

OMB#: 1850-0877

Expiration Date:

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

District Survey

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, 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 by Westat 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
I. Existence of Low-Performing Schools in Your District			
II. District strategies related to educator recruitment, hiring, and induction			
III. Educator performance evaluation and compensation systems			
IV. District strategies related to restructuring or reorganizing schools to improve student learning			
V. District strategies related to state standards, curricula, and assessments			
VI. District reform priorities for the 2011-2012 school year			
VII. District spending of Recovery Act funds			

I. Existence of Low-Performing Schools in Your District

1. 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

2. 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 <u>2009-2010</u> <i>(Enter Yes or No)</i>	Status in <u>2010-2011</u> <i>(Check one in each row.)</i>		
		No Current District Plans to Use the Strategy	District Was Actively Planning or Developing the Strategy	District Used the Strategy
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.

3. 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 <u>2009-2010</u> (Enter Yes or No)	Status in <u>2010-2011</u> for Schools (Check one in each row.)					Targeted the Strategy to Low-Performing Schools in <u>2010-2011</u> (Enter Yes or No*)
		No Current District Plans to Use the Strategy	District Was Actively Planning or Developing 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.

4. 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			
	<i>(Check one in each row.)</i>			
	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

5. 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 or Developing 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.

6. 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 <u>2009-2010</u> <i>(Enter Yes or No)</i>	Status in <u>2010-2011 for Educators</u> <i>(Check one in each row.)</i>					Targeted the Use of the Component to Educators in Low-Performing Schools in <u>2010-2011</u> <i>(Enter Yes or No*)</i>
		No Current Plans to Include the Component	Was Actively Planning Use or Developing the Component	The Component Was Used in the Compensation 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*							

	Component in the System in <u>2009-2010</u> <i>(Enter Yes or No)</i>	Status in <u>2010-2011</u> for Educators <i>(Check one in each row.)</i>					Targeted the Use of the Component to Educators in Low-Performing Schools in <u>2010-2011</u> <i>(Enter Yes or No*)</i>
		No Current Plans to Include the Component	Was Actively Planning Use or Developing the Component	The Component Was Used in the Compensation of ...			
				Half of Educators or Fewer	More Than Half of Educators but Not All Educators	All Educators	
Components of the educator compensation system in your district							
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.

7. 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.

8. 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

9. 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 or Developing 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*							

	Strategy Used in <u>2009-2010</u> <i>(Enter Yes or No)</i>	Status in <u>2010-2011</u> for Schools <i>(Check one in each row.)</i>					Targeted the Strategy to Low-Performing Schools in <u>2010-2011</u> <i>(Enter Yes or No*)</i>
		No Current District Plans to Use the Strategy	District Was Actively Planning or Developing the Strategy	District Used the Strategy for...			
				Half of Schools or Fewer	More Than Half of Schools but Not All Schools	All Schools	
Strategies to Support School Restructuring or Reorganization							
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.

10. 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 or Developing 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							

	Strategy Used in <u>2009-2010</u> <i>(Enter Yes or No)</i>	Status in <u>2010-2011</u> <i>(Check one in each row.)</i>					Targeted the Strategy to Low-Performing Schools in <u>2010-2011</u> <i>(Enter Yes or No *)</i>
		No Current District Plans to Use the Strategy	District Was Actively Planning or Developing the Strategy	District Used Strategy for...			
				Half of Schools or Fewer	More Than Half of Schools but Not All Schools	All Schools	
Strategies to improve instruction							
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.*

11. 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					Targeted Professional Development to Teachers in Low-Performing Schools in 2010-2011 (Enter Yes or No*)	
		(Check one in each row.)						
		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 assessment ¹ results for instructional planning								
Using interim assessment ² 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.

¹A 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.

12. 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

13. 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*)

14. 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*)

15. 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 <i>(Enter Yes or No)</i>	Other New or Revised State Content Standards <i>(Enter Yes or No)</i>
Mathematics		
Reading/English language arts		
Science		
Social studies		

16. 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 <u>2009-2010</u> (Enter Yes or No)	Status in <u>2010-2011</u> for Schools (Check one in each row.)					Targeted the Strategy to Low-Performing Schools in <u>2010-2011</u> (Enter Yes or No*)
		No Current District Plans to Use the Strategy	District Was Actively Planning or Developing 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.

Professional development area and delivery mode	Professional Development Made Available or Provided in <u>2009-2010</u> (Enter Yes or No)	Status in <u>2010-2011 for Educators</u> (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							
---------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

17. Indicate whether your district made available or provided the **professional development** activities below to educators 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.

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

18. 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				

19. 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*

20. 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 <i>(Enter Yes or No)</i>
Mathematics	
Reading/English language arts	
Science	
Social studies	

21. 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 Used in 2009-2010 <i>(Enter Yes or No)</i>	Status in 2010-2011 for Schools <i>(Check one in each row.)</i>					Targeted the Strategy to Low-Performing Schools in 2010-2011 <i>(Enter Yes or No *)</i>
		No Current District Plans to Use the Strategy	District Was Actively Planning or Developing 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.

¹A 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.

22. 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.

	Extent of Challenge in 2010-2011			
	<i>(Check one in each row.)</i>			
Challenges implementing assessments and using data systems	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

23. 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 educators ¹				
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 schools ^{1,*}				
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 assessments ²				
New interim assessments ³				
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.

²A 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.

VII. 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.

24. 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
 - o *(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%

25. 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%	

26. 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • track student achievement over time • link students to teachers of record • track educator quality 		
Classroom or instructional technology Include expenditures for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • new or revised standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, science, and/or social studies 		

Reform Areas for Recovery Act Spending	District Spent Recovery Act Funds to Support the Reform Area in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 <i>(Enter Yes or No)</i>	Among the Areas Where the District Spent Recovery Act Funds, Top Three Areas of District Recovery Act Spending in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 <i>(Enter 1, 2, and 3 once in the table)</i>
Assessments <i>Include expenditures for implementing:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> interim and summative student assessments in mathematics, reading/ language arts, science, and/or social studies 		
Differentiated Educator Compensation <i>Include expenditures for implementing systems for:</i> <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 		
Educator quality <i>Include expenditures for implementing systems for:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> recruitment hiring induction performance evaluation activities 		
Restructuring and reorganizing schools <i>Include expenditures such as:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 		

27. 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.

28. 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 Improvement Grant	Race to the Top	Teacher Incentive Fund	Investing in Innovation Fund	Title I ARRA Supplement	IDEA ARRA Supplement	Other Recovery Act Funds ¹
a. LEA Sample School A							
b. LEA Sample School B							
c. LEA Sample School C							

¹Other 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.