

Appendix A

SEA Survey

OMB#: 1850-0877

Expiration Date: 04/30/2014

Charting the Progress of Education Reform

An Evaluation of the Recovery Act's Role

Survey of State Education Agencies

Spring 2012



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. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 75 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is required to obtain or retain benefit: see Sections 75.591 and 75.592 of the EDGAR regulations. If you have any comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, please write to U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC 20202-4651. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, 555 New Jersey Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20208.

Notice of Confidentiality

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

Introduction

This survey and the larger study of which it is a part are supported under a contract from the United States (U.S.) Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences (IES). The overall purposes of the study are to examine (1) ongoing education reform efforts, (2) the uses of funds available under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Act) to support these reforms, and (3) the challenges associated with the reforms.

This is the second and final data collection for the study. We appreciate your participation in last year's data collection. We shortened the length of the survey based on respondent feedback.

Your SEA's responses are critical to informing ongoing federal efforts to support education reform. In addition, your responses will help inform policy makers, educators and researchers at the local, state, and national levels of reform efforts underway and challenges being encountered.

- *The survey includes four sections and covers the topics listed in the table below. Given the scope of topics covered in this survey, we anticipate that several members of the SEA staff will contribute responses.*
 - *We will not report individual SEA responses to any survey items, including the sections identifying any challenges an SEA may face in implementing education reform. States may be identified on composite measures of implementation, drawing on responses to multiple survey items.*
 - *Once your SEA's survey is complete, please use the following chart to indicate which SEA staff contributed to the SEA's response and estimate of the number of minutes they spent on the survey.*

Survey Section	For Each Person(s) Who Responded to Survey Questions		
	Position Title	Number of Years in the Position	Estimated total minutes to respond
I. Implementation of New or Revised State Content Standards and State Assessments Aligned with the Standards			
II. Education Workforce Development and Human Resource Management			
III. Support for Improving Low-Performing Schools			
IV. SEA Recovery Act Spending on Staff and Changes in SEA Budget			

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.

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

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

The pre-filled response to this question is based on information, gathered April 2012, from the Council of Chief State School Officers and the National Governors Association Common Core State Standards Initiative website. If this response is not correct, please cross out the pre-filled response and mark the correct response.

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

► Continue to Question 1a

► Skip to Question 4

1a. Is your state's decision regarding the adoption of the Common Core State Standards likely to change in the next 12 months?

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

2. Indicate whether your SEA played any of the following roles in supporting the implementation of the Common Core State Standards in 2011-2012, or expects to in 2012-2013.

SEA Role to Support the Implementation of the Common Core State Standards	Had This Role in 2011-2012 <i>(Check all that apply.)</i>	Expects to Have This Role in 2012-2013 <i>(Check all that apply.)</i>
Provided state-developed professional development on the standards to LEAs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Supported <u>LEA-designed</u> professional development on standards by providing:		
LEAs with specific funding for this purpose	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
"Train the trainers" sessions to lead LEA staff, who will, in turn, train teachers.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Guidance and technical assistance to LEAs on the design and implementation of professional development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Identified, developed and/or distributed instructional materials (e.g., curriculum guides, pacing guides, textbooks) aligned with the standards that:		
LEAs are <u>required</u> to use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
LEAs are <u>not required</u> to use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provided resources or technical assistance to help LEAs map curriculum taught (scope and sequence) to the standards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. Indicate the status of your SEA's efforts to develop new state assessments aligned with the Common Core State Standards in 2011-2012 and when your LEAs are expected to begin using these assessments.

Assessment Areas	State was a Member of a Federally-funded Assessment Consortium in 2011-2012 (Check all that apply.)	State was Developing its Own Assessments Independently in 2011-2012 (Check all that apply.)	When are Your LEAs Expected to Begin Using Assessments Aligned with the Common Core State Standards? (Check one box in each row.)			
			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015 or Later
Mathematics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reading/English language arts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. Did your state adopt other new or revised content standards in mathematics, reading/English language arts, science and/or social studies in the 2011-2012 school year?

(Check one box only.)	
Yes, instead of the Common Core State Standards	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes, in addition to the Common Core State Standards	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

5. Indicate whether your SEA played any of the following roles in helping LEAs use assessment data to improve instruction in 2011-2012 or expects to in 2012-2013.

SEA Role to Support the Use of Assessment Data	Had This Role in 2011-2012 (Check all that apply.)	Expects to Have This Role in 2012-2013 (Check all that apply.)
Provided state-developed professional development or guidance/technical assistance to LEAs' professional development on:		
Implementation of <u>new</u> or existing state assessments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Development of <u>new</u> or existing local assessments aligned with state assessments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strategies and procedures for LEA staff to use in accessing <u>new or existing</u> state assessment data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use of <u>new or existing</u> assessment data by teachers to improve instruction (including interim/formative assessments)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use of <u>new or existing</u> assessment data by principals and school leaders in school improvement planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provided LEAs with training or technical assistance to help them develop or implement their own professional development on new or existing assessments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provided LEAs with funding specifically for developing their own professional development on new assessments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provided LEAs with funding specifically to support their local assessment data systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Continued

	Had This Role in 2011-2012 <i>(Check all that apply.)</i>	Expected to Have This Role in 2012- 2013 <i>(Check all that apply.)</i>
SEA Role to Support the Use of Assessment Data		
Provided LEAs with funding specifically to support development and maintenance of their local assessment data systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provided teachers of mathematics and reading/English language arts with student growth data for their students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Facilitated access to <u>new or existing</u> assessment data by:		
Providing educators with key LEA, school and student indicators through report cards, data dashboards, or other feedback and analysis systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Establishing and maintaining state data systems that share longitudinal data on students with local data systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. Indicate to what extent, if at all, your SEA encountered these challenges when implementing new or revised state content standards and new state assessments aligned with these content standards in the 2011-2012 school year.

- *Select "Not Applicable" if a challenge listed cannot arise in your SEA because your SEA is not implementing the specified strategy.*

Challenges When Implementing New or Revised State Content Standards and New State Assessments	Extent of Challenge in 2011-2012 <i>(Check one box in each row.)</i>			
	Not Applicable	Not a Challenge	Minor Challenge	Major Challenge
Lack of SEA staff or expertise to provide districts with professional development and/or technical assistance on:				
Implementing new or revised state content standards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Implementing new state assessments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accessing and using assessment data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Developing instructional materials aligned with the new or revised state content standards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Developing interim/formative assessments to measure student mastery of the new or revised state content standards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Opposition from educators or other groups to the new or revised:				
State content standards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
State assessments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lack of instructional materials aligned with the new or revised state content standards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lack of assessments to measure student mastery of the new or revised state content standards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Current data systems limit LEA and school access to new assessment data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

II. Educator Workforce Development and Human Resource Management

7. Indicate whether your SEA played any of the following roles in supporting the evaluation of teacher performance in 2011-2012, or expects to in 2012-2013.

SEA Role to Support the Evaluation of Teacher Performance	Had This Role in 2011-2012 <i>(Check all that apply.)</i>	Expects to Have This Role in 2012- 2013 <i>(Check all that apply.)</i>
Administered a state-developed teacher evaluation system in which:		
LEA participation is required	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
LEA participation is optional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Supported LEA-designed teacher evaluation systems by:		
Providing LEAs with specific funding for this purpose	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Setting standards and guidelines that LEA-designed systems:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are required to meet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
May choose to meet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Providing guidance and technical assistance to LEAs on the design and implementation of their systems, including providing model teacher evaluation systems that LEAs may choose to use all or in part	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Requiring LEAs to submit teacher evaluation design and implementation plans for SEA approval	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Requiring LEAs to report on their teacher evaluation system operations and effectiveness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If you have not checked any boxes in Question 7, skip to Question 9; otherwise continue to Question 8.

8. Indicate whether your SEA included any of the following components in your state-developed system or in your SEA's standards, guidelines and/or technical assistance for teacher evaluation systems in 2011-2012, or expects to include them in 2012-2013.

Components Included in State-developed System or Standards, Guidelines and/or Technical Assistance for Teacher Evaluation Systems	Included in 2011-2012 (Check all that apply.)	Expects to Include for 2012-2013 (Check all that apply.)
A rating scale or rubric that defines three or more performance levels to evaluate classroom instruction or practice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
At least two yearly observations of classroom instruction with written feedback	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Multiple observers (such as master teachers, coaches, or peers) as well as school administrators	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student achievement gains in NCLB grades/subjects used in determining individual teacher performance ratings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student achievement gains in other grades/subjects used in determining individual teacher performance ratings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teachers are provided with specific suggestions for professional development activities designed to help them improve in the areas covered by the evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Required training and certification of teacher evaluators	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use of student achievement gains or growth in making decisions on teacher placement or dismissal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

9. Indicate whether your SEA played any of the following roles in supporting the evaluation of principal performance in 2011-2012, or expects to in 2012-2013.

SEA Role to Support the Evaluation of Principal Performance	Had This Role in 2011-2012 (Check all that apply.)	Expects to Have This Role in 2012-2013 (Check all that apply.)
Administered a state-developed principal evaluation system in which:		
LEA participation is <u>required</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
LEA participation is <u>optional</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Supported <u>LEA-designed</u> principal evaluation systems by:		
Providing LEAs with specific funding for this purpose	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

continued

SEA Role to Support the Evaluation of Principal Performance	Had This Role in 2011-2012 (Check all that apply.)	Expected to Have This Role in 2012-2013 (Check all that apply.)
Setting standards and guidelines that LEA-designed systems:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are required to meet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
May choose to meet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Providing guidance and technical assistance to LEAs on the design and implementation of their systems, including providing model principal evaluation systems that LEAs may choose to use all or in part	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Requiring LEAs to submit principal evaluation design and implementation plans for SEA approval	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Requiring LEAs to report on their principal evaluation program operations and effectiveness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If you have not checked any boxes in Question 9, skip to Question 11; otherwise continue to Question 10.

10. Indicate whether your SEA included any of the following components in your state-developed system or in your SEA's standards, guidelines and/or technical assistance for principal evaluation systems in 2011-2012, or expects to include them in 2012-2013.

Components Included in State-developed System or Standards, Guidelines and/or Technical Assistance for Principal Evaluation Systems	Included in 2011-2012 (Check all that apply.)	Expects to include for 2012-2013 (Check all that apply.)
State standards for school leaders	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Multiple observers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
A rating scale or rubric that defines three or more performance levels	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student achievement gains or growth used in determining principals' performance ratings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
At least two yearly observations of leadership activities with written feedback	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Principals are provided with specific suggestions for professional development activities designed to help them improve in the areas covered by the evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Required training and certification of evaluators prior to conducting evaluations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use of student achievement gains or growth in making decisions on principal placement or dismissal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11. Indicate whether your SEA played any of the following roles in supporting differentiated teacher compensation systems in 2011-2012, or expects to in 2012-2013.

SEA Role to Support Differentiated Teacher Compensation Systems	Had This Role in 2011-2012 <i>(Check all that apply.)</i>	Expects to Have This Role in 2012- 2013 <i>(Check all that apply.)</i>
Administered a state-developed differentiated teacher compensation system in which:		
LEA participation is required	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
LEA participation is optional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Supported <u>LEA-designed</u> differentiated teacher compensation system by:		
Providing LEAs with specific funding for this purpose	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Setting standards and guidelines that LEA-designed systems:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are required to meet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
May choose to meet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Providing guidance and technical assistance to LEAs on the design and implementation of their systems, including providing model differentiated teacher compensation systems that LEAs may choose to use all or in part	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Requiring LEAs to submit differentiated teacher compensation design and implementation plans for SEA approval	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Requiring LEAs to report on their differentiated teacher compensation program operations and effectiveness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

12. Indicate whether your SEA included any of the following components in your state-developed system or in your SEA's standards, guidelines and/or technical assistance for differentiated teacher compensation systems in 2011-2012, or expects to include them in 2012-2013.

Components Included in State-developed System or Standards, Guidelines and/or Technical Assistance for Differentiated Teacher Compensation Systems	Included in 2011-2012 (Check all that apply.)	Expects to include for 2012-2013 (Check all that apply.)
Base pay increases, add-ons, or stipends to teachers based in part on:		
Ratings of classroom observations of teaching practice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Achievement gains of students in individual teachers' classes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Serving as master teachers or instructional specialists	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Demonstrating higher levels of instructional skills via National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification or a similar state performance assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
One-time bonuses for:		
Achievement gains of students in individual teachers' classes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Achievement gains of students served by teacher grade-level or other teams	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Average achievement gains of students school-wide (e.g., same bonus provided to all teachers in the school)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Higher starting salaries, add-ons, stipends, or signing bonuses for:		
Teachers who move to low-performing schools*	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Science, technology, engineering, and/or mathematics (STEM) teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Special education teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teachers qualified to teach in other shortage areas	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Loan forgiveness or tuition support for:		
Teachers who move to low-performing schools*	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teachers qualified to teach in shortage areas, including STEM or special education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Non-financial incentives (e.g., smaller class size, planning time) for teachers in hard-to-staff subjects, low-performing schools*, or those serving as master teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

13. Indicate whether your SEA played any of the following roles in supporting differentiated principal compensation systems in 2011-2012, or expects to in 2012-2013.

SEA Role to Support Differentiated Principal Compensation Systems	Had This Role in 2011-2012 <i>(Check all that apply.)</i>	Expects to Have This Role in 2012- 2013 <i>(Check all that apply.)</i>
Administered a state-developed differentiated principal compensation system in which:		
LEA participation is required	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
LEA participation is optional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Supported <u>LEA-designed</u> differentiated principal compensation system by:		
Providing LEAs with specific funding for this purpose	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Setting standards and guidelines that LEA-designed systems:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are required to meet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
May choose to meet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Providing guidance and technical assistance to LEAs on the design and implementation of their systems, including providing model differentiated principal evaluation systems that LEAs may choose to use all or in part	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Requiring LEAs to submit differentiated principal compensation design and implementation plans for SEA approval	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Requiring LEAs to report on their differentiated principal compensation program operations and effectiveness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

14. Indicate whether your SEA included any of the following components in your state-developed system or in your SEA's standards, guidelines and/or technical assistance for differentiated principal compensation systems in 2011-2012, or expects to include them in 2012-2013.

Components Included in State-developed System or Standards, Guidelines and/or Technical Assistance for Differentiated Principal Compensation Systems	Included in 2011-2012 (Check all that apply.)	Expects to Include in 2012-2013 (Check all that apply.)
Performance evaluation ratings used to determine base pay increases	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bonuses or stipends for remaining in or transferring to hard-to-staff or low-performing schools*	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bonuses for improvement or gains in student achievement in principal's school	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

15. Indicate whether your SEA played any of the following roles in shaping educator certification, licensure, and/or educator preparation programs in 2011-2012, or expects to in 2012-2013.

SEA Role to Shape Educator Certification, Licensure, and/or Educator Preparation Programs (Including University-Based and Alternative Pathway Preparation and Certification Programs)	Had This Role in 2011-2012 (Check all that apply.)	Expects to Have This Role 2012-2013 (Check all that apply.)
Simplified and/or shortened process of obtaining full licensure/certification (e.g., require fewer credit hours):		
For state university based teacher preparation programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
For alternative pathway teacher preparation programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Aligned licensure/certification requirements with new or revised state teacher and principal/school leader standards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Issued standards or guidelines to pre-service <u>teacher</u> preparation programs to promote:		
Alignment with new or revised state content standards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment with state teacher standards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provision of training on practices specifically related to improving low-performing schools*	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tracking of effectiveness of graduates based on student achievement gains and make this data publically available	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Issued standards or guidelines to pre-service <u>principal/school leader</u> preparation programs to promote:		
Alignment with new or revised state content standards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment with state principal/school leader standards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provision of training on practices specifically related to improving low-performing schools*	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tracking of effectiveness of graduates based on student achievement gains and make this data publically available	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Authorized independent providers (not associated with institutions of higher education) to provide teacher training	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Used data on effectiveness of educator preparation program graduates based on student achievement gains to make decisions about program accreditation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

16. Indicate to what extent, if at all, your SEA encountered these challenges when working with LEAs and others to develop and manage a skilled educator workforce in the 2011-2012 school year.

- Select “Not Applicable” if a challenge listed cannot arise in your SEA because your SEA is not implementing the specified strategy.

Challenges Related to Developing and Managing a Skilled Educator Workforce	Extent of Challenge in 2011-2012 (Check one box in each row.)			
	Not Applicable	Not a Challenge	Minor Challenge	Major Challenge
Lack of SEA staff or expertise to:				
Develop reliable and fair methods for statewide system of educator performance evaluation based partly on student achievement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provide LEAs with professional development and/or technical assistance on educator recruitment, hiring, and induction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provide LEAs with professional development and/or technical assistance on differentiated teacher compensation systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Restrictions in rules and regulations on:				
How educators can be evaluated	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
How educators can be compensated	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Linking of student data to individual teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lack of clear federal guidance/support on educator compensation or evaluation systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Current data systems make linking student test data to individual teachers difficult	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Concerns or opposition from educators about:				
Evaluating educators based, at least in part, on student achievement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Performance based compensation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Difficulty in measuring student growth for teachers of non-tested subjects	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Resistance from colleges and universities to modifying educator preparation programs to changing state reform priorities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

III. Support for Improving Low-Performing Schools

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

17. Indicate whether your SEA provided any of the following types of support to assist LEAs' efforts to improve low-performing schools in 2011-2012, or expects to provide them in 2012-2013.

Indicate in the last row below if your SEA provided other types of support not listed to assist LEAs' efforts to improve low-performing schools in a major way.

Types of Support Provided to Assist LEAs' Efforts to Improve Low-Performing Schools	Provided in 2011-2012 (Check all that apply.)	Expects to Provide for 2012-2013 (Check all that apply.)
Established a state-level turnaround office specifically responsible for supporting low-performing schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gave low-performing schools more flexibility to operate in exchange for greater accountability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provided technical assistance and guidance on:		
Choosing and implementing the four school intervention models defined by ED ¹	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other ways to re-organize low-performing schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conducting needs assessments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Screened and disseminated information on:		
Education management organizations (EMOs) and charter management organizations (CMOs)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
School intervention experts or whole school program models	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Best practices on instructional strategies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strategies to engage parents in LEA/school improvement efforts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provided professional development (either directly or through external providers) on:		
Instructional strategies for working with students in low-performing schools to teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strategies to improve low-performing schools to principals and other school leaders	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provided funding specifically for:		
Extending the regular school year, week, or day	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Using technology in low-performing schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Collaborated with LEAs to establish statewide mechanisms for recruiting skilled teachers and principals to work in low-performing schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

continued

Types of Support Provided to Assist LEAs' Efforts to Improve Low-Performing Schools	Provided in 2011-2012 (Check all that apply.)	Expects to Provide for 2012-2013 (Check all that apply.)
Changed collective bargaining provisions to facilitate the movement of high-performing teachers to low-performing schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Used data from state or local educator evaluation systems to monitor the deployment of effective educators ² in low-performing schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Identified and eliminated state level impediments to:		
Conversion to charter schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Autonomy in staffing and/or budgeting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other types of support, please specify:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

18. Indicate to what extent, if at all, your SEA encountered these challenges in efforts to support improvement of low-performing schools in the 2011-2012 school year.

- Select “Not Applicable” if a challenge listed cannot arise in your SEA because your SEA is not implementing the specified strategy.

Challenges Related to Supporting Low-Performing Schools	Extent of Challenge in 2011-2012 (Check one box in each row.)			
	Not Applicable	Not a Challenge	Minor Challenge	Major Challenge
Lack of SEA staff or expertise to:				
Screen and disseminate information on EMOs, CMOs and school turn around experts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provide guidance and technical assistance on whole-school reform/turnaround models to LEAs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Identify and disseminate best practices concerning improving low-performing schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provide professional development focused on improving low-performing schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Current data systems make tracking the success of school improvement efforts at the student level difficult	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lack of clear Federal guidance/support focused on implementing whole-school reform/turn around models	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Restrictions in rules and regulations regarding:				
Number of schools that can be closed, opened as charters or restructured in other ways	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Extension of school days/years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Extent of autonomy that LEAs and schools can be granted in terms of staffing or budgets	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teacher hiring practices	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Concerns or opposition from educators about closing or restructuring schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

IV. SEA Recovery Act Spending on Staff and Changes in SEA Budget

The next question asks about how SEAs spent the K-12 education funds received through the Recovery Act and were reserved for SEA activities. An SEA may have received Recovery Act funds through one or more programs, including the:

- State Fiscal Stabilization Fund
- Race to the Top
- State Longitudinal Data System
- Education Technology State Grants
- Teacher Incentive Fund
- School Improvement Grant
- Title I Supplemental Appropriation
- IDEA Supplemental Appropriation
- Other Recovery Act programs that could be used for K-12 reform activities

Note that we are not asking you to report on spending of Education Job Funds, which your SEA may have received in fall 2010.

19. Did your SEA use Recovery Act funds received since 2009 to increase or maintain the number of SEA staff positions working in any of the following areas:

Area	Uses of Recovery Act Funds Recovered Since 2009	
	Maintain the Number of SEA Staff Positions (Check all that apply.)	Increase the Number of SEA Staff Positions (Check all that apply.)
Standards and assessments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Educator workforce issues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Supporting low-performing schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Developing or maintaining longitudinal data systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

20. Did your SEA's budget increase or decrease by more than 5 percent in each of the following fiscal years? For 2012-13, do you expect that your SEA's budget will increase or decrease by more than 5 percent?

Fiscal Year	Increased by More Than 5 Percent (Check all that apply)	Decreased by More Than 5 Percent (Check all that apply)
2007-08	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2008-09	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2009-10	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2010-11	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2011-12	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2012-13	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Thank You for Your Participation in This Evaluation

