



# STATE OF CONNECTICUT

## DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



### The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) Requirements

Connecticut has received approximately \$541 million under the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF). SFSF funds are intended to help stabilize State and local government budgets in order to minimize and avoid reductions in education and other essential public services.

Under the SFSF phase II application, Connecticut had to assure that it would implement a number of requirements under the following four key areas of education reform: achieving equity in teacher distribution, improving collection and use of data, standards and assessments, and supporting struggling schools. The State had to describe its current ability to collect data and other information needed for each assurance. If the State did not currently collect or publicly report any of these data requirements at least annually, a plan was required for each of the uncompleted requirements. The plan had to describe the State's process and timeline for developing and implementing each requirement by no later than September 30, 2011.

Below is a brief summary on the requirements Connecticut must complete by assurance area:

**Achieving equity in teacher distribution.** A number of data are required to be collected from Connecticut's schools districts. Therefore, each year the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) will distribute an electronic survey to every district to report on these requirements, including the systems they have to evaluate teachers and principals, how districts use the results from these systems, and if student growth serves as an evaluation criterion, among other data.

**Improving collection and use of data.** Connecticut has assured that the State will include all 12 elements described in the America COMPETES Act in our state's statewide longitudinal data system. This includes the following: maintaining our state-wide student identifier for pre-k through postsecondary, linking teachers to students, and the capacity to communicate with our higher education system, among other key student information.

Additionally, CSDE must provide student growth data to teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments and provide those teachers with reports of individual teacher impact on student achievement on those assessments.

**Standards and assessments.** Connecticut must complete an analysis of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations it provides students with disabilities and English language learners, to ensure their meaningful participation in the State's assessments. In addition, CSDE must collect and publicly post multiple data on graduation rate and enrollment and retention in institutions of higher education.

**Supporting struggling schools.** Connecticut must publicly report school gain information, by multiple categories, on state assessments in mathematics and reading/language arts. For the persistently lowest-achieving schools, CSDE must publicly post the number and identity of those

schools that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed. These are the four models outlined in the Federal School Improvement Grant. Additionally, CSDE must publicly report data on Charter schools, which include their progress on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics and school closure information.

Following is a detailed chart depicting the SFSF required activities and the State's process and timeline for developing and implementing each requirement by no later than September 30, 2011.

# SFSF Required Activities

Indicator Descriptor Number	Indicator/Descriptor	Plan	Timeline
Indicator (a)(2)	Confirm whether the State’s Teacher Equity Plan (as part of the State’s Highly Qualified Teacher Plan) fully reflects the steps the State is currently taking to ensure that students from low-income families and minority students are not taught at higher rates than other students by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers (as required in section 1111(b)(8)(C) of the ESEA).	CSDE needs to post Teacher Equity Plan	July 2010
Descriptor (a)(1)	Describe, for each local educational agency (LEA) in the State, the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding teacher development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal.	The State has developed and will distribute an electronic survey to every district in the state that will report on the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers in the district and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding teacher development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal. Please see attachment 2 for a copy of this survey. The results of this survey will be posted by the summer 2011 on the CSDE State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) Web site. Thereafter, this survey will be redistributed and reported upon <b>annually</b> until a newly designed, consistent evaluation system is developed and implemented over the next 3 years.	The State expects to be able to meet the following timelines to develop and implement the above plan: Spring 2011 – obtain survey results from all districts regarding teacher evaluation systems.  Summer 2011 – Post results of survey at CSDE’s SFSF Website.  Spring 2012-2013 – CSDE will redistribute this survey <b>annually</b> to all LEAs and report the outcomes on CSDE’s SFSF Website.

Indicator (a)(3)	Indicate, for each LEA in the State, whether the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion	The State has developed and will distribute an electronic survey to every district in the state that will report on the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers in the district and whether the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion. Please see attachment 2 for a copy of this survey. The results of this survey will be posted by the summer 2011 on the CSDE SFSF Website. Thereafter, this survey will be redistributed and reported upon <b>annually</b> until a newly designed, consistent evaluation system is developed and implemented over the next 3 years.	The State expects to be able to meet the following timelines to develop and implement the above plan: Spring 2011 – obtain survey results from all districts regarding teacher evaluation systems.  Summer 2011 – Post results of survey at CSDE’s SFSF Website.  Spring 2012-2013 – CSDE will redistribute this survey <b>annually</b> to all LEAs and report the outcomes on CSDE’s SFSF Website
Indicator (a)(4)	Provide, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level.	The State has developed and will distribute an electronic survey to every district in the state that will report on the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers in the district and for each LEA whose teachers receive performance rating or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage of teachers rated at each performance rating or level. Please see attachment 2 for a copy of this survey. The results of this survey will be posted by the summer 2011 on the CSDE SFSF Thereafter, this survey will be redistributed and reported upon <b>annually</b> until a newly designed, consistent evaluation system is developed and implemented over the next 3 years.	The State expects to be able to meet the following timelines to develop and implement the above plan:  Spring 2011 – obtain survey results from all districts regarding teacher evaluation systems.  Summer 2011 – Post results of survey at CSDE’s SFSF Website.  Spring 2012-2013 – CSDE will redistribute this survey <b>annually</b> to all LEAs and report the outcomes on CSDE’s SFSF Web site.
Indicator (a)(5)	Indicate, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, whether the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers	The State has developed and will distribute an electronic survey to every district in the state that will report on the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers in the district and whether the number and percentage of teachers rated at each performance rating or level are publicly reported for each school in the LEA.	The State expects to be able to meet the following timelines to develop and implement the above plan:  Spring 2011 – obtain survey results from all districts regarding teacher evaluation systems.

	rated at each performance rating or level are publicly reported for each school in the LEA.	Please see attachment 2 for a copy of this survey. The results of this survey will be posted by the summer 2011 on the CSDE SFSF Web site. Thereafter, this survey will be redistributed and reported upon <b>annually</b> until a newly designed, consistent evaluation system is developed and implemented over the next 3 years.	Summer 2011 – Post results of survey at CSDE’s SFSF Website  Spring 2012-2013 – CSDE will redistribute this survey <b>annually</b> to all LEAs and report the outcomes on CSDE’s SFSF Website.
Descriptor (a)(2)	Describe, for each LEA in the State, the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding principal development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal.	The State has developed and will distribute an electronic survey to every district in the state that will report on the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals in the district and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding principal development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal. Please see attachment 2 for a copy of this survey. The results of this survey will be posted by the summer 2011 on the CSDE SFSF Website. Thereafter, this survey will be redistributed and reported upon <b>annually</b> until a newly designed, consistent evaluation system is developed and implemented over the next 3 years.	The State expects to be able to meet the following timelines to develop and implement the above plan:  Spring 2011 – obtain survey results from all districts regarding principal evaluation systems.  Summer 2011 – Post results of survey at CSDE’s SFSF Website.  Spring 2012-2013 – CSDE will redistribute this survey <b>annually</b> to all LEAs and report the outcomes on CSDE’s SFSF Website.
Indicator (a)(6)	Indicate, for each LEA in the State, whether the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion	The State has developed and will distribute an electronic survey to every district in the state that will report on the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals in the district and whether the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion. Please see attachment 2 for a copy of this survey. The results of this survey will be posted by the summer 2011 on the Website. Thereafter, this survey will be redistributed and reported upon <b>annually</b> until a newly designed, consistent evaluation system is developed and implemented over the next 3 years.	The State expects to be able to meet the following timelines to develop and implement the above plan:  Spring 2011 – obtain survey results from all districts regarding principal evaluation systems.  Summer 2011 – Post results of survey at CSDE’s SFSF Website.  Spring 2012-2013 – CSDE will redistribute this survey <b>annually</b> to all LEAs and report the outcomes on CSDE’s SFSF Website

Indicator (a)(7)	Provide, for each LEA in the State whose principals receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of principals rated at each performance rating or level.	The State has developed and will distribute an electronic survey to every district in the state that will report on the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals in the district and whose principals receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage of principals rated at each performance rating or level. Please see attachment 2 for a copy of this survey. The results of this survey will be posted by the summer 2011 on the CSDE State SFSF Website. Thereafter, this survey will be redistributed and reported upon <b>annually</b> until a newly designed, consistent evaluation system is developed and implemented over the next 3 years.	The State expects to be able to meet the following timelines to develop and implement the above plan:  Spring 2011 – obtain survey results from all districts regarding principal evaluation systems.  Summer 2011 – Post results of survey at CSDE’s SFSF Website at.  Spring 2012-2013 – CSDE will redistribute this survey <b>annually</b> to all LEAs and report the outcomes on CSDE’s SFSF Website.
Indicator (b)(1)	Indicate which of the 12 elements described in section 6401(e)(2)(D) of the America COMPETES Act are included in the State’s statewide longitudinal data system.		
(1) A unique statewide student identifier that does not permit a student to be individually identified by users of the system?	In August 2009, Connecticut was awarded a second Institute of Education Sciences (IES) State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) grant. A component of this grant work established an Interoperability System Council (ISC) to bring together constituents from the CSDE, the Department of Higher Education (DHE), and the Department of Labor (DOL). The overarching goal of the ISC is to establish procedures and methods for connecting the various data systems. One of the first tasks is to have the SASID incorporated into the various DHE constituents’ data systems.	following <b>milestones</b> and <b>timelines</b> are planned: <b>Summer 2010:</b> CSDE mandates that the SASID is included on all high school transcripts. <b>November 2010:</b> Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) create the data field in their respective data systems in order to prepare to receive the SASID. <b>February – March 2011:</b> IHEs devise system of entry of the SASID, and train personnel on the entry of the new field. <b>July 2011:</b> IHEs begin entering the SASIDs into their data system, using the high school transcript as the source. A. The <b>CSDE and the DHE are the responsible agencies</b> for completing this work.	

		<p>B. No additional technical assistance is needed.</p> <p>C. No additional dollars are needed to implement this plan.</p> <p>The state will report on the progress of this plan <b>twice a year</b>, linking the plan and all plan updates to its ARRA SFSF Website.</p>
(2) Student-level enrollment, demographic, and program participation information?	<p>As noted in Element 1, Connecticut received an SLDS grant to enhance our data interoperability with the Department of Higher Education. Another component of this project is to work together and contract with the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC). The NSC project will provide data to the SLDS regarding postsecondary student enrollment, demographics, and program information.</p>	<p>The following <b>milestones</b> and <b>timelines</b> are planned:</p> <p><b>June 2010:</b> Finalize NSC contract.</p> <p><b>July 2010:</b> Send graduate cohort (classes 2003 through 2009) data to NSC, receive file from NSC.</p> <p><b>August 2010:</b> Load NSC data into the SLDS.</p> <p><b>August 2010: Develop plan for data analysis and dissemination.</b></p> <p><b>August-October 2010:</b> Analyze data.</p> <p><b>November 2010:</b> Publicly disseminate results of analyses.</p> <p>These milestones will be repeated yearly thereafter.</p> <p><b>A. The CSDE and the DHE are the responsible agencies</b> for completing this work.</p> <p><b>B.</b> No additional technical assistance is needed.</p> <p><b>C.</b> Budget: \$24,861 is the cost of an annual subscription to the NSC. Funds from the current SLDS grant will support this for three years.</p> <p><b>D.</b> The state will report on the progress of this plan <b>twice a year</b>, linking the plan and all plan updates to its ARRA SFSF.</p>
(3) Student-level information about the points at which students exit, transfer in, transfer out, drop out, or complete pre-K through postsecondary education programs?	<p>The system does not contain post-secondary education information. As already note, the CSDE received a second IES grant in August 2009 to support the development of a data interoperability framework, which will permit the sharing of data between the CSDE, the state’s Department of Higher Education (DHE). The ISC, described in Element 2, has determined that the NSC will be the best source for this type of postsecondary data. As such, the same plan for Element 2 applies for Element 3.</p>	<p>The following <b>milestones</b> and <b>timelines</b> are planned:</p> <p><b>June 2010:</b> Finalize NSC contract.</p> <p><b>July 2010:</b> Send graduate cohort (classes 2003 through 2009) data to NSC, receive file from NSC.</p> <p><b>August 2010:</b> Load NSC data into the SLDS.</p> <p><b>August 2010: Develop plan for data analysis and dissemination.</b></p> <p><b>August-October 2010:</b> Analyze data.</p> <p><b>November 2010:</b> Publicly disseminate results of analyses.</p>

		<p>These milestones will be repeated yearly thereafter.</p> <p>A. The <b>CSDE and the DHE are the responsible agencies</b> for completing this work.</p> <p>B. No additional technical assistance is needed.</p> <p>C. Budget: \$24,861 is the cost of an annual subscription to the NSC. Funds from the current SLDS grant will support this for three years.</p> <p>D. The state will report on the progress of this plan <b>twice a year</b>, linking the plan and all plan updates to its ARRA SFSF Website.</p>
(4) The capacity to communicate with higher education data systems?	The plan for Element 4, is virtually the same as Element 1:	The plan for Element 4, is virtually the same as Element 1:
(8) A teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students?	<p>Connecticut sees the work for elements 8 and 9 to be closely interrelated, and therefore its plan for implementing elements 8 and 9 need to be combined. In 2008-09, the State upgraded its educator certification system and, in addition to collecting the Social Security number of each certification applicant, also assigned a unique educator identification number (EIN), The EIN will be included in the CSDE's upgraded, annual certified-staff data file of the professional staff members who work in the state's public schools and programs beginning in late 2010. Every teacher working in schools in Connecticut had a unique identifier beyond the social security number. The next step is to link the teacher identifier with the student identifier (the SASID). One of the objectives of the IES SLDS grant awarded in August 2009 is to pilot the matching of teachers to students, <i>and in addition, link students to the courses in which they are enrolled.</i> This grant and pilot project are spread out over three years.</p>	<p><b>August 2010:</b> LEAs ingest the EIN into their local data system.</p> <p><b>August 2010:</b> Business requirements document and functional specifications documents are created.</p> <p><b>August-November 2010:</b> Districts conduct the crosswalk to match their course identification numbers with the NCES course codes. Using NCES course codes will ensure consistency across districts.</p> <p><b>September 2010-December 2010:</b> Development of system to collect student-teacher-transcript (schedule) data from every district in Connecticut.</p> <p><b>January 2011:</b> Pilot the collection system; teachers matched with students and their courses.</p> <p><b>February-April 2011:</b> Training and roll-out.</p> <p>A. The <b>CSDE is the responsible agency</b> for completing this work.</p> <p>B. The CSDE will need the technical assistance of the Department of Information Technology (DOIT) to ensure the data security infrastructure is in place, and that districts can access the SDE portal that exists in the DOIT environment.</p> <p>The state will report on the progress of this plan <b>twice a year</b>, linking the plan and all plan updates to its ARRA SFSF Website.</p>

	<p>Budget:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="764 203 1409 342"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Budget</th> <th>Source</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>FY 2011</td> <td>\$928,000</td> <td>Federal IES Grant, Awarded August 2009</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>\$1,000,000</td> <td>State Allocation</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FY 2012</td> <td>\$3,000,000</td> <td>State Allocation</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Budget	Source	FY 2011	\$928,000	Federal IES Grant, Awarded August 2009		\$1,000,000	State Allocation	FY 2012	\$3,000,000	State Allocation
	Budget	Source												
FY 2011	\$928,000	Federal IES Grant, Awarded August 2009												
	\$1,000,000	State Allocation												
FY 2012	\$3,000,000	State Allocation												
(9) Student-level transcript information, including on courses completed and grades earned?	Refer to Element 8	Refer to Element 8												
(11) Information regarding the extent to which students transition successfully from secondary school to postsecondary education, including whether students enroll in remedial coursework?	<p>As noted throughout this indicator, as part of Connecticut’s SLD grant, an Interoperability System Council (ISC) was formed. The ISC has begun embarking upon a project to analyze remediation rates of CT high school graduates. The results of this project will inform SDE and DHE about types of remediation data that are helpful to informing the system, and will be replicated yearly. This work, in conjunction with the NSC subscription, will allow for data about student transition to postsecondary education and data regarding remedial coursework to be part of the SLDS.</p>	<p><b>June 2010:</b> Finalize NSC contract.  <b>July 2010:</b> Send graduate cohort (classes 2003 through 2009) data to NSC, receive file from NSC; send request to postsecondary constituents for remediation/developmental data.  <b>August 2010:</b> Load NSC data and remediation data into the SLDS, using the State Assigned Student Identifier as the key.  <b>August 2010:</b> Develop plan for data analysis and dissemination.  <b>August-October 2010:</b> Analyze data.  <b>November 2010:</b> Publicly disseminate results of analyses. These milestones will be repeated yearly thereafter.  <b>A. The CSDE and the DHE are the responsible agencies</b> for completing this work.  <b>B.</b> No additional technical assistance is needed.  <b>C.</b> Budget: \$24,861 is the cost of an annual subscription to the NSC. Funds from the current SLDS grant will support this for three years. The state will report on the progress of this plan <b>twice a year</b>, linking the plan and all plan updates to its ARRA SFSF Website.</p>												
(12) Other information determined necessary to address alignment and adequate preparation for success in postsecondary education?	Analyze data elements that are currently stored and planned to be included in the following year, sufficient to address alignment and preparation for success in postsecondary education.	Start analyses prior to September 2011, using CAPT data only.												

Indicator (b)(2)	Indicate whether the State provides student growth data on their current students and the students they taught in the previous year to, at a minimum, teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs.	To facilitate a match between tested students and their teachers, the state will collect the names of mathematics and language arts teachers for each student in the tested grades and include them in the electronic data files that it makes available to districts and schools, so that the teachers will be linked to their students who participated in testing and, as a result, they will receive reports within their districts for the March 2011 administration of the CMT and CAPT.	<p><b>September 2010:</b> CSDE includes a field in its 2010 statewide testing file for each student's math and language arts teacher in the district where the student tested, and pilots downloading a teacher report of the teacher's previous year's students, on a voluntary basis. Using SASIDs for their fall 2010 students, teachers pilot extracting the 2010 data for their new cohort of students.</p> <p><b>January 2011:</b> For the tested grades, all districts provide the testing vendor the names of each student's math and language arts teacher. These are incorporated as fields in the testing file.</p> <p><b>March 2011:</b> For students new to CT after the beginning of the 2010-11 school year, teacher ID data will be collected as part of the test administration process.</p> <p><b>July 2011:</b> The testing vendor generates a teacher report that math and language arts teachers can access on-line for the students they taught in 2010-11.</p> <p><b>September 2011:</b> Principals and teachers can access the performance and growth data for their new fall 2011 cohort of students from the secure password protected CTReports.com website, using the SASID assigned to each student in their classes.</p>								
		<p>The matching will be completed within the scope of the testing contract funds and the new teacher reports will require \$25,000 in existing state funds annually to up-grade CTreports.com.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="934 1133 1438 1252"> <tr> <td>Year 1</td> <td>\$25,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 2</td> <td>\$25,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 3</td> <td>\$25,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total Costs</b></td> <td><b>\$75,000</b></td> </tr> </table>	Year 1	\$25,000	Year 2	\$25,000	Year 3	\$25,000	<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>	
Year 1	\$25,000										
Year 2	\$25,000										
Year 3	\$25,000										
<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>										
Indicator (b)(3)	Indicate whether the State provides teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects	Currently, the assessment data are not reported in a manner that can tease apart from other intervening variables the unique individual impact of a teacher on the mathematics or language arts achievement of students in his or her classroom. However, the Department staff	<p><b>June 2010:</b> Connecticut adopts a model for attributing student growth to mathematics and language arts teachers.</p> <p><b>August 2010:</b> Connecticut publishes guidelines for districts to use to appropriately interpret growth data and extract teacher impact. The CSDE sponsors</p>								

	with reports of individual teacher impact on student achievement on those assessments.	has been working with measurement experts from the University of Connecticut to develop growth and predictive regression models using vertical scale scores for individual students, classrooms, schools and districts, which can be used to compare <b>actual</b> performance over time with <b>expected</b> performance, based on the previous years' performance.	a two-day conference, the 2010 Assessment Forum, which highlights enhancements to Connecticut's comprehensive assessment system including the measurement of student growth in mathematics and reading. Begin using Connecticut Growth Model to monitor and evaluate progress of the lowest 5 percent schools under USDE grant SID. <b>September 2010 – June 2011:</b> Connecticut provides district staff with training on the use of testing data for the purpose of improving student performance, including the use of growth data. <b>December 2010:</b> CSDE pilots growth reports for teachers, based on the performance of their previous year's students.								
		<p><b>C. Budget:</b> The matching will be completed within the scope of the testing contract funds and the new teacher impact reports will require \$40,000 in state funds to up-grade CTreports.com. The MOA with the University of Connecticut will need to be extended for three years at a cost of \$250,000 in existing state funds.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Year 1</td> <td>\$290,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 2</td> <td>\$290,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 3</td> <td>\$290,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total Costs</b></td> <td><b>\$870,000</b></td> </tr> </table>	Year 1	\$290,000	Year 2	\$290,000	Year 3	\$290,000	<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>\$870,000</b>	
Year 1	\$290,000										
Year 2	\$290,000										
Year 3	\$290,000										
<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>\$870,000</b>										
Indicator (c)(4)	Indicate whether the State has completed, within the last two years, an analysis of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations it provides students with disabilities to ensure their meaningful participation in State assessments.	In 2007, Connecticut applied for and was awarded an Enhanced Assessment Grant (EAG) to conduct an accommodations validity study for students with disabilities. Connecticut is the lead state for the project. Working with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and Kentucky, Michigan and Nevada, the states conducted five studies comparing accommodated and non-accommodated test administration for students with disabilities and a matched sample of their non-disabled peers. The report is currently being written.	<b>June 2010:</b> Present the findings of the study at the CCSSO National Conference on Student Assessment.  <b>September 2010:</b> Release the study and post the document on the CSDE and ARRA websites.								
Indicator (c)(6)	Indicate whether the State has completed, within the last two years, an analysis of the	Connecticut will replicate the EAG study described in (c)(4) to conduct a parallel accommodations validity study for English	<b>July 2010:</b> Research plan is established and vendor is secured. <b>March 2011:</b> Study test administration is completed								

	appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations it provides limited English proficient students to ensure their meaningful participation in State assessments.	language learners and secure a vendor/researcher to do so.	and data are collected. <b>June 2011 – September 2011:</b> Data are analyzed and report is produced. <b>September 2011:</b> Release the study and post the document on the CSDE website.
Indicator (c)(10)	Provide, for the State, for each LEA in the State, for each high school in the State and, at each of these levels, by student subgroup (consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA), the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of students who graduate from high school using a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate as required by 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i).	Connecticut is currently collecting the data necessary to calculate the four-year adjusted cohort rate, however, the data are not publicly available as of this writing. Connecticut originally agreed to the NGA Compact graduation rate with plans to release this rate with the graduating class of 2010. The recently released Title I guidelines also called for the addition of the four-year adjusted cohort rates, and as such the process started to ensure data were in place to calculate the graduation rate earlier than anticipated. Because this is a new formula for Connecticut's graduation rate, the plan is to release these data to the LEAs to show for their district and each high school, their graduation rate for the graduating class of 2009. The state-level data were made available to the public in a press release issued March 23, 2010. After LEAs have had the opportunity to review the data and raise questions, Connecticut plans to release the data publicly during the 2010-11 school year.	<b>March 2010:</b> Connecticut releases statewide graduation rates based on the NGA Compact formula. <b>June 2010:</b> CSDE disseminates preliminary four year adjusted cohort graduation rates for the graduating class of 2009 to the LEAs for their review, and allows time for questions and data issues to be resolved. <b>August 2010:</b> CSDE finalizes the school and district 2009 graduation rates. <b>Fall 2010:</b> Four year adjusted cohort graduation rates are made available, in order to be in alignment with the NGA requirement. <b>Summer 2011:</b> The four year adjusted cohort rates are incorporated into the NCLB Report Cards, as required under revised Title I regulations, and posted.
Indicator (c)(11)	Provide, for the State, for each LEA in the State, for each high school in the State and, at each of these levels, by student subgroup (consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA), of the students who graduate from high school consistent with 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i), the	As noted in Indicator b(1), Connecticut received an SLDS grant to enhance our data interoperability with the Department of Higher Education. Another component of this project is to work together and contract with the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC). The NSC project will provide data to the SLDS regarding postsecondary student enrollment, demographics, and program information.	<b>June 2010:</b> Finalize NSC contract. <b>July 2010:</b> Send graduate cohort (classes 2003 through 2009) data to NSC, using the State Assigned Student Identifier (SASID) as the key, receive file from NSC. <b>August 2010:</b> Load NSC data into the SLDS, using the SASID to link the NSC file with the SLDS data. <b>August 2010: Develop plan for data analysis and dissemination.</b>

	number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) who enroll in an institution of higher education (IHE) (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA)) within 16 months of receiving a regular high school diploma.		<b>August-October 2010:</b> Analyze data. <b>November 2010:</b> Publicly disseminate results of analyses; specifically, of the students who graduated in June 2008, the number and percentage who enrolled in postsecondary education within 16 months of graduating, at the state, LEA, and school level. A retrospective analysis will also be conducted to report this same metric for earlier graduating classes.
Indicator (c)(12)	Provide, for the State, for each LEA in the State, for each high school in the State and, at each of these levels, by student subgroup (consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA), of the students who graduate from high school consistent with 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i) who enroll in a public IHE (as defined in section 101(a) of the HEA) in the State within 16 months of receiving a regular high school diploma, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) who complete at least one year's worth of college credit (applicable to a degree) within two years of enrollment in the IHE.	As noted in Indicator b(1), Connecticut received an SLDS grant to enhance our data interoperability with the Department of Higher Education. Another component of this project is to work together and contract with the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC). The NSC project will provide data to the SLDS regarding postsecondary student enrollment, demographics, and program information.	<b>June 2010:</b> Finalize NSC contract <b>July 2010:</b> Send graduate cohort (classes 2003 through 2009) data to NSC, using the State Assigned Student Identifier (SASID) as the key, receive file from NSC <b>August 2010:</b> Load NSC data into the SLDS, using the SASID to link the NSC file with the SLDS data <b>August 2010: Develop plan for data analysis and dissemination</b> <b>August-January 2011:</b> Analyze data <b>February 2011:</b> Publicly disseminate results of analyses; specifically, of the students who graduated, and who enrolled in postsecondary education within 16 months of graduating, the number and percentage who completed at least one year's worth of college credit within two years of enrollment at the IHE. The first graduating class for which Connecticut could potentially have two years' worth of postsecondary data from NSC is the class of 2008. A retrospective analysis will also be conducted to report this same metric for earlier graduating classes. These milestones will be repeated yearly thereafter.
Indicator (d)(1)	Provide, for the State, the average statewide school gain in the "all students" category and the average statewide school gain for each student subgroup	While Connecticut collects the data necessary to determine and report the number and percentage of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that have made progress, we do not report these data	June 2011: State assessment results are received; July 2011: Assessment results analyzed to determine those schools that are identified as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and preliminary adequate yearly progress (AYP)

	(as under section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v) of the ESEA) on the State assessments in reading/language arts and for the State and for each LEA in the State, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that have made progress (as defined in this notice) on State assessments in reading/language arts in the last year.	because this is a new requirement. However, the assessment data in mathematics and reading/language arts are publicly available, therefore enabling an interested party to make this determination. To comply with this reporting requirement, Connecticut will ensure that this metric is reported publicly by September 2011 via CSDE’s State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) portal on the Department’s Web site.	results shared with LEAs; July 2011- August 2011: LEAs review AYP results and file appeals if needed; CSDE responds to appeals; Mid-August 2011: Final AYP results are released, including designation of in need of improvement, corrective action, and restructuring; and September 2011: The average statewide school gain in the —all students   category and the average statewide school gain for each student subgroup on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics; and the number and percentage of Title I schools in need of improvement, corrective action, and restructuring that have made progress on the State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics will be reported on the CSDE Web site via the SFSF portal.
Indicator (d)(2)	Provide, for the State, the average statewide school gain in the “all students” category and the average statewide school gain for each student subgroup (as under section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v) of the ESEA) on State assessments in mathematics and for the State and for each LEA in the State, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that have made progress on State assessments in mathematics in the last year.	Same as Indicator (d)(1)	Same as Indicator (d)(1)
Indicator (d)(4)	Provide, for the State, of the persistently lowest-achieving schools that are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action,	The CSDE has begun planning for the use of the four intervention models noted in Race to the Top (turnaround model; restart model, school closure model, or transformational model) in	Federal application approved: April 15, 2010. Released application to LEAs: April 15, 2010. LEA Applications due to CSDE: May 14, 2010. Review of applications by CSDE: May –June 2010.

	or restructuring, the number and identity of those schools that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed (as defined in the NFR) in the last year.	addition to its Connecticut Accountability for Learning Initiative (CALI) with the use of the Section 1003 (g) of the ESEA School Improvement Grant. The goal is to increase the current requirements for districts participating in CALI to address the requirements for one of the four school intervention models for the lowest performing 5 percent of schools. Part of this process was to identify those schools that are persistently lowest achieving according to the definition described in Descriptor (d)(1). The schools eligible fall into five large urban districts. The CSDE has completed a formal overview of the requirements of the grant and met with districts individually to identify the schools in the district what will be eligible.	Award SIG grant to LEAs: no later than July 1, 2010. Planning for implementation spring/summer 2010. Public reporting of district applications and models chosen and approved will be available via CSDE's ARRA School Improvement Web site at- summer 2010. Implementation – fall 2010.
Indicator (d)(6)	Provide, for the State, of the persistently lowest-achieving schools that are secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, the number and identity of those schools that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed in the last year.	Same as Indicator (d)(4)	Same as Indicator (d)(4)
Indicator (d)(9)	Provide, for the State and for each LEA in the State that operates charter schools, the number and percentage of charter schools that have made progress on State assessments in reading/language arts in the last year.	While Connecticut collects the data necessary to determine and report the number and percentage of charter schools that have made progress, we do not report these data because this is a new requirement. However, the assessment data in mathematics and reading/language arts are publicly available, therefore enabling an interested party to make this determination. To comply with this reporting requirement, Connecticut will ensure that this metric is reported publicly by September 2011 via CSDE's SFSF portal on the Department's Web site.	June 2011: State assessment results are received; June 2011-July 2011: Assessment results are reviewed for accuracy; July 2011- August 2011: Assessment results are made publicly available; Mid-August 2011: Assessment results are analyzed; September 2011: Number and percentage of charter schools that have made progress on the State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics are reported on the CSDE Web site via the SFSF portal.

Indicator (d)(10)	Provide, for the State and for each LEA in the State that operates charter schools, the number and percentage of charter schools that have made progress on State assessments in mathematics in the last year	Same as Indicator (d)(9)	Same as Indicator (d)(9)
Indicator (d)(12)	Indicate, for each charter school that has closed (including a school that was not reauthorized to operate) within each of the last five years, whether the closure of the school was for financial, enrollment, academic, or other reasons.	To ensure the reasons for charter school closures are documented on the CSDE Web site on an annual basis.	The 2009-10 Charter School Operating Report, (CSOR) will attest to the reasons for any charter school closure including reasons for such closures. The next CSOR will be issued no later than December 2010. There are no obstacles to implement this reporting requirement. The CSOR will be uploaded on an annual basis pursuant to the provision of state law to produce such a report. No state funds are required to implement the provision for uploading the CSOR.