

Benefits of and Lessons Learned from Linking Teacher and Student Data

December 2007

By Terry Bergner, Julia Steiny and Jane Armstrong, Ph.D.

Increasingly, federal and state leaders are using longitudinal data systems for both policymaking and school improvement. In response, states are investing more resources in the systems' design, development and use. The Data Quality Campaign (DQC) has championed the development of state data systems based on 10 essential elements (see sidebar, page 2). One of the most crucial discussions taking place is how to link teacher and student data and the benefits of doing so. Until recently, most states have used these data systems separately, but by linking them, much more can be learned about effective teacher preparation and "what works" to improve teaching and learning in districts, schools and classrooms.

Many people immediately think of teacher accountability actions and sanctions when they hear about connecting teacher and student data. However, the benefits of linking these data systems extend far beyond accountability. Longitudinal data systems that connect teacher and student

Highlights

In this brief, find out more about:

- ▶ How several leading states are connecting teacher and student data;
- ▶ The benefits of creating these links; and
- ▶ Lessons learned by leading states.

data also are used to inform a variety of state and local policies and to help educators and policymakers focus on continuous improvement of student achievement. The more we understand the relationships among students, teachers and programs in the classroom, the more we can improve student performance over time.

In this brief, agency staff from five states that are successfully linking and using teacher and student data (Delaware, Tennessee, Utah, Washington and West Virginia) share their perspectives on the benefits of this work and the lessons they have learned. As of the 2007 DQC survey,¹ these five states have the following number of the 10 essential elements: Delaware — 10, Tennessee — 8, Utah —10, Washington — 8 and West Virginia — 9.

¹Data Quality Campaign/National Center for Educational Accountability, 2007 Survey of State P-12 Data Collection Issues Related to Longitudinal Analysis.

Please visit www.DataQualityCampaign.org to see the March 2007 quarterly issue brief and video of the quarterly meeting on linking teacher and student data to improve teacher and teaching quality.

Advances in State Student Data Systems

The DQC has identified 10 essential elements of a state longitudinal data system. In addition to these 10 elements, states need to ensure that student records can be transferred easily, student privacy is protected, data definitions and requirements are clear, and the data system is organized in ways that facilitate data use and user-friendly reporting.

Having the 10 Essential Elements of State Longitudinal Data Systems ...

The 10 essential elements include:

1. A unique statewide student identifier that connects student data across key databases across years
2. Student-level enrollment, demographic and program participation information
3. The ability to match individual students' test records from year to year to measure academic growth
4. Information on untested students and the reasons they were not tested
5. A teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students
6. Student-level transcript information, including information on courses completed and grades earned
7. Student-level college readiness test scores
8. Student-level graduation and dropout data
9. The ability to match student records between the P-12 and postsecondary systems
10. A state audit system assessing data quality, validity and reliability

... Allows States To Explore Policy and School Improvement Issues

With the 10 essential elements, states can:

- ▶ Know what achievement levels in middle school indicate that a student is on track to succeed in rigorous courses in high school
- ▶ Calculate the state's graduation rate according to the 2005 National Governors Association graduation compact
- ▶ Determine which high school performance indicators (e.g., enrollment in rigorous courses or performance on state tests) are the best predictors of students' success in college or the workplace
- ▶ Identify the percentage of high school graduates who take remedial courses once enrolled in college
- ▶ Improve communication and collaboration between postsecondary and P-12 systems
- ▶ Identify which schools produce the strongest academic growth for students
- ▶ Provide feedback from higher education institutions to high schools on student remediation
- ▶ Identify which teacher preparation programs produce the teachers whose students have the most academic growth

From *Creating a Longitudinal Data System: Using Data To Improve Student Achievement*, Data Quality Campaign, 2006.

State Teacher Data Systems

Although states often maintain teacher data systems separately from student data systems, they also collect information on teacher characteristics, preparation, quality and career paths. Evidence continues to accumulate on the positive relationship between teaching quality and student achievement.² Policy-makers and practitioners now want more data to identify, for example, which teacher preparation programs are doing the best jobs and the relationships among working conditions,

teacher characteristics and student achievement. They also want to be able to assess teacher attrition, supply and demand.³

The DQC's fifth essential element encourages states to design their data systems so they can match teacher data with those of their students. This link opens a new and likely transforming range of research and policy analyses that can explore in detail the relationships among teaching quality, school improvement and student performance.

Collecting Teacher Data

Following are recommendations by the Center for Teaching Quality for some of the data elements that should be collected about teachers:⁴

- ▶ Academic background
- ▶ Teacher preparation institute attended
- ▶ Earned certification and endorsement credentials
- ▶ School in which they teach
- ▶ Students and subjects they teach
- ▶ How long they have been teaching
- ▶ Their students' achievement scores
- ▶ Participation in professional development
- ▶ Working conditions

According to the Center for Teaching Quality, an ideal teaching-quality data system would be designed to address these policy issues:⁵

- ▶ **Pipeline** — Who and how many students are in teacher preparation programs?
- ▶ **Production** — How many teachers are being produced and in what certification areas?
- ▶ **Employment** — Where are teachers employed (especially in terms of supply and demand)?
- ▶ **Retention** — What percentage of teachers remain in teaching after three, five or 10 years?
- ▶ **Working conditions** — What working conditions help retain teachers?
- ▶ **Distribution** — Are highly qualified teachers available in hard-to-staff schools?
- ▶ **Effectiveness** — Which teacher education or training programs help raise student achievement?

²W.L. Sanders and J.C. Rivers, *Research Project Report: Cumulative and Residual Effects of Teachers on Future Student Academic Achievement*. University of Tennessee Value-Added Research and Assessment Center, Knoxville, TN, 1996. Jennifer Rice, *Teacher Quality: Understanding the Effectiveness of Teacher Attributes*. Economic Policy Institute, Washington, DC, 2003.

³Jacki Paone and Vincent Badolato, *The Alliance for Quality Teaching*, Denver, CO, presentation made at the Data Quality Campaign's March 12, 2007, quarterly meeting.

⁴Barnett Berry and Ed Fuller, *Teaching Quality Indicators Project Roadmap*. Center for Teaching Quality, North Carolina, The Networking Meeting, Chicago, IL, November 14–15, 2005.

⁵Barnett Berry, *Connecting Teacher and Student Data: Benefits, Challenges and Lessons Learned*. Center for Teaching Quality, North Carolina, presentation for the Data Quality Campaign Quarterly Issue Meeting, March 12, 2007.

Linking student and teacher data systems “creates the opportunity for researchers and policymakers to identify educational and other teacher characteristics that lead to improved student achievement. ... It will then become possible to further evaluate how teacher training and qualifications contribute to student learning through value-added assessments.”⁶

To match teachers to students, both systems must have individual records with individual identifiers — one for each teacher and one for each student. Currently, 45 states have systems with unique student identifiers in place, but only 18 states have a teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students.⁷

How Several Leading States Are Connecting Teacher and Student Data

Interviews with representatives of state education agencies (SEAs) in Delaware, Tennessee, Utah, Washington and West Virginia provide insights into the development and use of linked teacher and student data systems. These states started building their systems several years ago.

Across the 50 states, the ways state agencies collect, store and maintain teacher-level data and the information they collect about teachers vary greatly. In some states, SEAs collect and maintain teacher data, but in others, a separate state agency that oversees teacher licensure and certification performs this work. In the five states surveyed, data collected and maintained on teachers typically include:

- ▶ Certifications and endorsements;
- ▶ Degrees and training institution;
- ▶ Contact and demographic information;
- ▶ Qualifying exams and transcripts;
- ▶ Employment history;
- ▶ In-service professional development; and
- ▶ Survey information.

All states use these data to meet federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) reporting requirements and share the results with districts. More specific use of these data in the leading states is discussed later in this brief.

According to the state agency staff interviewed, “the spine of a linked teacher-student data system” is the course and

class schedule. West Virginia and Tennessee have some or all course codes standardized across the state. The combined teacher and student data system allows West Virginia education staff to transfer data when students and teachers move across districts, determine the number of teachers teaching in field, calculate the student/teacher ratio, report class sizes, and report the percentage of teachers that meet the definition of highly qualified under NCLB.

Each state began assigning unique teacher identifiers for different reasons.

Most of the five states adopted teacher identifiers five or more years ago to centrally maintain and share teacher licensure and certification information. These are permanent numbers that remain with an individual throughout his or her career in education.

Because the initial use of teacher identifiers often was related to a payroll system, the identifier often was the individual’s Social Security number (SSN). In recent years, however, concerns about confidentiality have arisen about the use of the SSN for this purpose. All of the states surveyed had used SSNs at one time but have converted or are in the process of converting to unique identifiers. Some SEAs continue to collect SSNs as a secondary identifier to be used for limited

⁶Vincent Badolato, *Addressing the Need for Better Data on Teaching in Colorado: Unique Teacher Identifier: Stakeholder Process Report*. The Alliance for Quality Teaching, Denver, CO, 2007.

⁷Data Quality Campaign/National Center for Educational Accountability, 2007 *Survey of State P-12 Data Collection Issues Related to Longitudinal Analysis*.

purposes. Because the teacher identifier often is associated with the payroll system identifier, it also can be used to report average teacher salary, average experience levels and average education levels.

The Office of Licensing or Certification, which may be a part of the SEA or may be a separate state agency, often assigns the teacher identifier.

Because all public school teachers must be licensed to teach, the certification office now commonly assigns the teacher identifier. Delaware, Utah and Washington are exploring the assignment of identifiers when postsecondary students *enter* state teacher preparation programs. Utah assigns its identifier either when a teacher applies for a license or when an undergraduate begins his or her student teaching. Delaware uses the teacher identifier to survey new teachers when they begin working and if they leave the state or teaching.

The costs of building the link between the databases vary depending on the agency that collects and maintains each source system.

Currently, most states are addressing multiple issues while enhancing their data systems, so teasing out costs directly

related to linking teacher and student data is difficult. For example, some states are building a data warehouse to link and store both student and teacher data, while others are not. Washington is spending about \$4 million to revamp its source data systems and build a data warehouse. About \$2 million is being spent on in-house enhancements to the current systems: \$300,000 for software; \$900,000 for initial implementation; \$500,000 for licensing; and \$400,000 for ongoing expenses.

Tennessee has a \$3.2 million grant from the U.S. Department of Education to build a longitudinal data warehouse, but only part of this work is related directly to linking teacher and student data. The project is divided into two phases. The first phase, which includes the student data, will go into production in fall 2007. Teacher data will be added in the next phase.

Delaware, on the other hand, linked its teacher and student records using current staff without any additional funds. The SEA assigned four staff members to spend 50 percent of their time over a six-month period to accomplish this work.

Benefits of Linked Teacher and Student Data Systems

1. Linked data systems can be used to meet the NCLB reporting requirement for highly qualified teachers (HQTs).

The federal NCLB requirement for reporting the percentage of HQTs is handled by the SEAs — not the districts — in these five states. For example, Utah uses the teacher identifier and state access to class schedules or rosters to determine whether teachers are highly qualified; in the past, the state used HQT assignment tables provided by districts. Current HQT reports are considered more reliable because teacher qualifications are associated directly with classroom rosters.

Tennessee uses classroom schedule information and, for each course, cross-walks it with the state's definition for HQTs to determine whether the teacher is highly qualified. Though automated, the procedure is complex and requires many steps.

West Virginia uses a similar automated process but also includes a teacher's score on the Praxis test and a principal's signoff on subject matter competency for each HQT approval.

Delaware uses its automated HQT system to examine overall teacher qualifications. Using the linked database, the state can determine quickly how many teachers are teaching out of their fields by subject and student characteristics.

2. Linked data systems allow states to evaluate teacher preparation programs.

Historically, states have determined teacher quality by checking teachers' credentials against a list of requirements, including completion of a preparation program. However, in recent years, using the information they have on their in-service teachers, researchers and certification offices have begun to take a closer look at teacher preparation. These efforts are just getting under way, but state leaders increasingly are asking for — and being asked for — these data.

In states with teacher data systems, research questions might include:

- ▶ Which preparation programs train teachers who persist in teaching as a career?
- ▶ When and how are new teachers exhibiting the greatest increases in teaching effectiveness?
- ▶ Which training programs are especially effective at equipping teachers with content skills to effectively teach students mathematics, writing or reading comprehension?
- ▶ Which institutions provide the most effective professional development for addressing specific weaknesses in in-service teachers?

Tennessee has analyzed its data on teacher effectiveness by teacher preparation institution and shares these data with the institutions. Recent legislation requires that the state report these data in an annual report card on teacher preparation performance.

Utah collects a significant amount of teacher preparation information and shares these data with faculty in teacher preparation programs.

Delaware has a school improvement initiative called “Correlates of Achievement,” which helps Delaware public schools collect, organize and use data to close achievement gaps. Using the framework from the Educational Testing Service report, *Parsing the Achievement Gap*,⁸ the first six of the 14

correlates have been translated into performance indicators. One correlate is related to teacher preparation and another to teacher experience and attendance. Indicators include out-of-field teaching in high-poverty schools, years of teaching experience, and teacher absentee and turnover rates.

3. Linked data systems provide student achievement information to districts, schools and teachers.

Districts, schools and teachers receive assessment results in a variety of ways. Often, testing companies return data to the district, reporting information by school, classroom and student. In Washington, the testing company provides test results to the SEA. Using the state's linked student-teacher files, SEA staff track and transfer test results to educators. Additional links to a student's previous enrollment, attendance and program participation enhance the value of the assessment data to identify what works for which students.

With access to a state data warehouse, teachers ideally can gain access to historical information on their own students. The most-detailed data systems provide student data at the item level or at a “cluster” level, such as an individual's aggregate results on all of the items measuring a specific content standard. With these data, teachers can evaluate how they can improve their instructional strategies. Some states that do not allow direct teacher access to the data provide report menus through which teachers can access data about their students and assessments. By using a sign-on identifier and password, a teacher's access can be limited to the records of his or her students only. Principals and district leaders usually have wider access to data, often aggregated at the classroom or school level.

In Washington, linked information is designed to answer questions about students' learning within the K–12 system. Linked information will help the state and districts strengthen instructional programs, connect more variables to student outcomes and identify successful teacher practices so that

⁸Paul Barton, *Parsing the Achievement Gap: Baselines for Tracking Progress*. Policy Information Report, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, NJ, 2003.

Washington’s education leaders will have a full picture of the educational workforce.

In addition to assessment data, West Virginia soon will give teachers access to a greater portion of their students’ records. Districts and schools retain the right to approve access to specific information. The student-level data elements available will include:

- ▶ Assessment scores;
- ▶ Grades;
- ▶ Transcripts;
- ▶ Enrollment and attendance records;
- ▶ Special education services, including entire Individual Education Plans;
- ▶ Other “tags” — a variety of information, including Section 504 and migrant status;
- ▶ Discipline records — expulsions and in- and out-of-school suspensions;
- ▶ Family information — contacts, perhaps siblings; and
- ▶ School locker number.

States with linked teacher-student records can use the student and teacher data to precode their state assessments prior to administration. West Virginia creates a “precode file” for printing assessment answer sheets or creating bar codes on each test. Codes match students to their teachers, who later receive the test results. Teachers are able to access records for their students, including attendance, grades, test scores, etc. By using actual class schedules, assessment results can be matched back to any teacher in a student’s schedule, including special needs, physical education and health.

Utah reports test scores by subscores of core curricular areas. The state administers the Iowa Test of Basic Skills in the fall and reports test results within six weeks. State assessment results also are reported before school begins. Teachers can look at scores by concept or by standard and objective — as well as sort results by each student’s demographic

information. State leaders encourage all teachers in Utah to analyze their students’ achievement results.

Delaware reports multiple years of data to teachers so they can identify trends over time. Teachers use the results to focus on student achievement — often leading to improvements in the curriculum.

4. Linked data systems can make the connection between teaching quality and student learning.

Tennessee was the first state to develop and use value-added models (VAM). These models are based on statistical techniques that use multiple years of student data to estimate the effects — or the value that has been added to the child’s education — by schools or individual teachers. With Tennessee’s student identifier system, students are tracked as individuals and not by cohorts.⁹ For example, a class of 20 elementary students might be split up the following year into two different teachers’ classes. The VAM can statistically predict the performance of each child based on the child’s prior performance on tests. The VAM can report back to the teacher and the principal the extent to which the teacher met or exceeded the statistical expectation for student achievement. These student-level data are most informative when used as a diagnostic tool for tailoring instruction for the individual student.

5. Linked student and teacher data systems can be used for feedback on teacher performance.

Delaware has used its linked teacher and student databases to develop a statewide educator *evaluation* system. Delaware piloted this system in two districts prior to 2007 and is in the process of revising and implementing it in more than a third of its districts in 2007–08. The revised system enables teachers, specialists and principals to use data to set goals for student achievement and includes indicators that will

⁹For more information on cohort, growth and value-added models, see Goldschmidt et al., *Policymakers’ Guide to Growth Models for School Accountability: How Do Accountability Models Differ?* Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, DC, 2005.

be used to measure how well the goals have been met. The system helps tie teacher goals to school goals.

Utah leaves it up to districts to undertake any analyses relating student achievement to individual teachers. The state provides value-added data by reporting statewide assessment averages in detailed areas, such as subtests. Schools and districts can see if they are above or below the statewide average. The teacher identifier is used primarily within the educator licensing system and to meet NCLB reporting requirements.

West Virginia chooses not to tie teacher accountability to student performance. SEA leaders do not believe there is adequate and scientifically based methodology for making this link.

West Virginia is using the student-teacher link to benchmark standards for each course and track students' grades through the teacher's online grade book. Teachers can use

this information to see quickly if the student is on track to meet standards. New content standards are being adopted, along with instructional guides that provide resources and suggested classroom assessments for the standards.

Through its VAM, Tennessee has the greatest opportunity to use student achievement data for teacher evaluation. When the model was introduced, the state promised that the information would be confidential between the teacher and his or her principal, and it has honored that commitment. The SEA leaves the evaluation of teachers up to school districts. Hamilton County (Chattanooga) uses the value-added data to identify high-performing teachers and recruit them to work in high-poverty schools. Tennessee offers researchers rich possibilities for investigation at the aggregate level but allows each district to determine how VAM fits into its teacher assessments.

Lessons Learned

The participating states did not report encountering major political barriers in implementing their systems. In many cases, there were legislative mandates, such as checking teachers' certifications against their assignments. However, this has not been the case in every state. In Colorado, there was much political opposition to creating a unique teacher identifier before the legislation was passed. Representatives from each of the five states mentioned the importance of involving all stakeholders from the beginning, throughout the process and after the data system is complete.

1. Take advantage of mandates to get the system off the ground.

Federal NCLB and Title II reporting requirements expanded data collection in most states. States often passed legislation to include a teacher and student identifier to ensure more accurate and useful data.

2. Involve stakeholders in every phase of design, development and data use.

The surveyed states brought all the stakeholders to the table at the very beginning to agree on a plan for the use of the data. They continued to involve their stakeholders throughout the project and on an ongoing basis after the data system was operational.

Delaware's SEA leaders met with stakeholders and conducted focus groups to ask what they wanted from the data system. The student information system — in place since 1999 — has built trust with teachers. How the teacher identifier was going to be used was carefully explained to union leaders and teachers.

Washington created a data advisory council and a separate governance group to design and implement its linked data system. District leaders were consulted at the beginning.

Emphasis was placed on working with districts, offering options and listening. Understanding the district's issues and being open to its suggestions created a collaborative environment and support for the project.

3. Do what you said you would do. Keep promises. Be transparent.

Delaware avoided barriers by being transparent. The state built the systems that it *said* it was going to build and involved a third-party study to make sure that the systems were built as intended. State leaders agreed that the systems should be evaluated periodically to ensure the designs are what the stakeholders agreed upon.

4. Solve problems quickly when they arise.

Utah reported experiencing some technical issues with some of the districts. Databases needed to be modified, and districts saw it as an unfunded request. When the SEA and district leaders got together to discuss these issues, the districts realized the potential value of the system and agreed it should go forward.

5. Ensure confidentiality and security of individual records.

All leading states reported important conversations about confidentiality and security. With both the teacher identifier

and linking projects, the teachers themselves often raised the issue of confidentiality. Strict policies must be in place and understood. State-of-the-art technology exists and should be employed to protect student and teacher confidentiality when building and deploying data warehouses and/or analytical tools and reports.

6. Provide adequate and ongoing training in the use of the system.

Training all stakeholders on how to use the system to meet their particular needs is important. The leading states used many forms of training: hands on, Web based, manuals and CDs. Several states used a train-the-trainer model to quickly spread use of the system. States should create, fund and implement ongoing, formal training.

7. Keep everyone in the communication loop.

The Washington SEA staff worked closely with key legislators — keeping them fully briefed, providing some early reports from the system and showing progress. These steps helped instill confidence in the SEA's ability to provide a strong system to improve education.

Conclusion

Linked student and teacher data systems provide new promise and possibilities for education improvement. These systems will give teachers the tools they need to tailor instruction, supply administrators with information to manage effectively and enable policymakers to identify quality programs that show real evidence of improving student achievement. And perhaps most important, they help ensure that every child in the state is taught by an HQT.

Interviews with SEA staff in leading states show that the design and use of these systems is within the grasp of all states. Legislative support and stakeholder pressure is important, and so is the engagement of all education stakeholders to help design the system for their needs.

Over time, more and more data systems will be linked — allowing many more data for decisionmaking and program evaluation. As more people use these systems, demand for even more links between data systems will increase.

Appendix: Status of State Teacher-Student Data Links

State	Does the SEA maintain a unique statewide teacher ID for each teacher?	The teacher ID is	Teacher and student records can be matched with					
			Elementary course/subject data	Elementary assessment data	Middle school course/subject data	Middle school assessment data	High school course/subject data	High school assessment data
AK	Yes	Same as SSN	No	No	No	No	No	No
AL	Yes	Same as SSN	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AR	Yes	Unique ID	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AZ	No	Unique ID	No	No	No	No	No	No
CA	No		No	No	No	No	No	No
CO	Yes	Same as SSN	No	No	No	No	No	No
CT	Yes	Same as SSN	No	No	No	No	No	No
DC	No	Same as SSN	No	No	No	No	No	No
DE	Yes	Unique ID	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
FL	Yes	Same as SSN	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
GA	Yes	Same as SSN	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
HI	Yes		No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
IA	Yes	Unique ID	No	No	No	No	No	No
ID	Yes	Same as SSN	No	No	No	No	No	No
IL	Yes	Same as SSN	No	No	No	No	No	No
IN	Yes	Same as SSN	No	No	No	No	No	No
KS	Yes	Unique ID	No	No	No	No	No	No
KY	Yes	Unique ID	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
LA	Yes	Same as SSN	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MA	Yes	Unique ID	No	No	No	No	No	No
MD	No							
ME	Yes	Unique ID	No	No	No	No	No	No
MI	Yes	Unique ID	No	No	No	No	No	No
MN	Yes	Unique ID	No	No	No	No	No	No
MO	Yes	Same as SSN		Yes		Yes		Yes
MS	Yes	Same as SSN	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MT	Yes	Unique ID	No	No	No	No	No	No

continued on page 11

continued from page 10

			Teacher and student records can be matched with					
State	Does the SEA maintain a unique statewide teacher ID for each teacher?	The teacher ID is	Elementary course/subject data	Elementary assessment data	Middle school course/subject data	Middle school assessment data	High school course/subject data	High school assessment data
NC	Yes	Same as SSN	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
ND	Yes	Unique ID	No	No	No	No	No	No
NE	Yes	Same as SSN	No	No	No	No	No	No
NH	Yes	Unique ID	No	No	No	No	No	No
NJ	Yes	Unique ID	No	No	No	No	No	No
NM	Yes	Unique ID	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
NV	Yes	Unique ID	No	No	No	No	No	No
NY	Yes	Same as SSN	No	No	No	No	No	No
OH	Yes	Unique ID	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
OK	Yes	Unique ID	No	No	No	No	No	No
OR	Yes	Unique ID	No	No	No	No	No	No
PA	Yes	Unique ID	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
RI	Yes	Unique ID	Yes		Yes		Yes	
SC	Yes	Unique ID	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
SD	No	Same as SSN	No	No	No	No	No	No
TN	Yes	Unique ID	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
TX	Yes	Unique ID	No	No	No	No	No	No
UT	Yes	Unique ID	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
VA	Yes	Unique ID	No	No	No	No	No	No
VT	Yes	Unique ID	No	No	No	No	No	No
WA	Yes	Unique ID	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
WI	Yes	Same as SSN	No	No	No	No	No	No
WV	Yes	Same as SSN	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
WY	Yes	Unique ID	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

DATAQUALITY CAMPAIGN

Using Data To Improve Student Achievement

www.DataQualityCampaign.org

The Data Quality Campaign is a national, collaborative effort to encourage and support state policymakers to improve the collection, availability and use of high-quality education data and to implement state longitudinal data systems to improve student achievement. The campaign aims to provide tools and resources that will assist state development of quality longitudinal data systems, while providing a national forum for reducing duplication of effort and promoting greater coordination and consensus among the organizations focusing on improving data quality, access and use.

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) is a nonpartisan, nationwide, nonprofit organization of public officials who head departments of elementary and secondary education in the states, the District of Columbia, the Department of Defense Education Activity and five U.S. extra-state jurisdictions. CCSSO provides leadership, advocacy and technical assistance on major educational issues. The Council seeks member consensus on major educational issues and expresses their views to civic and professional organizations, federal agencies, Congress, and the public.

The original research was conducted and the document written by Terry Bergner, Julia Steiny and Jane Armstrong, Ph.D., of Armstrong and Associates under a grant from The Michael and Susan Dell Foundation. This paper was adapted from the original by Nancy J. Smith, Ph.D., Data Quality Campaign, for CCSSO.

The authors wish to thank Robin Taylor, assistant secretary, assessment and accountability, Delaware Department of Education; Corey Chatis, director of data quality, Tennessee Department of Education; John Brandt, director, information technology, Utah Department of Education; Joseph F. Egan, chief information officer, administrative services, Washington Department of Education; and Nancy Walker, executive director, WEVIS, Office of Information Systems, West Virginia Department of Education.

Managing partners of the Data Quality Campaign include:

- ▶ Achieve, Inc.
- ▶ Alliance for Excellent Education

The campaign is managed by the National Center for Educational Accountability. The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation is the founding funder; additional support has been provided by the Casey Family Programs and the Lumina Foundation for Education.

For more information about the Data Quality Campaign, please visit www.DataQualityCampaign.org.

© Copyright 2007. Data Quality Campaign. All rights reserved.

- ▶ Council of Chief State School Officers
- ▶ Education Commission of the States
- ▶ The Education Trust
- ▶ National Association of State Boards of Education
- ▶ National Association of System Heads
- ▶ National Center for Educational Accountability
- ▶ National Center for Higher Education Management Systems
- ▶ National Governors Association Center for Best Practices
- ▶ Schools Interoperability Framework Association
- ▶ Standard & Poor's School Evaluation Services
- ▶ State Educational Technology Directors Association
- ▶ State Higher Education Executive Officers

Endorsing partners of the Data Quality Campaign include:

- ▶ ACT
- ▶ Alliance for Quality Teaching
- ▶ American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
- ▶ American Association of State Colleges and Universities
- ▶ American Board for Certification of Teacher Excellence
- ▶ American Youth Policy Forum
- ▶ APQC
- ▶ Business-Higher Education Forum
- ▶ Center for Teaching Quality
- ▶ College Summit
- ▶ Consortium for School Networking
- ▶ Educational Policy Institute
- ▶ ETS
- ▶ GreatSchools
- ▶ Institute for a Competitive Workforce
- ▶ Institute for Educational Leadership
- ▶ Jobs for the Future
- ▶ Knowledge Alliance
- ▶ League of Education Voters Foundation
- ▶ Learning Point Associates
- ▶ Midwestern Higher Education Compact
- ▶ National Alliance for Public Charter Schools
- ▶ National Association of Secondary School Principals
- ▶ The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education
- ▶ National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
- ▶ Pathways to College Network
- ▶ Postsecondary Electronic Standards Council
- ▶ Roads to Success
- ▶ Southern Regional Education Board
- ▶ Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education