APPENDIX C

RECRUITING PROTOCOL WITH STATE ADMINISTRATOR

OMB No. XXXX-XXXX
Approval Expires: XX/XX/20XX

RECRUITING PROTOCOL WITH STATE ADMINISTRATOR

IMPACT EVALUATION OF RACE TO THE TOP AND SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

RECRUITING PROTOCOL WITH STATE ADMINISTRATOR

INTRODUCTION AND REACHING THE PROPER PERSON

[*Use the SIG application contact as the first point of contact. Once initial contact is made, with either a gatekeeper or the contact, and the purpose of the call is explained, offer to send relevant information and a summary of questions for contact to review prior to continuing the call at a later time. If state did not receive RTT funds, skip all references below to RTT.]*

IF YOU REACH THE GATEKEEPER:

Hello, my name is _____ from _____. I am calling on behalf of the U.S. Department of Education which is conducting an evaluation of the School Improvement Grants and Race to the Top programs. The evaluation will involve all states that were awarded grants and is a critical part of your state's participation in these programs. May I speak with _____ about this evaluation?

[Before you are transferred, get the gatekeeper's name. If contact is not available, ask to leave voicemail on direct line.]

IF YOU REACH THE CONTACT DIRECTLY:

Hello, my name is _____ from _____. I am calling on behalf of the U.S. Department of Education. The department will be sending you a letter within the next month or so about the evaluation it is conducting of the School Improvement Grants and Race to the Top programs. The evaluation will involve all states that were awarded grants and is a critical part of your state's participation in these programs. According to our records, you are the main contact person for the School Improvement Grants. Is that correct?

Can you also tell me who is the main contact person for the Race to the Top program?

[*If not correct person for SIG, get name, title, phone number of correct person. Get contact information for RTT. Say thank you and goodbye. Contact the proper person and start again with above.]*

As you know, the School Improvement Grants and Race to the Top funds are designed to help states, districts, and schools implement educational reforms to turn around struggling schools and improve the academic performance of students. This evaluation will help the Department of Education and other policymakers, including Congress, understand the implementation and impact of the programs.

I would like to briefly describe the evaluation. After the study overview, I would also like to discuss the process used by the state to apply for and award the School Improvement Grants and get some information about your state's student data system. This information will help us finalize some key aspects of the study design. I can give

you the overview now and we can set up another time for this discussion if you don't have time now or would like to include others on the call.

BACKGROUND, PURPOSE, AND STUDY OVERVIEW

[*Provide sufficient details about the study to proceed with call. Do not get bogged down in design issues.]*

The goal of the evaluation is to understand whether and how the Race to the Top and School Improvement Grant programs achieve their goals. In order to study the implementation of school turnaround models funded by School Improvement Grants and the reform efforts funded by Race to the Top, we'll be conducting telephone interviews with state and district officials and administering a web survey to school principals. We will also collect student-level and school-level data to examine student outcomes.

The interviews and surveys will take place in spring 2012, and also possibly in spring 2013 and 2014, if the Department of Education opts to continue the evaluation for two additional years. We will collect administrative data as they become available in the summer or fall of 2012 (and again possibly in 2013 and 2014, if the evaluation is extended).

In total, the evaluation will include all 50 states and the District of Columbia, approximately 220 districts, and approximately 1,200 schools.

This study is being conducted for the Department of Education by Mathematica Policy Research, American Institutes for Research, and Social Policy Research Associates.

Do you have any questions or concerns about the study? [*If so, answer to best of your ability but if you are not sure of the answer, please say 'This issue has not come up before. I will bring it to the study team and get back to you as soon as I get an answer. Thank them for bringing up such a good question.*]

To finalize the study components, we need to understand how states determined which schools were eligible for and received School Improvement Grants as well as the process the state used to determine which schools would receive Race to the Top funds for the purposes of implementing any of the four Department of Education-specified school turnaround models. We would like to hear how your state ranked schools in order to determine which schools were eligible for School Improvement Grant funds (that is, Tier I, II, and III schools). We are interested specifically in the application for the School Improvement Grant funds that was awarded in Fiscal year 2010. This is the year in which there was $3.5 billion available for School Improvement Grants due to additional funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The state applications for this round of funding were due to the Department of Education on February 8, 2010. Are you the best person to discuss this?

> [If NO] Who should I speaking with instead? [*Get contact information and ask if he/she can notify the new contact that you'll be calling*.]

Can you/this person or the RTT contact provide similar information for Race to the Top? That is, can this person provide information about how your state determined which schools would receive Race to the Top funds for implementing one of the four school turnaround models specified by the Department of Education?

> [IF NO:] Who should I speak with instead? [*Get contact information. Thank the contact for his/her time, and ask if he/she can notify the new contact that you'll be calling*.]

CONTINUE IF CONTACT CAN ANSWER SIG QUESTIONS

These questions may take up to an hour. If you have some time now, perhaps we can start and if we don't finish, we can schedule another meeting to finish our discussion. If you don't have time now to start these questions or would like to include others in the call, we can schedule a meeting, preferably in the next two weeks.

May I continue with these questions or would you like to schedule a meeting?

[IF WANT TO SCHEDULE A MEETING] When would be the best time to talk in the next two weeks? We expect this meeting may take up to an hour. [MAKE A FIRM APPOINTMENT FOR THE FOLLOW-UP CALL.]

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS – SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY

[*If this is a follow up meeting, thank the contact for taking the time to talk and reiterate that we are focusing on the application for the School Improvement Grant funding that was awarded in Fiscal Year 2010*.]

I'm going to start with some questions which will help us to confirm or clarify information from publicly available sources.

1. I would like to first confirm some information from your state's SIG application.

   - We understand there were __ eligible schools in Tier I. Is this correct?
   - We understand there were __ eligible schools in Tier II. Is this correct?
   - We understand there were __ eligible schools in Tier III. Is this correct?

2. Can we confirm the number of eligible schools that received funding?

   [SKIP QUESTIONS FOR TIERS WHERE THERE WERE NO ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS]

   - We understand the state made awards to ___ eligible schools in Tier I. Is this correct?
   - We understand the state made awards to ___ eligible schools in Tier II. Is this correct?

- We understand the state made awards to ___ eligible schools in Tier III. Is this correct?

[IF STATE DID NOT MAKE ANY AWARDS TO TIER I SCHOOLS, SKIP Q. 3-4.]

3. I'm going to ask you some questions about how, under the original definitions, you determined which schools were eligible. Let's start with Tier I. I understand that, under the original definition, in order to determine which schools were eligible in Tier I, you had to rank Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring based on achievement. Can you describe this process?

   IF STATE USED A RANKING PROCESS, USE PROBES BELOW AS NEEDED.

   Probes:

   - How many components entered into the final ranking score?
   - Describe each component separately.
   - How was each component calculated?
   - Did these components refer to a certain time period? If so, which components and what was the time period?
   - How were the components weighted or combined to get the composite/final ranking or score for each school?
   - Did you use the lowest achieving (based on composite score) five percent schools or another cut-off value to determine which schools were eligible?

   IF STATE DID NOT USE A RANKING PROCESS, RECORD THIS AND ASK:] Can you describe the process by which you determined the eligible schools for Tier I under the original definition?

4. To identify eligible schools for Tier I, you also had to rank all your Title I high schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring based on graduation rate in order to determine which high schools had a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years. Can you describe this process?

   Probes:

   - Which years is the graduation rate based on?
   - How did you combine the annual graduation rates for a composite graduation rate?
   - Did you use the 60% graduation rate or another cut-off value to determine which high schools were eligible?

[IF STATE DID NOT MAKE ANY AWARDS TO TIER II SCHOOLS, SKIP Q. 5-6.]

5. Let's talk about Tier II now. I understand that in order to determine which schools were eligible in Tier II, you had to rank all your secondary schools that are eligible

for, but not receiving, Title I funds based on achievement. Can you describe this process?

IF STATE USED A RANKING PROCESS, USE PROBES BELOW AS NEEDED.

Probes:

- How did you define 'secondary school'?
- How many components entered into the final ranking score?
- Describe each component separately.
- How was each component calculated?
- Did these components refer to a certain time period? If so, which components and what was the time period?
- How were the components weighted or combined to get the composite/final ranking or score for each school?
- Did you use the lowest achieving (based on composite score) five percent schools or another cut-off value to determine which schools were eligible?

IF STATE DID NOT USE A RANKING PROCESS, RECORD THIS AND ASK:] Can you describe the process by which you determined the eligible schools for Tier I under the original definition?

6. To identify eligible schools for Tier II, you also had to rank all your secondary schools that are eligible for, but not receiving, Title I funds based on graduation rate in order to determine which high schools had a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years. Can you describe this process?

   Probes:

   - Which years is the graduation rate based on?
   - How did you combine the annual graduation rates for a composite graduation rate?
   - Did you use the 60% graduation rate or another cut-off value to determine which high schools were eligible?

7. Did you use the expanded tier definitions to determine the eligibility of any schools?

   Probes:

   - If so, which tiers?
   - How many schools in each tier did you identify as eligible using the expanded tier definition?

[IF STATE HAD NO NEWLY ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS IN TIER I, SKIP Q. 8.]

8. I understand that in order to determine the newly eligible schools for Tier I, you had to rank all Title I-eligible elementary schools based on achievement. Can you describe this process?

   IF STATE USED A RANKING PROCESS, USE PROBES BELOW AS NEEDED.

   Probes:

   - How many components entered into the final ranking score?
   - Describe each component separately.
   - How was each component calculated?
   - Did these components refer to a certain time period? If so, which components and what was the time period?
   - How were the components weighted or combined to get the composite/final ranking or score for each school?
   - Did you use the lowest achieving (based on composite score) five percent schools or another cut-off value to determine which schools were eligible?

   IF STATE DID NOT USE A RANKING PROCESS, RECORD THIS AND ASK:] Can you describe the process by which you determined the eligible schools for Tier I under the expanded definition?

[IF STATE HAD NO NEWLY ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS IN TIER II, SKIP Q. 9-10.]

9. Let's talk about newly eligible schools in **Tier II** now. I understand that in order to determine which schools were newly eligible in Tier II, you had to rank all your Title I-eligible secondary schools based on achievement. Can you describe this process?

   IF STATE USED A RANKING PROCESS, USE PROBES BELOW AS NEEDED.

   Probes:

   - How many components entered into the final ranking score?
   - Describe each component separately.
   - How was each component calculated?
   - Did these components refer to a certain time period? If so, which components and what was the time period?
   - How were the components weighted or combined to get the composite/final ranking or score for each school?
   - Did you use the lowest achieving (based on composite score) five percent schools or another cut-off value to determine which schools were eligible?

IF STATE DID NOT USE A RANKING PROCESS, RECORD THIS AND ASK:] Can you describe the process by which you determined the eligible schools for Tier II under the expanded definition?

10. To identify newly eligible schools for Tier II, you also had to rank all your Title I-eligible secondary schools based on graduation rate in order to determine which high schools had a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years. Can you describe this process?
    Probes:

    - Which years is the graduation rate based on?
    - How did you combine the annual graduation rates for a composite graduation rate?
    - Did you use the 60% graduation rate or another cut-off value to determine which high schools were eligible?

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS – DISTRICT APPLICATION PROCESS

Now, let's talk about the district applications for School Improvement Grants funding. The School Improvement Grants application from the Department of Education called for these grants to go to schools that demonstrate the strongest commitment to use the funds for the purposes of improving student achievement. Accordingly, states were required to describe how they will assess the districts' commitment to design and implement interventions consistent with the department's requirements.

11. Your state's SIG application includes the following description of how your state determined or defined whether a district had the commitment to design and implement school intervention models fully and effectively [SUMMARIZE INFORMATION FROM THE STATE'S SIG APPLICATION.] Is that correct? Are there any additional details I should be aware of regarding how your state made this decision?

    Probes:

    - Did you have certain criteria?
    - If yes, what were the criteria?
    - How did the criteria differ in importance?

12. The School Improvement Grants application from the department also asked states to explain how they will evaluate whether a district lacks capacity to implement a school intervention model in each Tier I school. Can you provide a brief description of how your state determined or defined whether a district had the capacity to implement a school intervention model in each Tier I school?

    Probes:

- Did you have certain criteria?
- If yes, what were the criteria?
- How did the criteria differ in importance?

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS – FUNDING OF SCHOOLS

Let's turn to the process your state used to decide which eligible schools to fund.

[IF STATE FUNDED ALL OF THEIR TIER I and II SCHOOLS, SKIP Q. 13-14.]

13. You indicated that not all of the eligible Tier I and II schools received funding. How did the state determine which of the eligible Tier I schools would receive School Improvement Grants funding? For example, if you did not approve funding for all schools below the 5 percent achievement cutoff, did you use some other achievement cutoff (such as the lowest-achieving 3 percent) to determine which schools would receive funds? If so, what was that cutoff? As another example, if you approved funding for more schools than just those below the 5 percent achievement cutoff, did you use some other achievement cutoff (such as the lowest-achieving 6 percent or 7 percent)? If so, what was that cutoff?

14. Was this decision made separately within each district, or was it a statewide decision? For example, you might have approved funding for the lowest-achieving 3 percent of schools in one district, but the lowest-achieving 4 percent in another district.

[IF STATE DID NOT FUND ANY TIER III SCHOOLS, SKIP Q. 15-17.]

15. You indicated above that some Tier III schools were funded. How many of these Tier III schools received funding for the purpose of implementing a school turnaround model? We're focused only on the four turnaround models specified by the School Improvement Grants criteria: transformation, restart, turnaround, and school closure.

    Clarification: Some Tier III schools may have received funding for purposes other than the implementation of these four models.

[IF STATE DID NOT FUND ANY TIER III SCHOOLS FOR PURPOSE OF IMPLEMENTING ONE OF FOUR SPECIFIED SCHOOL TURNAROUND MODELS, SKIP Q. 16 – 17.]

16. How did you determine which Tier III schools would receive School Improvement Grants funding for the purposes of implementing a school turnaround model? For example, did you choose all schools between the 5 percent achievement cutoff and some higher cutoff to receive School Improvement Grants funding? If so, what was that higher cutoff?

17. Was this decision made separately within each district, or was it a statewide decision? For example, you might have approved funding for the lowest-achieving 6 percent of schools in one district, but the lowest-achieving 7 percent in another district.

18. Is the state using (or did it already use) the criteria it used to rank the schools' eligibility for School Improvement Grants to determine school eligibility for any other programs, or funding sources, or other interventions? If so, what are they?

    Examples: using the same process and cutoffs to assign schools for other programs/interventions, like a math curriculum.

RACE TO THE TOP [REMINDER: *If state did <u>not</u> receive RTT funds, skip the following section.]*

Now, I'd like to ask you questions about Race to the Top in your state.

19. Did your state use Race to the Top funds to implement any of the four school turnaround models specified by the Department of Education in any schools in the 2010-2011 school year?

[IF STATE DID NOT USE ANY RTT FUNDS TO IMPLEMENT ONE OF FOUR SPECIFIED TURNAROUND MODELS, SKIP Q. 20- 25]

20. Did all schools that received Race to the Top funds to implement a turnaround model in the 2010-2011 school year implement a school turnaround model that year?

21. To determine which schools would receive Race to the Top funds for implementing a school turnaround model in the 2010-2011 school year, did you use the same Tier I and II original definitions that you used to determine which schools would receive School Improvement Grants funds?

    [IF YES:] In general, can you help me understand which schools you decided to serve with Race to the Top funds? For example, did you use School Improvement Grants funds to serve the lowest-achieving 3 percent of schools, and Race to the Top funds to serve schools between 3 and 5 percent?

    [IF NO:] Please tell me how the state ranked schools in order to identify which schools would receive Race to the Top funds in the 2010-2011 school year to support the implementation of one of the four school turnaround models specified by the Department of Education.

22. I understand that, when determining which schools would receive Race to the Top funds, you had the option of including Title I-ineligible schools that would have been considered "persistently lowest-achieving" if they were eligible for Title I funds. Did you include any Title I-ineligible schools in the set of schools that were designated to receive Race to the Top funds for implementing a school turnaround model in the 2010-2011 school year?

[IF NO, GO TO Q. 23.]

[IF YES:] How many Title I-ineligible schools did you designate to receive Race to the Top funds for implementing a school turnaround model in the 2010-2011 school year?

(a) [IF LESS THAN FOUR, GO TO Q. 23.]

(b) [IF GREATER THAN FOUR, OR THE CONTACT CANNOT ANSWER THE QUESTION:] Please tell me how your state ranked Title I-ineligible schools in order to identify which schools would receive Race to the Top funds.

23. Did you provide Race to the Top funding for the purposes of implementing one of the four school turnaround models in the 2010-2011 school year to all the Tier I and II schools? We're focused only on the four turnaround models specified by the School Improvement Grants criteria: transformation, restart, turnaround, and school closure.

[IF YES, GO TO Q. 24.]

[IF NO:]

a. How many of the Tier I and II schools received Race to the top funds for the purpose of implementing one of the four specified turnaround models?

b. How did the state determine which Tier I and II schools would receive Race to the Top funding in the 2010-2011 school year for the purposes of implementing a school turnaround model? For example, if you did not approve funding for all schools below the 5 percent achievement cutoff, did you use some other achievement cutoff (such as the lowest-achieving 3 percent) to determine which schools would receive funds? If so, what was that cutoff? As another example, did you use School Improvement Grants funds to serve the lowest-achieving 1 to 3 percent of schools, and Race to the Top funds to serve schools between 3 and 5 percent?

c. Was this decision made separately within each district, or was it a statewide decision? For example, you might have approved funding for the lowest-achieving 3 percent of schools in one district, but the lowest-achieving 4 percent in another district.

24. Did you provide Race to the Top funding to any Tier III schools in the 2010-2011 school year for the purposes of implementing one of the four school turnaround models specified by the Department of Education? We're focusing only on the four turnaround models specified by the School Improvement Grants criteria: transformation, restart, turnaround, and school closure.

[IF NO, GO TO Q. 25.]

[IF YES:]

a. How did you determine which Tier III schools would receive Race to the Top funding in the 2010-2011 school year for the purposes of implementing one of the four school turnaround models? For example, did you choose all schools between the 5 percent achievement cutoff and some higher cutoff to receive Race to the Top funding? If so, what was that higher cutoff?

b. Was this decision made separately within each district, or was it a statewide decision? For example, you might have approved funding for the lowest-achieving 6 percent of schools in one district, but the lowest-achieving 7 percent in another district.

25. Is the state using (or did it already use) the criteria it used to rank the schools' Race to the Top eligibility to determine school eligibility for any other interventions? If so, what are they?

    Examples: using the same process and cutoffs to assign schools for other programs/interventions, like a math curriculum.

STUDENT-LEVEL DATA AVAILABILITY *[To the extent possible (to save time for respondents), please look up information on the data elements below based on publicly-available sources (so that you're simply confirming the information below with respondents).]*

The discussion we just had will help us determine whether your state will be used in our analysis to determine the impact of receiving funds to implement school turnaround models on student achievement. Because your state might be chosen for this component of the study, we might need you to provide student-level data for this analysis. (We can provide more specific information about the study's data needs once we've determined which components of the study your state will be involved in.)

26. At the elementary school level, what statewide tests are administered [TEST NAME, SUBJECT AREA] and when does this happen during the school year? At the middle school/junior high level? At the high school level?

27. Have these tests changed at all between 2007 and 2010? If so, when? How did they change?

28. Do students need to pass any of these tests for promotion or graduation?

    [IF NO, SKIP TO Q.29.]

    [IF YES:]

    a. Which test?

    b. Do students have multiple chances at passing? Please describe.

29. Now I'm going to discuss the data we are interested in for the study and ask you a few questions about each data element. But before we do this, can you tell me who is responsible for preparing or handling the data and can answer questions about the data system? [GET THAT PERSON'S CONTACT INFO.]

    For each element, can you tell me if the state has these data and for how many years back?

    a. Do you have student ID numbers?

    b. Are these student IDs stable over time?

        (2) [IF NO:] When did they change? Do they change every year, or did they change only during one or more specific years?

    b. Are the student IDs used by the district different from the student IDs used by the state?

    c. Do you have standardized state test scores (from the tests used for No Child Left Behind)?
    (1) What is the name of the state English/language arts test used for NCLB?
    (2) What is the name of the state math test used for NCLB?
    (3) Do you have scale scores (NCEs) or percentile ranks for each test?
    (4) Do you have numbers of questions correct for each test?
    (5) Do you have proficiency levels for each test?

    d. Do you have standardized test scores from other tests (such as statewide quarterly assessments, DIBELS, or SAT)?

    e. Do you have an indicator for whether students graduated from high school?

    f. Do you have an indicator for whether students enrolled in college after leaving high school? We are interested in any post-secondary enrollment (four-year or community college), because the Department of Education is interested in whether School Improvement Grants and Race to the Top funds have any effect on the number of students who enroll in any kind of college after leaving high school.

    g. Do you have data on whether students completed one year of college credit? If not this exact variable, what kind of information do you have on college credits? [NOTE EXACTLY WHAT DATA ARE AVAILABLE.]

    h. Do you have student-level data on average daily attendance rates (or number of days absent)?

    i. Do you have year-by-year school affiliation for students who change schools within the state?

    j. Do you have year-by-year information on students' English language learner (ELL) status?

30. What is the process and what are the requirements for obtaining the kinds of data we've been discussing? For example, do we need to submit a formal data request?

31. Are there any other requirements for participating in the study that we should be aware of?

32. Do you charge anything for providing data? If so, what do you charge?

33. What is the turnaround time for receiving these data? Does it differ for different tests (for example, English/language arts test, math test, elementary-level tests, middle school tests, and high school tests)?

34. Who should be our main contact person for collecting student records data? [GET NAME, TITLE, PHONE NUMBER, AND EMAIL.]

SCHOOL-, DISTRICT-, AND STATE-LEVEL DATA AVAILABILITY QUESTIONS

Because we'll also need some school-level data for the study, I'd like to ask you some questions about the type of school-level data that the state maintains.

35. For each data element, can you tell me if the state has these data and for how many years back?

    a. Do you have student ID numbers?

    b. Are these student IDs stable over time?

        (1) [IF NO:] When did they change? Do they change every year, or did they change only during one or more specific years?

    c. Are the student IDs used by the district different from the student IDs used by the state?

    d. Do you have school-level high school graduation rates? [IF NO:] Do you have district- or state-level high school graduation rates?

    e. Do you have school-level college enrollment rates (or school-level percentages of students who said they planned to attend college)? We are interested in any post-secondary enrollment (four-year or community college). [IF NO:] Do you have district- or state-level college enrollment rates (or planned college enrollment rates)?

    f. Do you have school-level rates (or district-level or state-level rates) of completion of one year of college credit? If not this exact variable, what kind of information do you have on college credits? [NOTE EXACTLY WHAT DATA ARE AVAILABLE.]

g. Do you have school-level average daily attendance rates (or number of days absent)? [IF NO:] Do you have district- or state-level average daily attendance rates (or number of days absent)?

36. What is the process and what are the requirements for obtaining the kinds of school level data we've been discussing? For example, do we need to submit a formal data request?

37. Do you charge anything for providing data? If so, what do you charge?

38. What is the turnaround time for receiving these school level data?

39. Who should be our main contact person for collecting these school level data? [GET NAME, TITLE, PHONE NUMBER, AND EMAIL.]

CONTACTS FOR STATE INTERVIEWS

We will be conducting telephone interviews with state administrators about the implementation of School Improvement Grants and school reform efforts funded with Race to the Top grants. We will be looking at reforms in the following areas: standards and assessments, data systems, efforts to improve the effectiveness of teachers and leaders (and equity in their distribution across schools), state capacity to implement reforms, charter schools, and school turnaround. We are interested in general reforms and whether and how those reforms may specifically target English Language Learners.

40. In addition to you, are there other state administrators or staff who are involved with reform efforts in these areas with whom we should speak?

    [FOR EACH OF THE SIX TOPIC AREAS, GET A NAME, TITLE, PHONE NUMBER, AND EMAIL.]

    1. Standards and assessments: _____

    2. Data system: _____

    3. Efforts to improve the effectiveness of teachers and leaders (and equity in their distribution across schools):_____

    4. State capacity to implement reforms: _____

    5. Charter schools: _____

    6. School turnaround: _____

WRAP UP

Thank you for this extremely helpful information. In the next three weeks, I will be submitting a memorandum of understanding for the state to review and sign. We will be contacting the staff involved with the state student data systems about the collection of school level and if needed, student level data.

Before we end the call, I just want to check to see if you have any questions? Thank you so much for your time.

AFTER THE CALL

MAKE SURE YOU:

1. SEND AN EMAIL TO THANK THE CONTACT AND CONFIRM ANY NEXT STEPS THAT YOU AGREED TO DURING THE CALL.

2. ENTER INFORMATION FROM YOUR CALL IN THE RECRUITING DATABASE AND UPDATE PROTOCOL DOCUMENTATION TOOL.