Appendix B

LEA Survey

Charting the Progress of Education Reform

An Evaluation of the Recovery Act's Role

District Survey

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. 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.

District Name:

City: State:

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 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.

- This survey focuses on district reform efforts. The survey includes six 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. However, note that **Item 1 must be answered first** so that respondents to other items respond correctly regarding low-performing schools in your district. The person who is most knowledgeable about low-performing schools in your district should answer Item 1.

- 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.

- 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 Spending and Receipt of Recovery Act Funds			

The study, including this survey, is being conducted by Westat and its partners, Policy Studies Associates, and Chesapeake Research Associates. IES is providing technical direction.

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:**

    - a Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; **or**

    - a school that was eligible for, but not served through, Title I that had it been served would have been in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; **or**

    - a 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 2011-2012 school year?

    ☐ Yes
    ☐ No

    > *If you checked "No" to Item 1, you will be directed to skip subsequent items 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 <u>recruit new educators</u> (i.e., those in their first year of teaching or principal experience) in the 2011-2012 school year.**

- *Do not report on any strategies that your state education agency (SEA) or schools are using independently of district strategies.*

District Strategies to Recruit New Educators	Status in 2011-2012 *(Check one in each row)*		
	No Current Plans to Use the Strategy	Actively Planning or Developing the Strategy	Used the Strategy
Focus recruitment efforts on new teachers from university-based programs that have evidence of the effectiveness of its graduates based on their students' achievement gains	☐	☐	☐
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	☐	☐	☐

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 2011-2012 school year.**

   If your district used a strategy for some but not all schools, indicate whether the strategy was targeted to low-performing schools in 2011-2012.

District Strategies to Support School Hiring and New Teacher Induction	Status in 2011-2012 for Schools *(Check one in each row)*					Targeted the Strategy to Low-Performing Schools in 2011-2012 *(Check Yes or No*)*
	No Current Plans to Use the Strategy	Actively Planning or Developing the Strategy	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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
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**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Provide first year teachers with a full year of mentoring and observation, feedback, and demonstrations by assigned mentors and/or skilled teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No

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

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

*** If your district used this strategy in 2011-2012, report how many schools out of all the schools in the district were affected (e.g., half of schools or fewer). All schools will only apply if all schools in your district are low performing as defined in Section I.

4. **Indicate to what extent, if at all, your district encounters these <u>challenges</u> when recruiting, hiring, and supporting new educators in the 2011–2012 school year.**

- *Select "Not Applicable" if a challenge listed <u>cannot arise in your district</u> because your district is not implementing the specified strategy.*

Challenges When Recruiting, Hiring, and Supporting New Educators	Extent of Challenge in 2011-2012 *(Check one in each row)*			
	Not Applicable	**Not a Challenge**	**Minor Challenge**	**Major Challenge**
Insufficient funding to implement or sustain new educator induction programs	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lack of district staff 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 can 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 <u>educator performance evaluation system</u> in use in your district in the 2011-2012 school year.

   If your district used a component for some, but not all educators, indicate whether the component was targeted to educators in low-performing schools in 2011-2012.

Components of Educator Performance Evaluation System in Your District	Status in 2011-2012 for Educators *(Check one in each row)*					Targeted the Use of the Component to Educators in Low-Performing Schools in 2011-2012 *(Check Yes or No*)*
	No Current Plans to Include the Component	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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Includes at least two yearly observations of classroom instruction with written feedback	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Uses multiple observers (such as master teachers, coaches, or peers as well as school administrators)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Requires evaluators to be trained to conduct reliable and accurate classroom observations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Includes student achievement gains in NCLB grades/subjects in determining individual teacher performance ratings	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Includes student achievement gains in other grades/subjects in determining individual teacher performance ratings	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Gives student achievement gains an explicit weight in determining teachers' performance ratings in grades or subjects with standardized tests	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Provides teachers with specific suggestions for professional development activities designed to help them improve in the areas covered by the evaluation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No

continued

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

Components of Educator Performance Evaluation System in Your District	Status in 2011-2012 for Educators *(Check one in each row)*					Targeted the Use of the Component to Educators in Low-Performing Schools in 2011-2012 *(Check Yes or No*)*
	No Current Plans to Include the Component	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	
Principal evaluation system						
Includes student achievement gains or growth in determining principals' performance ratings	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No

** 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 <u>educator compensation system</u> in use in your district in the 2011-2012 school year.

If your district used a component for some, but not all educators, indicate whether the component was targeted to educators in low-performing schools in 2011-2012.

Components of the Educator Compensation System in Your District	Status in 2011-2012 for Educators *(Check one in each row)*					Targeted the Use of the Component to Educators in Low-Performing Schools in 2011-2012 *(Check Yes or No*)*
	No Current Plans to Include the Component	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 evaluation system						
Provides base pay increases, add-ons, or stipends to teachers based in part on:						
Ratings of classroom observations of teaching practice	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Achievement gains of students in individual teachers' classes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Demonstrating higher levels of instructional skills via National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification or a similar state or district performance assessment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Serving as master teachers or instructional specialists, or teacher coaches/mentors	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Provides one-time bonuses for:						
Achievement gains of students in individual teachers' classes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
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)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Average achievement gains of students school-wide (e.g., same bonus provided to all teachers in the school)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No

continued

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

Components of the Educator Compensation System in Your District	Status in 2011-2012 for Educators *(Check one in each row)*					Targeted the Use of the Component to Educators in Low-Performing Schools in 2011-2012 *(Check Yes or No*)*
	No Current Plans to Include the Component	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	
Provides higher starting salaries, add-ons, stipends, or signing bonuses for:						
Teachers who move to teach in low-performing schools***	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Science, technology, engineering, and/or mathematics (STEM) teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐ Yes ☐ No
Special education teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐ Yes ☐ No
Teachers qualified to teach in other shortage areas	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No

continued

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

*** If your district used this strategy in 2011-2012, report how many educators out of all educators in the district were affected (e.g., half of educators or fewer). All educators will only apply if all educators in your district are in low-performing schools as defined in Section I.

Components of the Educator Compensation System in Your District	Status in 2011-2012 for Educators *(Check one in each row)*					Targeted the Use of the Component to Educators in Low-Performing Schools in 2011-2012 *(Check Yes or No*)*
	No Current Plans to Include the Component	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	
Principal compensation system						
Includes performance evaluation ratings in determining base pay increases	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Includes bonuses or stipends in addition to base pay for remaining in or transferring to hard-to-staff or low-performing schools	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Provides bonuses for improvements or gains in student achievement in their school	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No

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

*** *If your district used this strategy in 2011-2012, report how many educators out of all educators in the district were affected (e.g., half of educators or fewer). All educators will only apply if all educators in your district are in low-performing schools as defined in Section I.*

7. **Indicate how, if at all, your district used <u>student achievement data in decisions about educator tenure, assignment, and retention</u> in the 2011-2012 school year.**

   If your district used this data in the decisions for some, but not all, educators indicate whether the use of student achievement data was targeted to educators in low- performing schools in 2011-2012.

   - *Do not report on how schools may use this information if they are responsible for decisions related to tenure and retention.*

District Uses of Student Achievement Data for Tenure, Assignment, and Retention	Status in 2011-2012 for Educators *(Check one in each row)*					Targeted the Use of Student Achievement Data to Educators in Low-Performing Schools in 2011-2012 *(Check Yes or No*)*
	No Current Plans to Use Data	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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Dismissal or non-retention with the district	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Retention in the school or reassignment to another school	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
The principal's contract is renewed or tenure given	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No

** 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 encounters these <u>challenges</u> when implementing educator evaluation and compensation systems in the 2011-2012 school year.**

- *Select "Not Applicable" if a challenge listed <u>cannot arise in your district</u> because your district is not implementing the specified strategy.*

Challenges When Implementing Educator Evaluation and Compensation Systems	Extent of Challenge in 2011-2012 *(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 (e.g., low-performing schools, STEM subjects)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lack of district staff 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 <u>support school restructuring or reorganization</u> in the 2011-2012 school year.

   If your district used the strategy for some, but not all schools, indicate whether the strategy was targeted to low-performing schools in 2011-2012.

District Strategies to Support School Restructuring or Reorganization	Status in 2011-2012 for Schools *(Check one in each row)*					Targeted the Strategy to Low-Performing Schools in 2011-2012 *(Check Yes or No*)*
	No Current Plans to Use the Strategy	Actively Planning or Developing the Strategy	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:						
Have low-performing schools report to a specialized district turnaround office or turnaround leader who reports to the superintendent of chief academic officer	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Give low-performing schools more flexibility to operate in exchange for greater accountability	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Extend the regular school day and/or week, including "Saturday" school or before/after school sessions (required for some students)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Extend the regular school year	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Allow school leaders to deviate from standard district staffing or budgeting patterns to implement school-specific reforms	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No

continued

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

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

*** If your district used this strategy in 2011-2012, report how many schools in the district were affected (e.g., half of educators or fewer). All schools will only apply if all schools in your district are low performing as defined in Section I.

District Strategies to Support School Restructuring or Reorganization	Status in 2011-2012 for Schools *(Check one in each row)*					Targeted the Strategy to Low-Performing Schools in 2011-2012 *(Check Yes or No*)*
	No Current Plans to Use the Strategy	Actively Planning or Developing the Strategy	Used the Strategy for …			
			Half of Schools or Fewer	More Than Half of Schools but Not All Schools	All Schools	
Improve teacher working conditions to attract and retain effective teachers**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Identify and screen qualified charter or education management organizations (CMOs or EMOs)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Contract with CMOs, EMOs, or community organizations to operate schools	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Replace a substantial proportion of the teachers in individual low-performing schools***	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Target individual chronically low-performing schools for closure***	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Replace principals in individual low-performing schools***	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Use longitudinal data to track success of school improvement models	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Screen current teachers based on whether they have the competencies the district or school has determined are needed to be effective within the school environment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No

continued

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

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

*** If your district used this strategy in 2011-2012, report how many schools in the district were affected (e.g., half of educators or fewer). All schools will only apply if all schools in your district are low performing as defined in Section I.

District Strategies to Support School Restructuring or Reorganization	Status in 2011-2012 for Schools (Check one in each row)					Targeted the Strategy to Low-Performing Schools in 2011-2012 (Check Yes or No*)
	No Current Plans to Use the Strategy	Actively Planning or Developing the Strategy	Used the Strategy for ...			
			Half of Schools or Fewer	More Than Half of Schools but Not All Schools	All Schools	
Monitor and evaluate the support or assistance provided by external or district turnaround specialists	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
District technical assistance to schools to help them:						
Identify and screen potential school improvement models	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Screen and select school improvement experts for low-performing schools***	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Conduct a needs assessment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Convert to a charter school	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Use additional budgeting or staffing flexibility provided by the district or SEA	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No

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

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

  *** *If your district used this strategy in 2011-2012, report how many schools in the district were affected (e.g., half of educators or fewer). All schools will only apply if all schools in your district are low performing as defined in Section I.*

10. **Indicate whether your district used the strategies below to help individual schools improve instruction and related support activities in the 2011-2012 school year.**

If your district used a strategy for some, but not all, schools, indicate whether the strategy was targeted to low-performing schools in 2011-2012.

District Strategies to Improve Instruction	Status in 2011-2012 for Schools *(Check one in each row)*					Targeted the Strategy to Low-Performing Schools in 2011-2012 *(Check Yes or No*)*
	No Current Plans to Use the Strategy	Actively Planning or Developing the Strategy	Used the 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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Submit improvement plans that detail implementation of a whole school improvement model (from a partner or an outside vendor)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Use instructional coaches to support teacher learning	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Modify daily schedules to increase the amount of instructional time for reading/English language arts or mathematics	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Partner with an organization that specializes in instructional improvement, e.g., local universities or outside vendors	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Schedule common planning time for teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Implement school-level programs to:						
Address students' emotional and social needs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Encourage family and community involvement	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No

continued

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

District Strategies to Improve Instruction	Status in 2011-2012 for Schools *(Check one in each row)*					Targeted the Strategy to Low-Performing Schools in 2011-2012 *(Check Yes or No*)*
	No Current Plans to Use the Strategy	Actively Planning or Developing the Strategy	Used the Strategy for ...			
			Half of Schools or Fewer	More Than Half of Schools but Not All Schools	All Schools	
Provide teachers of mathematics and reading/English language arts with student growth data for <u>last</u> year's students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Provide teachers of mathematics and reading/English language arts with student growth data for <u>this</u> year's students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No

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

11. Indicate to what extent, if at all, your district encountered these <u>challenges</u> when supporting school restructuring and improvement in the 2011-2012 school year.

- *Select "Not Applicable" if a challenge listed <u>cannot arise in your district</u> because your district is not implementing the specified strategy.*

Challenges When Supporting School Restructuring and Improvement	Extent of Challenge in 2011-2012 *(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 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

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

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Do Not Know

13. Has your state adopted <u>other</u> new or revised content standards in Mathematics and/or Reading/English Language Arts in the 2011-2012 school year?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Do Not Know

14. For which subjects did your district require schools to begin implementing new or revised state content standards in 2011-2012, and for which subjects will this be required for 2012-2013?

Subjects for Which the District Required Schools Implement New or Revised State Content Standards	Required for Schools in 2011-2012	Will be Required for Schools in 2012-2013
Mathematics – Common Core State Standards	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable
Mathematics – Other New or Revised State Standards	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable
Reading/English language arts – Common Core State Standards	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable
Reading/English language arts – Other New or Revised State Standards	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable

15. **Indicate whether your district used the strategies below to <u>implement the Common Core State Standards or other new or revised state content standards in reading/English language arts and mathematics</u> in the 2011-2012 school year.**

If your district used a strategy for some, but not all, schools, indicate whether the strategy was targeted to low-performing schools in 2011-2012.

District Strategies to Implement the Common Core State Standards or Other New or Revised State Content Standards	Status in 2011-2012 for Schools *(Check one in each row)*					Targeted the Strategy to Low-Performing Schools in 2011-2012 *(Check Yes or No*)*
	No Current Plans to Use the Strategy	Actively Planning or Developing the Strategy	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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Reading/English language arts	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Distribute to schools instructional materials specifically designed to help the following students master new or revised state content standards						
English language learners	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Students with disabilities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
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	☐	☐			☐	

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

16. **Indicate whether your district made available or provided the <u>professional development activities</u> below to educators who teach or mentor in that subject <u>related to the Common Core State Standards or other new or revised state content standards</u> in the 2011-2012 school year.**

   If your district made available or provided professional development to some, but not all, applicable educators, indicate whether the activity was targeted to educators in low-performing schools in 2011-2012.

   • *Do not report SEA sponsored or organized professional development activities*

District Professional Development Area and Delivery Mode	Status in 2011-2012 for Educators *(Check one in each row)*					Targeted Professional Development to Applicable Educators in Low-Performing Schools in 2011-2012 *(Check Yes or No*)*
	No Current Plans to Make Available or Provide Professional Development	Actively Planning to Make Available or Provide Professional Development	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	
Professional development provided or made available by district on:						
The new or revised state standards for teachers who teach:						
Mathematics	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Reading/English language arts	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Instructional strategies specifically designed to help the following students master new or revised state content standards:						
English language learners	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Students with disabilities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No

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

17. **Indicate to what extent, if at all, your district encountered these <u>challenges</u> when planning or implementing the Common Core State Standards or other new or revised state content standards in the 2011-2012 school year.**

- *Select "Not Applicable" if a challenge listed <u>cannot arise in your district</u> because your district is not implementing the specified strategy.*

Challenges Planning or Implementing Any New or Revised State Content Standards	Extent of Challenge in 2011-2012 *(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 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	☐	☐	☐	☐

18. **Indicate whether your district administered new state or district assessments in the 2011-2012 school year or expects to do so in 2012-2013.**

Subjects for Which the District Administered New State or District Assessments	In 2011-2012 (*Check yes or no*)	Expects to Administer in 2012-2013 (*Check yes or no*)
Mathematics	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No
Reading/English language arts	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No

19. **Indicate whether your district used the strategies below to <u>use assessment data for improving instruction and school performance</u> in the 2011-2012 school year.**

   If your district used a strategy for some, but not all, schools, indicate whether the strategy was targeted to low-performing schools in 2011-2012.

   - *Do not report on SEA activities associated with these strategies.*

District Strategies Related to Use of Assessment Data	Status in 2011-2012 for Schools (*Check one in each row*)					Targeted the Strategy to Low-Performing Schools in 2011-2012 (*Check Yes or No*)
	No Current Plans to Use the Strategy	Actively Planning or Developing the Strategy	Used the Strategy for ...			
			Half of Schools or Fewer	More Than Half of Schools but Not All Schools	All Schools	
Implement summative assessments[1] in:						
Non-NCLB tested grades	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Non-NCLB tested subjects	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Implement interim assessment[2] in any grade/subject	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Use longitudinal data to track student achievement gains:						
For individual teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
For schools	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No

continued

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

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

[2] Interim assessments are tests given periodically to check student progress, including standardized and diagnostic assessments but <u>not</u> including teacher-developed tests.

District Strategies Related to Use of Assessment Data	Status in 2011-2012 for Schools (Check one in each row)					Targeted the Strategy to Low-Performing Schools in 2011-2012 (Check Yes or No*)
	No Current Plans to Use the Strategy	Actively Planning or Developing the Strategy	Used the Strategy for ...			
			Half of Schools or Fewer	More Than Half of Schools but Not All Schools	All Schools	
Provide teachers with on-line access to individual student results from:						
State summative assessments	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
District summative assessments	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Interim assessments	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Use tests that are aligned across grades to better measure student growth	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Provide teachers with on-line access to individual students' demographic information, attendance, or discipline data linked to student assessment data	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Provide computers or funds for computers for teacher and principal use in accessing and analyzing student data	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Provide educators with key aggregate student and school indicators through report cards, data dashboards, or other feedback and analysis systems	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Provide or make available professional development to teachers on using student summative assessment results for instructional planning	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No
Provide or make available professional development to teachers on using interim assessment results for instructional planning	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No

continued

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

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

[2] Interim assessments are tests given periodically to check student progress, including standardized and diagnostic assessments but <u>not</u> including teacher-developed tests.

District Strategies Related to Use of Assessment Data	Status in 2011-2012 for Schools *(Check one in each row)*					Targeted the Strategy to Low-Performing Schools in 2011-2012 *(Check Yes or No*)*
			Used the Strategy for …			
	No Current Plans to Use the Strategy	Actively Planning or Developing the Strategy	Half of Schools or Fewer	More Than Half of Schools but Not All Schools	All Schools	
Provide or make available professional development to teachers on how to use longitudinal assessment or student growth data to improve instruction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Yes ☐ No

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

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

[2] Interim assessments are tests given periodically to check student progress, including standardized and diagnostic assessments but <u>not</u> including teacher-developed tests.

20. Indicate to what extent, if at all, your district encountered these <u>challenges</u> when implementing assessments and using assessment data in the 2011-2012 school year.

- *Select "Not Applicable" if a challenge listed <u>cannot arise in your district</u> because your district is not implementing the specified strategy.*

Challenges Implementing Assessments and Using Data Systems	Extent of Challenge in 2011-2012 *(Check one in each row)*			
	Not Applicable	**Not a Challenge**	**Minor Challenge**	**Major Challenge**
Insufficient funding to:				
Train educators in how to administer and use assessments	☐	☐	☐	☐
Support data systems that store and provide access to assessment information	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lack of district staff 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 Spending and Receipt of Recovery Act Funds

In this section, we ask about how districts generally spent K-12 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,
- Title I Supplemental Appropriation,
- IDEA Supplemental Appropriation,
- Race to the Top,
- Teacher Incentive Fund,
- School Improvement Grant,
- Investing in Innovation Fund (i3), and/or
- Other Recovery Act Programs that could be used for K-12 reform activities.

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.

21. **Thinking about all of the K-12 Recovery Act funds your district received in 2011-2012, estimate the percentage of those funds that your district allocated for:**

    1. Staff position expenditures at the district and school levels, including
       - *New jobs created*
       - *Existing jobs maintained*

    2. Expenditures for data systems and classroom or instructional technology, including
       - *Data systems that track student achievement over time, link students to teachers of record, or track educator quality*
       - *Computers and software for educator or student use in classroom learning activities*
       - *Assistive technology for special education students*
       - *Other informational technology materials and equipment (e.g., smartboards, telecommunications)*

    3. All other non-staff expenditures

Spending of Recovery Act Funds	Percentage
Staff position expenditures	
Expenditures on data systems and classroom or instructional technology	
All other non-staff expenditures	
Total Recovery Act Funds	100%

22. Has your district used Recovery Act funds received since 2009 to increase or maintain the number of district staff positions working in any of the following areas:

Area	Uses of Recovery Act Funds Received Since 2009	
	Maintain the Number of Staff Positions (*Check yes or no*)	**Increase the Number of Staff Positions** (*Check yes or no*)
Standards and assessments	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No
Educator workforce development issues	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No
Supporting low-performing schools	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No
Data systems and data use	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No

23. Did your district budget increase or decrease by more than 5 percent in each of the following fiscal years?

Fiscal Year	Change in Budget (*Check one in each row*)		
	Increased	**Decreased**	**Neither Increased Nor Decreased**
2007-08	☐	☐	☐
2008-09	☐	☐	☐
2009-10	☐	☐	☐
2010-11	☐	☐	☐
2011-12	☐	☐	☐
Expected for 2012-13	☐	☐	☐

24. **Thinking about all of the Recovery Act funds your district received in 2011-2012, 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%	☐

25. **(A) First, indicate whether your district received Recovery Act funds from each listed program in 2011-2012.**
   - *A district may have received these funds directly as a grant recipient, through formula funding from the SEA, or as a sub-recipient to an SEA.*

   (B) Second, for each program where "yes" was selected, indicate if the school listed benefited from program funds in 2011-2012. A school benefitted from these funds if:

   - *It received a direct sub-grant,*

   - *Its staff participated in district-sponsored activities (e.g., professional development), or*

   - *It received district-purchased products/services (e.g., computers, other instruction related technology, instructional materials, instructional coaches, consultants, etc.).*

	School Improvement Grant	Race to the Top	Teacher Incentive Fund	Investing in Innovation Fund	Title I Recovery Act Supplement	IDEA Recovery Act Supplement	Other Recovery Act Funds[1]
District received	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No
Sample School #1	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No
Sample School #2	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No
Sample School #3	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☐ No

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

Thank You for Your Participation in This Evaluation