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**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, D.C. 20202-4651. If you have comments on 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 for this study come 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. The reports prepared for the study will summarize survey findings across individuals and institutions and will not associate responses with a specific district, school, or person. We will not provide information that identifies you or your district 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 (ARRA or the Recovery Act) to support these reforms, and (3) the challenges associated with the reforms.

* This survey focuses on district reform efforts. The survey includes seven sections and covers the topics listed in the table below. Given the scope of topics covered in this survey, we anticipate that several different district staff will contribute responses to various items.
* Your district’s responses are critical to drawing lessons to improve 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.
* All survey results will be presented as aggregate findings and no individual districts will be named or otherwise identified in any study reports or other communications that use survey data.
* The study, including this survey, is being conducted byWestat and its partners, Policy Studies Associates, the University of Wisconsin, and Chesapeake Research Associates. IES is providing technical direction.
* Once your district’s survey is complete, please provide the following information for the district administrator(s) who assisted with the completion of each section of the survey.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Survey Section | For Each Person(s) Who Responded to a Survey Section  |
| Position Title  | Number of Years in the Position | Estimated total minutes to respond  |
| 1. Existence of Low-Performing Schools in Your District
 |  |  |  |
| 1. District strategies related to educator recruitment, hiring, and induction
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Educator performance evaluation and compensation systems
 |  |  |  |
| 1. District strategies related to restructuring or reorganizing schools to improve student learning
 |  |  |  |
| 1. District strategies related to state standards, curricula, and assessments
 |  |  |  |
| 1. District reform priorities for the

2011-2012 school year |  |  |  |
| 1. District spending of Recovery Act funds
 |  |  |  |

1. **Existence of Low-Performing Schools in Your District**
2. Throughout this survey, we ask if your district targeted particular reform strategies to low-performing schools or educators in low-performing schools. For this survey, we define **a low-performing school** as:
	* any Title I eligible school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
	* 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.

Did your district have any schools identified as low-performing in the 2010-2011 school year?

🞏 Yes

🞏 No

*If you checked “No” to item 1, you will be directed to skip subsequent topics related to low-performing schools.*

**II. District Strategies Related to Educator Recruitment, Hiring, and Induction**

1. Indicate whether your district used the strategies below to **recruit new educators** (i.e., those in their first year of teaching or principal experience) in the **2009-2010** and **2010-2011** school years.
	* *Report strategies that* ***your district*** *used. Do not report on any strategies that your state education agency (SEA) or schools are using independently of district strategies.*

| Strategies to recruit new educators  | Strategy Used in **2009-2010** *(Enter Yes or No)* | Status in **2010-2011***(Check one in each row.)* |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No Current District Plans to Use the Strategy | District Was Actively Planning orDeveloping the Strategy | District Used theStrategy  |
| **Focus recruitment efforts on new teachers from university-based preparation programs that:** |
| Are aligned with state content standards |  |  |  |  |
| Specialize in preparing teachers for teaching in low-performing schools\*  |  |  |  |  |
| Have evidence of the effectiveness of its graduates based on their students’ achievement gains |  |  |  |  |
| Have established strong partnerships with your district |  |  |  |  |
| **Use alternative teacher pipelines (e.g., Teach for America, local alternative program) as a source of teacher recruits** |  |  |  |  |
| **Provide financial or classroom supports to teachers with provisional or emergency certificates to obtain full certification in STEM or special education** |  |  |  |  |
| **Use non-traditional administrator training programs (such as New Leaders for New Schools or district-run programs) to recruit new principals** |  |  |  |  |

***\*****Note if your district does not have any* ***low-performing schools*** *(as defined in Section I), skip to the next row.*

1. Indicate whether your district used the strategies below to **support school hiring and new teacher induction** (i.e., help for teachers in their first year of teaching) in the **2009-2010** and **2010-2011** school years. Indicate whether any of these strategies were **targeted to low-performing schools** in 2010-2011.

| Strategies to support school hiring and new teacher induction  | Strategy Used in **2009-2010** *(Enter Yes or No)* | Status in **2010-2011 for Schools** *(Check one in each row.)* | Targeted the Strategy to Low-Performing Schools in **2010-2011***(Enter Yes or No\*)* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No Current District Plans to Use the Strategy | District Was Actively Planning orDeveloping the Strategy | District Used the Strategy for… |
| Half of Schools or Fewer | More Than Half of Schools but Not All Schools | All Schools |
| **Provide school leaders with the authority to hire more qualified transfer candidates without regard to district seniority status** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Minimize the assignment of inexperienced teachers to low-performing schools\*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Make available or provide ongoing professional development for principals on how they can identify, recruit, and hire effective teachers\*\*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Provide first year teachers with a full year of mentoring and observation, feedback, and demonstrations by assigned mentors and/or skilled teachers**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

***\*****Note if your district does not have any* ***low-performing schools*** *(as defined in Section I), skip to the next row.*

\*\*Effective teacher are those whose students achieve acceptable rates (e.g*.*, at least one grade level in an academic year) of student growth.

1. Indicate to what extent, if at all, your district encountered these **challenges** when recruiting, hiring, and supporting new educators in the **2010-2011** school year

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Challenges when recruiting, hiring, and supporting new educators | Extent of Challenge in 2010-2011*(Check one in each row.)* |
| Not Applicable | Not a Challenge | Minor Challenge | Major Challenge |
| **Insufficient funding to implement or sustain new educator induction programs**  |  |  |  |  |
| **Lack of district staff capacity or expertise to:** |
| Identify and recruit effective educators\* |  |  |  |  |
| Train mentors/coaches to support new educators  |  |  |  |  |
| Develop partnerships with alternative educator preparation programs |  |  |  |  |
| **Restrictions in rules and regulations relating to:** |
| How teachers can be hired or assigned to schools |  |  |  |  |
| How principals be hired or assigned to schools |  |  |  |  |
| **Lack of clear SEA guidance/support concerning hiring and/or induction**  |  |  |  |  |
| **Lack of information concerning quality of teacher training programs**  |  |  |  |  |
| **Shortage of qualified applicants**  |  |  |  |  |

\*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.

III. Educator Performance Evaluation and Compensation Systems

1. Indicate whether your district included the components below in the **educator performance evaluation system** in use in your district in the **2009-2010** and **2010-2011** school years. Indicate whether any of these components were **targeted to educators in low-performing schools** in 2010-2011.

| Components of educator performance evaluation system in your district | Component in the System in **2009-2010** *(Enter Yes or No)* | Status in **2010-2011 for Educators** *(Check one in each row.)* | Targeted the Use of the Component to Educators in Low-Performing Schools in **2010-2011***(Enter Yes or No \*)* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No Current Plans to Include the Component | Was Actively Planning Use orDeveloping the Component |  The Component Was Used in the Evaluation of… |
| Half of Educators or Fewer | More Than Half of Educators but Not All Educators | All Educators  |
| **Teacher evaluation system** |
| **Uses a rating scale or rubric that defines three or more performance levels to evaluate classroom instruction or practice**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Includes at least two yearly observations of classroom instruction with written feedback** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Uses multiple observers (such as master teachers, coaches, or peers as well as school administrators)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Requires evaluators to be trained to conduct reliable and accurate classroom observations** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Includes student achievement gains in NCLB grades/subjects in determining individual teacher performance ratings**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Includes student achievement gains in other grades/subjects in determining individual teacher performance ratings**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Provides teachers with specific suggestions for professional development activities designed to help them improve in the areas covered by the evaluation**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Principal evaluation system** |
| **Includes student achievement gains or growth in determining principals’ performance ratings** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

***\*****Note if your district does not have any* ***low-performing schools*** *(as defined in Section I), skip to the next row.*

1. Indicate whether your district included the components below in the **educator compensation system** in use in your district in the **2009-2010** and **2010-2011** school years. Indicate whether any of these components were **targeted to educators in low-performing schools** in 2010-2011.

| Components of the educator compensation system in your district | Component in the System in **2009-2010** *(Enter Yes or No)* | Status in **2010-2011 for Educators** *(Check one in each row.)* | Targeted the Use of the Component to Educators in Low-Performing Schools in **2010-2011***(Enter Yes or No\*)* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No Current Plans to Include the Component | Was Actively Planning Use orDeveloping the Component | The Component Was Used in theCompensation of … |
| Half of Educators or Fewer | More Than Half of Educators but Not All Educators | All Educators  |
| **Teacher compensation system**  |
| **Provides base pay increases, add-ons, or stipends to teachers based in part on:** |
| Ratings of classroom observations of teaching practice  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Achievement gains of students in individual teachers’ classes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Demonstrating higher levels of instructional skills via National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification or a similar state or LEA performance assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Serving as master teachers or instructional specialists, or teacher coaches/mentors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  **Provides one-time bonuses for:**  |
| Achievement gains of students in individual teachers’ classes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Achievement gains of students served by teacher grade-level or other teams (e.g., same bonus provided to teachers of students in the same grade) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average achievement gains of students school-wide (e.g., same bonus provided to all teachers in the school) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Provides higher starting salaries, add-ons, stipends, or signing bonuses for:**  |
| Teachers who move to teach in low-performing schools\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Science, technology, engineering, and/or mathematics (STEM) teachers  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Special education teachers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teachers qualified to teach in other shortage areas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Provides loan forgiveness or tuition support for:** |
| Teachers who move to low-performing schools\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teachers qualified to teach in shortage areas, including STEM or special education |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Provides non-financial incentives (e.g., smaller class size, planning time, reduced classroom hours) for teachers in hard-to-staff subjects, low-performing schools, or those serving as master teachers** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Principal compensation system** |
| **Includes performance evaluation ratings in determining base pay increases** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Includes bonuses or stipends in addition to base pay for remaining in or transferring to hard-to-staff or low-performing schools**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Provides bonuses for improvements or gains in student achievement in their school**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

***\*****Note if your district does not have any* ***low-performing schools*** *(as defined in Section I), skip to the next row.*

1. Indicate whether your district employs the approaches below **to use student achievement data** **in decisions about educator tenure, assignment, and retention** in the **2009-2010** and **2010-2011** school years. Indicate whether any of these uses of student achievement data were **targeted to educators in low-performing schools** in 2010-2011.
	* + *Report on how* ***your district*** *used these data. Do not report on how schools may use this information if they are responsible for decisions related to tenure and retention.*

| Uses of Student Achievement Data for Tenure,Assignment, and Retention | Used in **2009-2010** *(Enter Yes or No)* | Status in **2010-2011 for Educators** *(Check one in each row.)* | Targeted the Use of Student Achievement Data to Educators in Low-Performing Schools in**2010-2011***(Enter Yes or No \*)* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No Current District Plans to Use Data  | District Was Actively Planning to Use Data  | Used for… |
| Half of Educators or Fewer | More Than Half of Educators but Not All Educators | All Educators  |
| **Use gains or growth in the achievement of teachers’ students in deciding teacher:** |
| Tenure |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dismissal or non-retention with the district |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retention in the school or reassignment to another school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Use gains or growth in the achievement of students in the principal’s school in deciding whether:** |
| The principal is retained as leader of the school or reassigned to another school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The principal ‘s contract is renewed or tenure given  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

***\*****Note if your district does not have any* ***low-performing schools*** *(as defined in Section I), skip to the next row.*

1. Indicate to what extent, if at all, your district encountered these **challenges** when implementing educator evaluation and compensation systems in the **2010-2011** school year.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Challenges when implementing educator evaluation and compensation systems | Extent of Challenge in 2010-2011*(Check one in each row.)* |
| Not Applicable | Not a Challenge | Minor Challenge | Major Challenge |
| **Insufficient funding to:** |
| Provide performance-based compensation to all eligible teachers |  |  |  |  |
| Provide differential compensation for teachers in high need areas (i.e., low performing schools, STEM subjects)  |  |  |  |  |
| **Lack of district staff capacity or expertise to:** |
| Develop reliable approaches for rating educator performance based, in part, on student achievement |  |  |  |  |
| Conduct comprehensive educator performance evaluations  |  |  |  |  |
| Identify professional development needs of teachers based on performance evaluations |  |  |  |  |
| **Current data systems make linking student test data to individual teachers difficult** |  |  |  |  |
| **Restrictions in rules and regulations on:** |
| How educators can be evaluated |  |  |  |  |
| How educators can be compensated |  |  |  |  |
| **Lack of clear SEA guidance/support on educator compensation or evaluation system** |  |  |  |  |
| **Concerns or opposition from school staff/staff unions 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**  |  |  |  |  |

**IV. District Strategies Related to Restructuring or Reorganizing Schools to Improve Student Learning**

1. Indicate whether your district used the strategies below **to support school restructuring or reorganization** in the **2009-2010** and **2010-2011** school years. Indicate whether any of these strategies were **targeted to low-performing schools** in 2010-2011.

| Strategies to Support School Restructuring or Reorganization | Strategy Used in**2009-2010***(Enter Yes or No)* | Status in **2010-2011 for Schools** *(Check one in each row.)* | Targeted the Strategy to Low-Performing Schools in **2010-2011***(Enter Yes or No\*)* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No Current District Plans to Use the Strategy | District Was Actively Planning orDeveloping the Strategy | District Used the Strategy for…  |
| Half of Schools or Fewer | More Than Half of Schools but Not All Schools | All Schools |
| **District policies or programs that:** |
| Extend the regular school day and/or week, including “Saturday” school or before/after school sessions (required for some students) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Extend the regular school year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Allow school leaders to deviate from standard district staffing or budgeting patterns to implement school-specific reforms  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Improve teacher working conditions to attract and retain effective teachers\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Identify and screen qualified charter or education management organizations (CMOs or EMOs) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contract with CMOs, EMOs, or community organizations to operate schools |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Replace a substantial proportion of the teachers in individual low-performing schools\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Target chronically low-performing schools for closure\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Replace principals in low-performing schools\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Use longitudinal data to track success of school improvement models |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Conduct district-organized parent information sessions tailored to individual school improvement efforts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **District technical assistance to schools to help them:**  |
| Identify and screen potential school improvement models |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Screen and select school improvement experts for low-performing schools\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Conduct a needs assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Convert to a charter school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Use additional budgeting or staffing flexibility provided by the district or SEA  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

***\*****Note if your district does not have any* ***low-performing schools*** *(as defined in Section I), skip to the next row.*

\*\*Effective teacher are those whose students achieve acceptable rates (e.g*.*, at least one grade level in an academic year) of student growth.

1. Indicate whether your district used the strategies below to help individual schools **improve instruction and related support activities** in the **2009-2010** and **2010-2011** school years. Indicate whether any of these strategies were **targeted to low-performing schools** in 2010-2011.

| Strategies to improve instruction | Strategy Used in **2009-2010** *(Enter Yes or No)* | Status in **2010-2011** *(Check one in each row.)* | Targeted the Strategy to Low-Performing Schools in **2010-2011***(Enter Yes or No \*)* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No Current District Plans to Use the Strategy | District Was Actively Planning orDeveloping the Strategy | District Used Strategy for…  |
| Half of Schools or Fewer | More Than Half of Schools but Not All Schools | All Schools |
| **Requires schools to:**  |
| Conduct a comprehensive needs assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Submit improvement plans that detail: |
| Implementation of a whole school improvement model (from a partner or an outside vendor) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Changes in curricula, instructional methods, or staffing that are not part of implementing a whole school improvement model |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Use instructional coaches to support teacher learning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Provide one-on-one or small group instructional sessions for struggling students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Have smaller class sizes than typical for grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Modify daily schedules to increase the amount of instructional time for reading/English language arts or mathematics  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Purchase technology to support instruction (includes computers and software for teacher or student use in the classroom) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Partner with an organization that specializing in instructional improvement, e.g., local universities or outside vendors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Schedule common planning time for teachers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implement school-level programs to:  |
| Address students’ emotional and social needs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Encourage family and community involvement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Orient parents to school improvement efforts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Provide computers and software to schools for student use in classroom learning activities** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Provide assistive technology to schools for special education students**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Provide technical assistance to schools (either directly or through outside vendors) in using new computers and software**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

***\*****Note if your district does not have any* ***low-performing schools*** *(as defined in Section I), skip to the next row.*

1. Indicate whether your district made available or provided the **professional development activities** below **related to supporting school restructuring and improving instruction** in the **2009-2010** and **2010-2011** school years. Indicate whether any of these activities were **targeted to teachers in low-performing schools** in 2010-2011.
	* + *Report only in* ***district-level*** *plans and activities. Do not report on your state education agency (SEA) activities associated with professional development.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Professional development to support school restructuring/improvement | Professional Development Made Available or Provided in 2009-2010*(Enter Yes or No)* | Status in **2010-2011 for Teachers***(Check one in each row.)* | Targeted Professional Development to Teachers in Low-Performing Schools in 2010-2011*(Enter Yes or No\*)* |
| No Current District Plans to Make Available or Provide Professional Development | District Was Actively Planning to Make Available or Provide Professional Development | District Made Available or Provided Professional Development to: |
| Half of Teachers or Fewer | More than Half of Teachers but Not All Teachers | All Teachers |
| **Focus of professional development provided or made available by district to teachers** |
| **Improving content knowledge in STEM**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Specific school improvement models**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Differentiating instruction** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Literacy instruction** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Using student summative assessment1 results for instructional planning** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Using interim assessment2 results to adapt instruction** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Using technology for instruction** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Engaging the community/****parents in school efforts**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

***\*****Note if your district does not have any* ***low-performing schools*** *(as defined in Section I), skip to the next row.*

*1*A summative assessment summarizes learning as of a particular point in time and is used for evaluative purposes (e.g., a grade).  Examples of summative assessments include state or district standards-based assessments or an end of course assessment.

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

1. Indicate to what extent, if at all, your district encountered these **challenges** when supporting school restructuring and improvement in the **2010-2011** school year.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Challenges when supporting school restructuring and improvement | Extent of Challenge in 2010-2011*(Check one in each row.)* |
| Not Applicable | Not a Challenge | Minor Challenge | Major Challenge |
| **Insufficient funding to:** |
| Implement whole-school/turn around intervention models  |  |  |  |  |
| Make substantial changes to school day/year schedules  |  |  |  |  |
| Support special programs for students and families |  |  |  |  |
| Support school-based experts (outside consultants, instructional specialists/coaches, mentors) |  |  |  |  |
| **Lack of district staff capacity or expertise to:** |
| Provide guidance/advice concerning whole-school/turn around intervention models |  |  |  |  |
| Screen or provide guidance/advice about EMOs and CMOs |  |  |  |  |
| Train instructional specialists, coaches, lead teachers, or school-based professional development staff |  |  |  |  |
| **Current data systems make tracking the success of school improvement efforts difficult** |  |  |  |  |
| **Insufficient help from local social services and other community-based organizations in providing services to students and their families** |  |  |  |  |
| **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 schools can be granted in terms of staffing or budgets |  |  |  |  |
| **Lack of clear SEA guidance/support focused on adoption of whole school-reform models**  |  |  |  |  |
| **Concerns or opposition from parents or community groups about closing or restructuring schools** |  |  |  |  |
| **Lack of evidence about:** |
| Effectiveness of school improvement models  |  |  |  |  |
| Performance of CMOs/EMOs or other intervention experts |  |  |  |  |
| **Unwillingness of high-performing teachers to move to low-performing schools\*** |  |  |  |  |

***\*****Note if your district does not have any* ***low-performing schools*** *(as defined in Section I), skip to the next row.*

**V. District Strategies Related to State Standards, Curricula, and Assessments**

1. Has your state adopted the Common Core State Standards in Mathematics and/or English Language Arts?

🞏 Yes (*Skip to Item 15)*

🞏 No (*Continue to Item 14)*

🞏 Do Not Know (*Continue to Item 14)*

1. Has your state adopted other new or revised content standards in Mathematics, Reading/English Language Arts, Science, and/or Social Studies in the 2009-10 or 2010-2011 school years?

🞏 Yes (*Continue to Item 15)*

🞏 No (*Skip to Item 21)*

🞏 Do Not Know (*Skip to Item 21)*

1. Indicate for which **subjects** your district planned or implemented activities related to the Common Core State Standards or other new or revised state content standards for the **2010-2011** school year.
* ***New*** *content standards adopted by your state may include the Common Core State Standards or other state content standards adopted or revised in 2009-2010 or 2010-2011.*
* *Report only* ***district-level*** *plans and activities for this school year. For example, enter a ‘No’ for mathematics under the Common Core State Standards if your state adopted these standards, but the district was not actively planning or implementing activities related to these mathematics standards in 2010-2011.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subjects in Which District Was Planning or Implementing New or Revised State Content Standards | District Was Planning or Implementing Activities In 2010-2011 Related to… |
| Common Core State Standards*(Enter Yes or No)* | Other New or Revised State Content Standards *(Enter Yes or No)* |
| Mathematics |  |  |
| Reading/English language arts |  |  |
| Science |  |  |
| Social studies |  |  |

1. Indicate whether your district used the strategies below **to implement any new or revised state content standards** in the **2009-2010** and **2010-2011** school years. Indicate whether any of these strategies were **targeted to low-performing schools** in 2010-2011.

| Strategies to implement the Common Core State Standards or other new or revised state content standards  | Strategy Used **2009-2010** *(Enter Yes or No)* | Status in **2010-2011 for Schools***(Check one in each row.)* | Targeted the Strategy to Low-Performing Schools in **2010-2011***(Enter Yes or No\*)*  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No Current District Plans to Use the Strategy | District Was Actively Planning orDeveloping the Strategy | District Used the Strategy for… |
| Half of Schools or Fewer | More Than Half of Schools but Not All Schools | All Schools |
| **Distribute to schools instructional materials (e.g., curriculum guides, curriculum frameworks, pacing guides) aligned with new or revised state standards in:** |
| Mathematics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reading/English language arts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Science and/or social studies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Distribute to schools instructional materials specifically designed to helping the following students master new or revised state content standards:** |
| English language learners  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students with disabilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Provide district criteria for schools to use when selecting a new curriculum aligned with the new or revised state standards for:** |
| Mathematics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reading/English language arts  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Science and/or social studies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

***\*****Note if your district does not have any* ***low-performing schools*** *(as defined in Section I), skip to the next row.*

1. Indicate whether your district made available or provided the **professional development** activities below toeducators who teach or mentor in that subject **related to the Common Core State Standards or other new or revised state content standards** in the **2009-2010** and **2010-2011** school years. Indicate whether any of these activities were **targeted to educators in low-performing schools** in 2010-2011.
* *Report only* ***district-level*** *plans and activities. Do not report on SEA sponsored or organized professional development activities.*

| Professional development area and delivery mode | Professional Development Made Available or Provided in **2009-2010***(Enter Yes or No)* | Status in ***2010-2011 for Educators****(Check one in each row.)* | Targeted Professional Development to Applicable Educators in Low-Performing Schools in 2010-2011*(Enter Yes or No\*)* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No Current District Plans to Make Available or Provide Professional Development | District Was Actively Planning to Make Available or Provide Professional Development | District Made Available or Provided Professional Development to… |
| Half of Applicable Educators or Fewer | More Than Half of Applicable Educators but Not All Educators  | All Applicable Educators |
| **In-person professional development provided or made available by district on:**  |
| **The new or revised state standards for teachers who teach:**  |
| Mathematics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reading/English language arts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Science and/or social studies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Instructional strategies for teachers specifically designed to help the following students****master new or revised state content standards:** |
| English language learners  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students with disabilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **The new or revised state standards for instructional coaches and/or mentors in:** |
| Mathematics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reading/English language arts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Science and/or social studies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Instructional strategies for instructional coaches and/or mentors specifically designed to help** **the following students master new or revised state content standards:** |
| English language learners  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students with disabilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Internet-based professional development provided or made available by district on:**  |
| **The new or revised state standards for educators who teach or mentor in:** |
| Mathematics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reading/English language arts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Science and/or social studies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Instructional strategies for educators specifically designed to help the following students master new or revised state content standards:** |
| English language learners  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students with disabilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

***\*****Note if your district does not have any* ***low-performing schools*** *(as defined in Section I), skip to the next row.*

1. Indicate to what extent, if at all, your district encountered these **challenges** when planning or implementing the Common Core State Standards or other new or revised state content standards in the **2010-2011** school year.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Challenges planning or implementing any new or revised state content standards | Extent of Challenge in 2010-2011*(Check one in each row.)* |
| Not Applicable | Not a Challenge | Minor Challenge | Major Challenge |
| **Insufficient funding to:** |
| Provide adequate training to teachers on the content and use of the standards |  |  |  |  |
| Purchase new instructional materials aligned with new standards |  |  |  |  |
| Support instructional specialists or coaches to help educators implement new standards |  |  |  |  |
| **Lack of district staff capacity or expertise to:** |
| Develop new curricula guides and instructional materials aligned with new standards |  |  |  |  |
| Provide guidance about or train educators on using new standards for their instruction |  |  |  |  |
| **Lack of clear SEA guidance/support on:** |
| Specific content of new standards |  |  |  |  |
| Expectations concerning when and how standards should be implemented  |  |  |  |  |
| **Inadequate quality or availability of state-developed instructional materials aligned with standards**  |  |  |  |  |
| **Concerns or opposition focused on new standards from:** |
| School staff/staff unions  |  |  |  |  |
| Parents or other community groups |  |  |  |  |
| **Current assessments are not aligned with the new standards**  |  |  |  |  |

1. Did your district use **new** summative assessments aligned with the Common Core State Standards or other new or revised state content standards in the 2010-2011 school year?

🞏 Yes *Continue to Item 20*

🞏 No *Skip to Item 21*

1. Indicate for which **subjects** your district used **new** summative assessments aligned with the Common Core State Standards or other new or revised state content standards in the 2010-2011 school year.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subjects of New Assessments Aligned with Common Core or other new or revised state content standards  | Used New Summative Assessment in 2010-2011*(Enter Yes or No)* |
|
| Mathematics |  |
| Reading/English language arts |  |
| Science |  |
| Social studies |  |

1. Indicate whether your district used the strategies below **to implement new or existing assessments and to use data systems for storing, reporting, and using assessment results** in the **2009-2010** and **2010-2011** school years. Indicate whether any of these strategies were **targeted to low-performing schools** in 2010-2011
* *Report on strategies related to assessments in use in the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 school years. These may or may not include new assessments aligned with the Common Core State Standards or other new or revised state content standards.*
* *Report only* ***district-level*** *plans and activities. Do not report on SEA activities associated with these strategies.*

| Strategies related to new or existing assessments and data systems  | Strategy Usedin **2009-2010***(Enter Yes or No)* | Status in **2010-2011 for Schools** *(Check one in each row.)* | Targeted the Strategy to Low-Performing Schools in **2010-2011***(Enter Yes or No \*)* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No Current District Plans to Use the Strategy | District Was Actively Planning orDeveloping the Strategy | District Used the Strategy for… |
| Half of Schools or Fewer | More Than Half of Schools but Not All Schools | All Schools |
| **Implement summative assessments1 in:** |
| Non-NCLB-tested grades |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-NCLB-tested subjects |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Implement interim assessments2**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Use longitudinal data to track student achievement gains:** |
| For individual teachers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| For schools |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Provide teachers with on-line access to individual student results from:** |
| State summative assessments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| District summative assessments (not state required) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interim assessments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Use tests that are aligned across grades to better measure student growth** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Provide teachers with on-line access to individual students’ demographics information, attendance, or discipline data linked to student assessment data** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Provide computers or funds for computers for teacher and principal use in accessing and analyzing student data**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Provide educators with key aggregate student and school indicators through report cards, data dashboards, or other feedback and analysis systems**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

***\*****Note if your district does not have any* ***low-performing schools*** *(as defined in Section I), skip to the next row.*

*1*A summative assessment summarizes learning as of a particular point in time and is used for evaluative purposes (e.g., a grade).  Examples of summative assessments include state or district standards-based assessments or an end of course assessment.

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

1. Indicate to what extent, if at all, your district encountered these **challenges** when implementing assessments and using data systems for storing, reporting, and using assessment results in the **2010-2011** school year.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Challenges implementing assessments and using data systems | Extent of Challenge in 2010-2011*(Check one in each row.)* |
| Not applicable | Not a Challenge | Minor Challenge | Major Challenge |
| **Insufficient funding to:**  |
| Train educators in how to administer and use assessments |  |  |  |  |
| Support data systems that store and provide access to assessment information |  |  |  |  |
| **Lack of district staff capacity or expertise to:** |
| Provide guidance about or train educators on how to administer assessments |  |  |  |  |
| Provide guidance about or train educators on how to use assessments to improve instruction |  |  |  |  |
| Maintain and facilitate educators’ access to assessment data systems |  |  |  |  |
| **Restrictions in rules and regulations relating to what can be included in state or district data systems and how to access them** |  |  |  |  |
| **Lack of clear SEA guidance/support on using state assessment data systems** |  |  |  |  |
| **Concerns or opposition from:** |
| Parents or other community groups to additional assessments |  |  |  |  |
| School staff about additional assessments  |  |  |  |  |
| **Standardized assessments not available for enough subjects or grades** |  |  |  |  |
| **Delays in transmission of assessment results to schools or teachers** |  |  |  |  |

VI. District Reform Priorities for the 2011-2012 School Year

1. We realize that districts may need to make choices about their emphasis on particular reform areas. In the table below, indicate the priority level of each district reform area below for the **2011-2012** school year.
* *Select only one “highest” priority reform area.*

| School Reform Priorities for 2011-2012 | Level of Priority for **2011-2012** *(Check one in each row.)* |
| --- | --- |
| Highest Priority | High Priority | Medium Priority | Low Priority |
| **Implementing reforms to increase educator quality:** |
| Improved ways to recruit and hire effective educators1 |  |  |  |  |
| Improved educator induction programs  |  |  |  |  |
| Performance evaluation systems that hold educators accountable for improved student outcomes |  |  |  |  |
| Performance-based compensation systems for educators |  |  |  |  |
| Incentives or programs to attract and retain effective educators in the district’s low-performing schools1,\*  |  |  |  |  |
| **Restructuring or reorganizing schools to improve student learning:** |
| Increasing the school day, week or year |  |  |  |  |
| Providing additional budgeting or staffing flexibility  |  |  |  |  |
| Increasing oversight of low performing schools |  |  |  |  |
| Closing low-performing schools or converting them to charters\* |  |  |  |  |
| **Implementing reforms to improve instruction:** |
| Strategies for improving instruction or related student services |  |  |  |  |
| Targeting strategies for improving instruction or related student services to low-performing schools\* |  |  |  |  |
| **Implementing new or revised state content standards in:** |
| Reading/English/language arts and/or mathematics  |  |  |  |  |
| Other subjects |  |  |  |  |
| **Administering assessments:** |
| New summative assessments2 |  |  |  |  |
| New interim assessments3 |  |  |  |  |
| **Using technology:** |
| On-line data systems that provide information on student learning growth or gains |  |  |  |  |
| Use of computers and other technologies for classroom instruction |  |  |  |  |

*\*Note if your district does not have any* ***low-performing schools*** *(as defined in Section I), skip to the next row.*

1Effective 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.

*2*A summative assessment summarizes learning as of a particular point in time and is used for evaluative purposes (e.g., a grade).  Examples of summative assessments include state or district standards-based assessments or an end of course assessment.

*3* Interim assessments are tests given periodically to check student progress, not including teacher-made tests.

1. **District Spending of Recovery Act Funds**

In this section, we ask about how districts generally spent education funds received through the Recovery Act. A district may have received Recovery Act funds through one or more programs, such as the:

* State Fiscal Stabilization Fund,
* the Title I Supplemental Appropriation,
* the IDEA Supplemental Appropriation,
* Race to the Top,
* the Teacher Incentive Fund,
* a School Improvement Grant, and/or
* the Investing in Innovation Fund (i3).

A district may receive these funds directly as a grant recipient, through formula funding from the SEA, or as a sub-recipient to an SEA grant. We are interested in Recovery Act funds your district received through any of these mechanisms. Note that we are not asking you to report on Education Job Funds which your district may have received.

1. Thinking about all of the Recovery Act funds your district received in **2009-2010 and 2010-2011**, estimate the percentage of those funds that your district allocated for:
	1. staff position expenditures (including new jobs created and existing jobs maintained, at both the district and school levels)
	2. expenditures for data systems and classroom or instructional technology
		* (*this includes expenditures for data systems that: track student achievement over time, link students to teachers of record, and track educator quality. Also include 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., smart boards, telecommunications)); and*
	3. all other non-staff expenditures.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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  | 100% |

1. Thinking about all of the Recovery Act funds your district received in **2009-2010 and 2010-2011**, estimate the percentage of those funds that your district used to support low-performing schools (as defined in Section I).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Percentage of Recovery Act Funds Used to Support Low-Performing Schools | *(Check one)* |
|
| 0 |  |
| 1-25% |  |
| 26-50% |  |
| 51-75% |  |
| 76-100% |  |

1. Identify whether your district spent Recovery Act funds to support the seven reform areas below in the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 school years. Among those reform areas where your district spent Recovery Act funds, identify the 3 reform areas where your district spent the largest portion of these funds during the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 school years.
* *Enter a ‘1’ for the reform area where your district devoted the largest amount of its Recovery Act funds; 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.*

| Reform Areas for Recovery Act Spending | District Spent Recovery Act Funds to Support the Reform Area in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 *(Enter Yes or No)* | Among the Areas Where the District Spent Recovery Act Funds, Top Three Areas of District Recovery Act Spending in 2009-2010 **and** 2010-2011*(Enter 1, 2, and 3 once in the table)* |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Data systems***Include expenditures for systems that:** track student achievement over time
* link students to teachers of record
* track educator quality
 |  |  |
| **Classroom or instructional technology***Include expenditures for:** computers and software for student use in classroom learning activities
* assistive technology for special education students
* other informational technology materials and equipment (e.g., smartboards, telecommunications)
 |  |  |
| **New or Revised Content Standards***Include expenditures for implementing:** new or revised standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, science, and/or social studies
 |  |  |
| **Assessments***Include expenditures for implementing:** interim and summative student assessments in mathematics, reading/ language arts, science, and/or social studies
 |  |  |
| **Differentiated Educator Compensation***Include expenditures for implementing systems for:** 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
 |  |  |
| **Educator quality***Include expenditures for implementing systems for:** recruitment
* hiring
* induction
* performance evaluation activities
 |  |  |
| **Restructuring and reorganizing schools***Include expenditures such as:** costs of partnering with an outside organization
* placing lead teachers and instructional coaches in schools
* lowering class sizes
* short terms costs of restaffing the school
 |  |  |

1. Enter the following district revenue amounts for last three school years.
	* *Revenue amounts should be the sum of revenues from local sources (including private contributions), state sources, federal sources through the state government, and federal sources directly.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 revenue, state revenue, and federal revenue values reported by the district for the U.S. Department of Commerce’s 2009 Survey of Local Government Finances: School Systems.

1. Indicate the cumulative revenues from Recovery Act programs available to each school in your district listed below. **Include actual dollar amounts available to the school for the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 school years.**
* *If Recovery Act funds support centrally funded positions (e.g., an instructional coach) that provide assistance to a school listed below, estimate the dollar amount of that position for that school based on the amount of time the staff member is providing direct services or assistance. Include that estimate in the totals below.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School | School Improve-ment Grant | Race to the Top | Teacher Incentive Fund | Investing in Innovation Fund | Title I ARRASupplement | IDEA ARRA Supplement | Other Recovery Act Funds1 |
| 1. LEA Sample School A
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. LEA Sample School B
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. LEA Sample School C
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1 Other programs that received additional funding through the Recovery Act are: Education Technology State Grants (Title II, Part D or “Ed Tech”), McKinney-Vento Education for Homeless Children and Youth, Preschool Grants for Children With Disabilities (IDEA Part B, Section 619), and the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund.