school under the management of a CMO or EMO. Students from the former school may attend the new school. (4) A school closure where the LEA closes the school and students enroll in higher-achieving LEA schools.

²Effective teachers are those whose students achieve acceptable rates (e.g., at least one grade level in an academic year) of student growth. Effective principals are those whose students, overall and for each subgroup, achieve acceptable rates (e.g., at least one grade level in an academic year) of student growth.

26. Indicate to what extent, if at all, your SEA encountered these challenges in efforts to support improvement of low-performing schools in the 2010-2011 school year.

Challenges related to supporting low performing schools	Extent of Challenge in 2010-2011 (Check one box in each row.)			
	Not Applicable	Not a Challenge	Minor Challenge	Major Challenge
Lack of SEA staff capacity or expertise to:				
Screen and disseminate information on EMOS, CMO's and school turn around experts				
Provide guidance and technical assistance on whole-school reform/turn around models to districts				
Identify and disseminate best practices concerning improving low performing schools				
Provide professional development focused on improving low performing schools				
Current data systems make tracking the success of school improvement efforts difficult				
Lack of clear Federal guidance/support focused on implementing whole-school reform/turn around models				
Restrictions in rules and regulations regarding:				
Number of schools that can be closed, opened as charters or restructured in other ways				
Extension of school days/years				
Extent of autonomy that districts and schools can be granted in terms of staffing or budgets				
Teacher hiring practices				
Concerns or opposition from educators about closing or restructuring schools				

IV. SEA Reform Priorities for the 2011-2012 School Year

27. We realize that SEAs may need to make choices about their emphasis on particular reform areas. Indicate the priority level of each SEA reform area – for the 2011-2012 school year.

- Select only one “highest” priority reform area.
- If your SEA will not address one or more of the priority areas in 2011-2012, check “Not applicable.”

Priorities	Level of Priority for the 2011-2012 School Year (Check one in each row.)				
	Highest Priority	High Priority	Medium Priority	Low Priority	Not Applicable
Adopting new or revised state content standards in:					
Mathematics or reading/English language arts					
Other subjects					
Developing state assessments:					
New assessments aligned with the new or revised state content standards					
New interim assessments					
Implementing data systems and increasing use of technology:					
On-line data systems that store and report data on student achievement					
Instructional technology for use in classrooms					
Implementing reforms to increase educator quality:					
Improved strategies to recruit and hire effective educators*					
Improved teacher induction programs					
Improved principal induction programs					
Evaluation systems that rely in part on value-added or growth models to hold teachers accountable for improved student outcomes					
Performance-based compensation systems for educators					
Incentives or programs to attract and retain effective educators in low-performing schools**					
Other programs or strategies to improve the performance of low-performing schools					

* Effective teachers are those whose students achieve acceptable rates (e.g., at least one grade level in an academic year) of student growth. Effective principals are those whose students, overall and for each subgroup, achieve acceptable rates (e.g., at least one grade level in an academic year) of student growth.

** For the purposes of this survey, a low-performing school is (a) any Title I eligible school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or (b) any high school (regardless of Title I status or funding) that has a cohort graduation rate (percent of 9th graders who graduate within 4 or 5 years) that is less than 60 percent over the past several years.

V. SEA Recovery Act Spending for Reforms

In this section, we ask about how SEAs spent education funds received through the Recovery Act and were reserved for SEA activities. An SEA may have received Recovery Act funds through one or more programs, including the:

- State Fiscal Stabilization Fund,
- Race to the Top,
- State Longitudinal Data System
- Education Technology State Grants
- the Teacher Incentive Fund,
- a School Improvement Grant
- the Title I Supplemental Appropriation
- the IDEA Supplemental Appropriation

Note that we are not asking you to report on spending of Education Job Funds which your SEA may have received.

28. Thinking about all of the Recovery Act funds your SEA received in **2009-2010 and 2010-2011**, estimate the percentage of those funds that your SEA allocated for:

1. SEA staff position expenditures (*including new jobs created and existing jobs maintained*);
 2. expenditures for data systems and classroom or instructional technology
 - o *this includes SEA expenditures for planning, administering, and maintaining state data systems that track student achievement over time, link students to teachers of record, and track educator quality. Also include SEA expenditures for computers and software for educator or student use in classroom learning activities, assistive technology for special education students, other informational technology materials and equipment (e.g., smartboards, telecommunications); and*
 3. all other non-staff SEA expenditures.
- *Do not include in the percentages Recovery Act funds that were passed through to LEAs.*

Spending of Recovery Act funds	Percentage
Staff position expenditures	
Expenditures on data systems and classroom or instructional technology	
Other non-staff expenditures	
Total Recovery Act funds Reserved for SEA Activities	100%

29. Identify whether your SEA spent Recovery Act funds reserved for SEA activities to support the six reform areas below. Among those reform areas where the SEA spent Recovery Act funds, identify the 3 reform areas where your SEA spent the largest portion of its Recovery Act funds for SEA activities during the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 school years. Exclude Recovery Act funds that get passed through to LEAs.

- Enter a '1' for the reform area where your SEA devoted the largest amount of its Recovery Act funds for SEA activities; a '2' for the second largest amount of funds; and a '3' for the third largest amount of funds. Each number should be used once.
- Include professional development activities funded by the Recovery Act under the appropriate reform area. For example, funds used to train teachers on the Common Core State Standards would be included under New or Revised Content Standards and Assessments.

Reform Areas for Recovery Act Spending for SEA Activities	SEA Spent Recovery Act Funds to Support the Reform Area in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 (Enter Yes or No)	Among the Areas Where the SEA Spent Recovery Act Funds, Identify the Top Three Areas of SEA Spending in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 (Enter 1, 2, and 3 once in the table)
<p>Data systems Include SEA expenditures for planning, administering, and maintaining state systems that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • track student achievement over time • link students to teachers of record • track educator quality 		
<p>Classroom or instructional technology Include SEA expenditures for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • computers and software for educator or student use in classroom learning activities • assistive technology for special education students • other informational technology materials and equipment (e.g., smartboards, telecommunications) 		
<p>New or Revised Content Standards and Assessments Include SEA expenditures for planning, implementing, or overseeing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • new or revised standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, science, and/or social studies • new interim and summative student assessments in mathematics, reading/ language arts, science, and/or social studies aligned with new or revised state content standards 		
<p>Differentiated Educator Compensation Include SEA expenditures for planning and administering state systems for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • performance-based compensation for teachers and principals • additional compensation for serving as master teachers or instructional specialists, teaching in hard-to-staff subjects, or working in high- need schools <p>Also include SEA expenditures for overseeing or supporting LEA-designed compensation systems</p>		

<p>Reform Areas for Recovery Act Spending for SEA Activities</p>	<p>SEA Spent Recovery Act Funds to Support the Reform Area in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 (Enter Yes or No)</p>	<p>Among the Areas Where the SEA Spent Recovery Act Funds, Identify the Top Three Areas of SEA Spending in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 (Enter 1, 2, and 3 once in the table)</p>
<p>Educator quality Include SEA expenditures for planning and administering state systems for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recruitment • hiring • induction • performance evaluation activities • placing mentors or evaluators in districts or schools <p>Also include SEA expenditures for overseeing or supporting LEA-designed induction programs and compensation systems</p>		
<p>Restructuring and reorganizing schools Include SEA expenditures for planning, administering, or overseeing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • costs of partnering with an outside organization • placing lead teachers and instructional coaches in schools • lowering class sizes • extending school day/week/year • short terms costs of restaffing the school <p>Also include SEA expenditures for overseeing or supporting LEA efforts to restructure and reorganize schools</p>		

30. Enter the following SEA revenue amounts for last three school/fiscal years.

- Revenue amounts should be the sum of revenues from local, intermediate, state, federal, and other (e.g., private/philanthropic funds) sources.

School/fiscal year	Total Revenues	Total Revenues for Operating Purposes	Total Revenue for Capital Outlays and Debt Service
2010-2011 (fiscal year 2011)			
2009-2010 (fiscal year 2010)			
2008-2009 (fiscal year 2009) ¹			

¹The total revenues value for the 2008-2009 school year should be the sum of the local, intermediate, state, federal, and other revenues reported by the SEA for the U.S. Department of Education's 2009 National Public Education Financial Survey.