



**NEBRASKA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

# DASHBOARD PROJECT

Stakeholder Engagement Findings Report v1.0

**DOUBLE LINE // PARTNERS**

Lyria Zeh, Caitlin Sharp, Cydney Wehner

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	2
<b>Stakeholder Group #1 - The Design Team</b> .....	3
Background .....	3
Engagement Methods.....	4
Summary of Findings.....	5
<b>Stakeholder Group #2 - Pilot Districts</b> .....	6
Background .....	6
Engagement Methods.....	7
Summary of Findings.....	8
<b>Stakeholder Group #3 - NDE Staff</b> .....	12
Background .....	12
Engagement Methods.....	12
Summary of Findings.....	12
<b>Education Service Center Coordinating Council: Single Sign-On Project</b> .....	17
Single Sign-On .....	17
<b>Overall Findings</b> .....	18
Strengths.....	18
Opportunities.....	18
Challenges .....	18
Recommendations .....	18
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	31

## Introduction

Nebraska is a recipient of the Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) grant. The SLDS grant program has helped propel the successful design, development, implementation and expansion of longitudinal data systems. These data systems are intended to enhance the ability of states to efficiently and accurately manage, analyze, and use education data, including individual student records. The SLDSs should help states, districts, schools, educators, and other stakeholders to make data-informed decisions to improve student learning and outcomes; as well as to facilitate research to increase student achievement and close achievement gaps.

The Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) has selected Ed-Fi as the underlying data standard to support the SLDS grant goals and objectives. One application of the Ed-Fi standard is the development of a statewide dashboard solution customized for Nebraska educators' needs.

Stakeholder engagement sessions are a critical component to the long-term, successful implementation of Nebraska's Ed-Fi Dashboard project. NDE asked to collaborate with Double Line Partners (DLP) to conduct engagement sessions that would enable stakeholders to understand the project vision, to review the project's progress, and to allow stakeholders to provide input into the design of the dashboard. Additionally, the goal of the engagement sessions was to build a sense of collaboration around the dashboard project and to create a platform to listen and respond to questions and concerns in a mutually beneficial way.

The overarching stakeholder engagement plan was comprised of five stages – plenary, plenary questions and answers, clean slate, dashboard feedback, and final review.

**Plenary** – The first stage provided stakeholders with the project vision and purpose, an introduction to the dashboard through a demo, and logistical details about the stakeholder engagement process.

**Plenary Q&A** - The second stage of the engagement plan allowed stakeholders to react to the project by asking questions specific to the plenary stage. During this question and answer session, the project team gauged stakeholders' overall impressions, areas that were not clear, and aspects that were most/least appealing about the dashboard project.

**Clean Slate** - The third stage of the engagement plan gave stakeholders an opportunity to outline the top ten crucial questions and/or pieces of data they would want to include in a dashboard prior to viewing draft dashboards.

**Dashboard Feedback** - The fourth stage of the plan allowed participants to provide detailed feedback on the draft dashboard by writing directly on the draft dashboard pages and sharing individual feedback with the entire group.

**Final Review** - Finally, the project team gathered the top 3-5 priorities for the dashboard and captured key findings from the sessions. Stakeholders were asked to validate the findings presented and were allowed to make changes or corrections as needed.

Through combined efforts, the Nebraska Department of Education and Double Line Partners held varying levels of engagement sessions with key stakeholders. The project team was deliberate in identifying a full range of representatives that would provide valuable and diverse feedback. Additionally, the team was purposeful in targeting specific groups at the various five stages in order to maximize the time spent with each group. The three key stakeholder groups that were identified are the Design Team, Pilot Districts, and the NDE staff.

Ongoing engagement is also critical to the success of the project. A standing weekly meeting with the pilot districts allows for continuous updates as well as an opportunity to answer questions and address concerns.

## Stakeholder Group #1 - The Design Team

### Background

Representatives from thirteen school districts and two ESU's across the state of Nebraska volunteered as the first stakeholder group. All public school districts in Nebraska were invited to participate in the Design Team process. This group, the Design Team, consisted of 145 members with a wide range of cross-functional roles from classroom teachers to data and technical functions. This allowed for a diverse perspective of user needs to be captured. Table 1 below shows the breakdown of participants by role. Teachers represented approximately sixty percent of the group, including the additional 14 teachers represented in the multiple roles category. This is important as teachers will also represent the majority group of dashboard users. Another dominant group represented by the Design Team was individuals in the multiple roles category at 14%. Those participants that wear multiple hats offered valuable input as they will use the dashboard in varying capacities.

District characteristics reveal an appropriate cross-sectional representation of the state of Nebraska. Key characteristics of the participating districts included the number of students (Membership), percentage of students eligible for free/reduced priced meals (Poverty Percentage), percentage of students receiving special education services (Special Education Percentage), percentage of mobile students (School Mobility Rate), percentage of students enrolled in two or more public schools (Highly Mobile Percentage). Table 2 below shows that almost 30% of students in Nebraska attend a district in the Design Team, a strong representation for the entire state. Of the represented students, 44% are receiving free/reduced priced meals which is directly in line with the state's 44% poverty percentage. Additionally, 14% of the represented students are receiving special education services which also aligns with the state at 14.66%. Although not as close, school mobility rates and highly mobile students are still well represented by the Design Team which a less than 2% difference from the state.

**Table 1: Design Team - Participation by Role**

District / ESU	Teachers	Multiple Roles	Admin	Principals / APs	Other	IT / Data	Total Attendees
BANCROFT-ROSALIE COMM SCHOOLS	4	1	1		1		7
CROSS COUNTY COMMUNITY SCHOOLS		1					1
DONIPHAN-TRUMBULL PUBLIC SCHS	2			1	2		5
EDUCATIONAL SERVICE UNIT 07		3	2	3		1	9
EDUCATIONAL SERVICE UNIT 11		1					1
ELKHORN PUBLIC SCHOOLS	3		3	1	3	3	13
FAIRBURY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	4	1		3	2	1	11
GRAND ISLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS	5		2	1			8
MC COOK PUBLIC SCHOOLS						1	1
OMAHA PUBLIC SCHOOLS	43	13	5	2	4		67
PLATTSMOUTH COMMUNITY SCHOOLS				1			1
PONCA PUBLIC SCHOOLS						1	1
SO SIOUX CITY COMMUNITY SCHS	12		2	2	1	1	18
VALENTINE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS			1				1
WESTSIDE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS		1					1
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>145</b>

**Table 2: Design Team – District Characteristics**

District	Membership	Poverty Percentage	Special Education Percentage	School Mobility Rate	Highly Mobile Percentage
Bancroft Rosalie	272	42.65%	7.72%	7.59%	6.96%
Cross County Community	369	37.67%	17.07%	7.69%	5.97%
Doniphan-Trumbull	479	25.89%	12.94%	6.91%	5.78%
Elkhorn	6,459	7.73%	9.88%	3.94%	2.68%
Fairbury	980	52.96%	23.47%	12.87%	7.54%
Grand Island	9,098	69.06%	11.06%	15.70%	7.76%
McCook	1,427	40.43%	15.00%	10.22%	7.02%
Omaha	50,559	72.99%	16.37%	17.07%	7.59%
Plattsmouth Community	1807	45.55%	13.39%	6.92%	5.06%
Ponca	459	24.62%	13.51%	7.48%	5.59%
South Sioux	3,823	72.22%	12.58%	13.48%	6.96%
Valentine	646	44.12%	14.09%	6.70%	3.32%
Westside Community	6,051	30.52%	14.96%	5.45%	3.21%
<b>Design Team Districts</b>	<b>82,429</b>	<b>43.57%</b>	<b>14.00%</b>	<b>9.39%</b>	<b>5.80%</b>
<b>State of Nebraska</b>	<b>303,242</b>	<b>44.18%</b>	<b>14.66%</b>	<b>11.35%</b>	<b>4.86%</b>

<http://reportcard.education.ne.gov/Search/AdvancedSearch.aspx> - 2012-2013 State of the Schools Report

## Engagement Methods

The primary goal during the engagement sessions with the Design Team was to get an initial reaction to the dashboard project. Therefore, NDE met with the design team to conduct the first stages of the engagement plan which included the plenary, plenary Q&A, and clean slate.

**Plenary and Plenary Q&A** – The Design Team was presented with information about the project vision and was given an opportunity to ask questions about the project plan and timeline.

**Clean Slate** - Following the two plenary stages, the Design Team was then asked to identify and rank the top ten features of any dashboard and the top questions they would need a typical dashboard to answer. This clean slate approach allowed participants to give input into qualities of an effective dashboard prior to reviewing a draft of the Ed-Fi dashboard pages. This important step helped validate the usefulness of the Ed-Fi dashboards with key stakeholders.

## Summary of Findings

Each participant’s responses to the top ten features were categorized into sixteen areas. Since the respondents ranked their top ten features, an average ranking was calculated based on the number of responses corresponding to a given ranking. The results of the eleven most significant categories are shown in the second column of Table 3. (The full list of categories and corresponding responses can be found in Appendix A.) The results show that the categories with the highest average ranking of 4.2 were Assessment Metadata, School Calendar, and Student Assessment.

Again, the participants’ responses to the top questions were categorized into sixteen specific areas. Table 3 also shows that the top three categories were Student Assessment with 227 votes, Grades and Credits with 102 votes, and Assessment Metadata with 98 votes.

**Table 3: Design Team’s Top Ten Features and Top Questions**

Category	Top Ten Features Avg. Ranking	Top Questions Total Votes
Assessment Metadata	4.2	98
School Calendar	4.2	26
Student Assessment	4.2	227
Student Attendance	4.5	62
Enrollments	4.7	19
Grades and Credits	4.9	102
Discipline	5.1	45
Learning Standards	5.3	57
Programs	5.4	96
Education Organization	5.6	19
Students and Parents	7	65

An important finding to highlight is that assessment metadata and student assessments both showed up in the top three for both exercises. This warranted further analysis to understand which assessments the Design Team considered most important. Table 4 displays the breakdown of how the team prioritized specific assessments. The NeSA, Nebraska’s statewide assessment, showed up as the top priority when considering both the total votes and total voting districts and ESUs. Another important note is that although Acuity came up as the number four priority, only two districts or ESUs considered it as a priority. Further analysis into the number of students that those two districts represent would be helpful in understanding if it should be considered as a top priority.

**Table 4: Design Team - Student Assessments by Total Votes and Total Voting Districts/ESUs**

Student Assessment	Total Votes	Total Voting Districts/ESUs
1. NeSA	111	12
2. MAP	53	8
3. SAT	45	7

<b>4. Acuity</b>	30	2
<b>5. DIBELS</b>	27	6
<b>6. ACT</b>	23	8

## Stakeholder Group #2 - Pilot Districts

### Background

All districts across the state of Nebraska were welcomed to participate in the Ed-Fi Dashboard project as a pilot district. These early adopters would benefit by influencing the design of the dashboard, giving feedback on features, providing use cases for feature development, and influencing content, mode and the approach to training all Nebraska users.

Nine districts volunteered as Pilot Districts: Bancroft Rosalie Community Schools, Boone Central Schools, Fairbury Public Schools, McCook Public Schools, Neligh-Oakdale Schools, Omaha Public Schools, Ponca Public Schools, South Sioux City Community Schools, and Valentine Community Schools. In order to garner buy-in and investment for the project, NDE created contracts with the nine pilot districts outlining detailed expectations and goals. Additionally, the pilot districts will act as project champions and key influencers, so listening to their concerns, answering questions, and mitigating risks immediately will be critical to the project’s success.

Since the districts volunteered to become pilot districts, statewide representation by the pilot districts was an early concern and will continue to be considered throughout the pilot phase of the project. An analysis of the pilot districts’ characteristics are shown in Table 5. The pilot districts represent nearly 20% of the Nebraska’s total student population. Of those students, the average percentage of poverty is 47.73% which is in line with the state of Nebraska’s poverty percentage of 44.18%. Additionally, the Special Education population is appropriately represented by the pilot districts at 14.95% when comparing it to the 14.66% at the state level. Additionally, highly mobile student populations within the pilot districts align to the state’s percentages. It is important to highlight that the needs of these three student groups will be appropriately represented in the pilot phase and statewide roll-out.

**Table 5: 2012-13 Pilot District Characteristics**

District	Membership	Poverty Percentage	Special Education Percentage	School Mobility Rate	Highly Mobile Percentage
<b>Bancroft Rosalie</b>	272	42.65%	7.72%	7.59%	6.96%
<b>Boone Central</b>	584	34.25%	13.70%	5.73%	3.99%
<b>Fairbury</b>	980	52.96%	23.47%	12.87%	7.54%
<b>McCook</b>	1,427	40.43%	15.00%	10.22%	7.02%
<b>Neligh-Oakdale</b>	408	45.34%	18.14%	16.85%	10.26%
<b>Omaha</b>	50,559	72.99%	16.37%	17.07%	7.59%
<b>Ponca</b>	459	24.62%	13.51%	7.48%	5.59%
<b>South Sioux</b>	3,823	72.22%	12.58%	13.48%	6.96%

<b>Valentine</b>	646	44.12%	14.09%	6.70%	3.32%
<b>Pilot Districts</b>	<b>59,158</b>	<b>47.73%</b>	<b>14.95%</b>	<b>10.89%</b>	<b>6.58%</b>
<b>State of Nebraska</b>	<b>303,242</b>	<b>44.18%</b>	<b>14.66%</b>	<b>11.35%</b>	<b>4.86%</b>

<http://reportcard.education.ne.gov/Search/AdvancedSearch.aspx> - 2012-2013 State of the Schools Report

## Engagement Methods

In addition to the typical engagement plan, the pilot districts were also asked to complete surveys to gauge each district’s level of readiness for dashboard implementation. Initial information was gathered to understand where and how district data is stored including information about students, staff, grades, and assessments. A complete list of the information gathered from pilot districts can be found in Appendix B.

On January 9, 2014, during an on-site meeting in Kearney, Nebraska, more than twenty representatives from the nine pilot districts were asked to participate in four of the five stages of the engagement plan – plenary, plenary Q&A, dashboard feedback, and final review. In order to efficiently utilize time and resources, the clean slate sessions were not conducted during the onsite visit with the pilot districts, since the Design Team thoroughly covered this stage. Additionally, seven of the nine pilot districts were included in the Design Team and therefore participated in the prior clean slate sessions held by NDE.

Furthermore, Double Line met with the pilot districts on April 14, 2014 in Kearney, NE where the pilot districts reviewed the final wire-frames, discussed a prioritization method to rank all feature requests, and heard updates on the state’s single sign on project.

An essential component to the engagement process with pilot districts was conducting the sessions during an on-site visit. The in-person meetings helped established stronger relationships with the pilot districts, a critical element to maintaining long term buy-in and trust around the project.

**Plenary and Plenary Q&A** - The first part of the visit was dedicated to informing attendees of the project vision and allowing them to ask questions about the project plan and timeline.

**Dashboard Feedback** – The majority of the time with the pilot districts was used to gather feedback on the draft Ed-Fi dashboards. Every participant received feedback forms that included ten student level dashboard pages – Student Information, Attendance and Discipline, Attendance Drill Downs, State Assessments, Local Assessments, Local Assessments Drill Downs, Grades and Credits, Advanced Academics, College and Career Readiness, and Transcript. Participants reviewed the forms in detail and asked any outstanding questions before writing down all comments directly on the forms. The group then engaged in a facilitated discussion to better understand each district’s needs.

**Final Review** – Pilot districts submitted all feedback directly on the forms during the on-site visit, and some pilot districts took the forms home to gather additional feedback from other key district staff. (The detailed feedback from each district’s forms can be found in Appendix C.) Double Line incorporated all feedback forms and notes from the day to form key findings from the engagement sessions and presented a summary of the information to the pilot districts. The pilot districts were then given an opportunity to offer additional comments or changes to the findings.

The pilot districts were given a final opportunity to provide input into the final wire-frames. The final wireframes included all Nebraska specific customizations and the NeSA assessment views for a student, classroom, school, and district. Pilot districts took back the wireframes to their districts and will provide any additional feedback by May 2, 2014.

## Summary of Findings

The Key Findings section characterizes the important lessons Double Line learned from the pilot districts. These important lessons will be used when implementing and customizing core Ed-Fi elements. Customizations are those changes considered routine in any dashboard implementation and will be included in the scope of the fall pilot. Feature requests are enhancements requested by the stakeholders that will require new development and will be prioritized with all stakeholder feedback for future implementation. The prioritization method will be discussed in detail within the recommendations section of this report.

### **Key Findings:**

During the on-site engagement session in January, 2014, Double Line listened to and analyzed the feedback from the pilot districts in order to better understand the educational landscape among the pilot districts.

**Data Sources** - Pilot districts collectively use three Student Information Systems (SIS) - Infinite Campus, School Master, and PowerSchool. Each district has at least initiated, or participated in initial conversations with their respective SIS vendors. This proved helpful for NDE and Double Line during the SIS vendor engagement process. Additionally, since Pearson, the PowerSchool vendor, has worked closely and continues to work with Tennessee on their dashboard implementation, there has been initial commitment to work with the team on this project. In addition to the SIS vendors, Double Line identified that there are various data sources for each district's student and staff data and a complete list of these data sources can be found in Appendix D. As elements of staff data are critical to standing up the dashboard, Double Line will conduct additional analysis to determine if the needed elements are housed in the district's SIS or another HR system.

Participants expressed that going from system to system to collect and analyze data is a current pain point. Pilot districts expressed the need for the dashboard to act as a "one-stop-shop" with the ability to pull data from multiple systems and display it in a useful manner for data-driven decision making around student outcomes.

**Assessments** – In 2009, the Nebraska State Accountability (NeSA) assessment replaced previous school-based assessments for purposes of federal accountability. Under the old assessment and accountability system, districts were rated on the quality of their local assessment processes and the performance of their students in the School-Based Teacher-Led Assessment and Reporting System (STARS). With the development of NeSA in 2009, a new accountability system has been implemented. The new system is Nebraska Performance Accountability System (NePAS), which is based largely on the annually administered NeSA Reading, Math, Science, and Writing scale scores for status, improvement, and growth. According to NDE's Standards, Assessment, and Accountability Update for 2013-14<sup>1</sup>, in addition to the NeSA, NDE also requires districts, per the Quality Education Act, to submit individual student scores and sub scores on national norm referenced tests or National Assessment Instruments (NAI). NDE strictly recommends but does not require the following tests for grade levels 4 and 8 – Terra Nova, Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS), Stanford Achievement Test (SAT), and Northwest Evaluation Assessment (NWEA). Additionally, NDE recommends the ACT Plan assessment for grade level 10. In response to the new accountability system, all districts place a high priority on both NeSA and district specific NAIs. The absence of standardization around assessments (outside of the NeSA) allows district's the autonomy to decide which NAIs are most effective for their teachers and students; however, it proves more difficult to prioritize which other assessments to implement during the fall pilot. A full list of assessments used by the pilot districts can be found in Table 6 below.

Currently, districts do not receive NeSA results at the objective level, but agree that this information would be valuable for all teachers for purposes of targeting their instruction. Districts also value having the NeSA Alternative and Spanish

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.education.ne.gov/Assessment/pdfs/SAA\\_12\\_Oct\\_2013.pdf](http://www.education.ne.gov/Assessment/pdfs/SAA_12_Oct_2013.pdf)

versions displayed in the dashboard. Furthermore, districts expressed the importance of displaying historical NeSA results, but test version changes must be considered and accounted for in the dashboard. Also, districts expressed interest in showing the most recent assessment displayed in any given year since each NeSA assessment is administered at varying grade levels. Finally, many districts asked to see the overall state scores for each subject in order to better understand how their students were performing against the rest of the state.

**Absences and Discipline** – The number of excused and unexcused absences for a student can give a teacher or administrator an indicator of why a student is struggling in a certain area. Likewise, behavioral problems associated with a student can give a teacher another piece of insight into a student’s performance.

Most districts would like to set the absence goal at five days. Ponca and Neligh-Oakdale requested the attendance goal set to a 4 days/year and 4 days/semester, respectively. Showing this information in the dashboard is standard to any dashboard implementation, but in order to create individual district thresholds to show metric states, new development is required.

Additionally, the majority of districts do not want teachers given access to student discipline records, with the exception of McCook, Bancroft-Rosalie, and Neligh-Oakdale. While there are no state requirements forbidding teachers to view discipline records, individual districts have differing philosophies around student discipline and have therefore created district policies around who can access student discipline records. If districts cannot agree on whether or not teachers can access discipline, this will have to be a feature that is either deactivated on the dashboard or prioritized as feature request where each district could turn the feature on or off.

**Grades and Credits** – Grades are a critical component to the dashboard as many teachers will use this page to assess which students are failing, close to failing, and which students’ grades are not improving in certain subjects. Credit accumulation is equally critical at the high school level as this helps teachers identify which students are not on track to graduate. Additionally, teachers can utilize the grades metrics as an indicator to encourage a high performing student to enroll in more rigorous coursework, such as AP or Dual Credit courses.

Most districts use quarterly grading periods for their schools, with the exception of Bancroft-Rosalie and Boone Central who use semester grade reporting for high school students. Additionally, most districts use letter grades based on a 100% scale for upper grade levels and letter grades only for lower grade levels. Although most districts use the 100% scale score, there is not a standard around what qualifies as a failing grade. Additionally, Omaha and McCook are currently using standards based grading (a 0-4 grade scale), and Valentine is moving toward standards based grading.

If letter grades are already calculated in the SIS, displaying the number of failing grades is included in Ed-Fi dashboard. However, if the pilot districts do not already categorize and store failing grades in the SIS, new development for each district is required to map a district’s grades to the district’s standard grading scale.

Similarly, credit accumulation differs by district, so it may require new development to show a status associated with the number of credits a student has earned. Double Line has seen this in other states and plans to show the number of credits in the dashboard without a metric state (red or green). Additionally, since each district has slightly different requirements for graduation, the “On Track to Graduate” metric may not show a metric state. Additional analysis around how the data is currently stored in the SIS will be necessary to determine how this metric will be presented in the dashboard.

Standardization among pilot districts does not exist around Advanced Placement (AP) courses and exams. More than half of the pilot districts do not offer Advanced Placement (AP) exams; however, more than half of the pilot districts do offer AP courses. Additionally, those that do offer AP courses mentioned that AP courses were on a separate grading scale. And, those districts that do not offer AP courses suggested that Dual Credit courses be used instead for the

Advanced Academics page. For the Advanced Academics page, those districts that utilize AP exams, AP courses, and Dual Credit courses will have this information displayed in the dashboard. These districts will also benefit from the Advanced Course Potential metric that determines whether a student should be enrolled in an AP or Dual Credit course based on a student's proficiency level of exceeds standards on the NeSA assessment in a specific subject area.

**Accountability Reporting** – NDE has acknowledged that the current process for submitting accountability data is laborious for districts across the state. Currently, districts must populate a template with accountability data and submit the template to NDE at least once per year. Additionally, different accountability collections occur at different times throughout the calendar year. Understanding that the majority of the information used to populate the templates is found in Ed-Fi standards, NDE recognized that there may be an opportunity to leverage the dashboard for accountability submissions. When asked about the desire to utilize the Ed-Fi standards to submit accountability data, pilot districts were receptive to the idea with the caveat that there would still be an opportunity to review data prior to the submission. Both NDE and the pilot districts decided to move forward with a feasibility study to determine if the dashboard project can be leveraged for purposes of accountability data submissions. This feasibility study will be conducted in parallel with the fall pilot implementation.

**Single Sign On** – During the stakeholder engagement sessions with the pilot districts, Double Line learned that a single sign-on project would be implemented simultaneously with the dashboard project. Led by the Educational Service Unit Coordinating Council (ESUCC), this project will utilize a single-sign on system to authenticate users. Pilot districts were interested in how the project would coincide with the dashboard project. This raised a flag for NDE and the Double Line team that an additional stakeholder group should be interviewed in order to better understand and communicate how the ESUCC project would integrate with the Ed-Fi dashboards. More details are discussed later in this report under the 'Education Service Unit Coordinating Council Single Sign-On Project' section.

#### **Customizations:**

Pilot districts also made changes to the draft dashboards that are considered routine to any dashboard implementation. The below list of customizations to the Student Information page and all headers and legends have already been validated by the pilot districts and will be included within the scope of fall pilot and statewide rollout.

- Remove Economically Disadvantaged per FERPA interpretation
- Remove Title I if school-wide participation
- Remove Graduation Plan as there are no specific statewide graduation tracks
- Change Bilingual Program to Dual Language Program
- Change English as a Second Language (ESL) to English Language Learners (ELL)
- Change Gifted/Talented to High Ability Learner (HAL)

#### **Feature Requests:**

Following the January meetings with the pilot districts, the Double Line team was able to determine requested features that would require new development based on what we heard during the meetings and the notes made directly on the feedback forms. These features are listed below and will be prioritized with all other stakeholder requests based on the prioritization method described in the recommendations section of this report.

#### *Student Information Page*

- Student Assistance Team information
- Highly Mobile indicator
- Attended Pre-school indicator

- Track Criterion Reference Test (CRT) data over multiple years
- Response to Intervention (RtI) indicator

*State Assessments and Other Assessments Pages*

- Nebraska State Accountability (NeSA) assessment
- English Language Development Assessment (ELDA)
- Other assessments (full list can be found in Table 6 below)

*Attendance and Discipline Page*

- District level goals for the days absent metric
- District level option to disable teacher access to discipline records

*Grades and Credits*

- Grades metric states
- Credit accumulation metric states

**Table 6: Pilot District Profiles of Other Assessments**

District	ACT	MAP	DIBELS	ASVAB	Compass	ACT Suite (Aspire)	SAT	C4L	Others
Bancroft-Rosalie	X	X	X	X	X	X			STS
Boone Central	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		PSAT, Asset STAR-Early Lit
Fairbury	X	X	X	X		X		X	STAR
McCook	X		X		X				ITBS, CRT, Asset, AIMSWeb
Neligh-Oakdale	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	AR, STAR, Asset, PSAT
Omaha	X		X	X			X		CAT, F&P, Acuity
Ponca	X	X				X			PSAT, AR
S Sioux City	X	X		X			X		
Valentine	X	X	X	X	X			X	
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	

## Stakeholder Group #3 - NDE Staff

### Background

On February 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>, 2014, the Double Line team met with 39 staff members of the Nebraska Department of Education. The staff members represented teams including the Special Education team, School Accreditation, Early Childhood, Assessment, Curriculum & Instruction, Career Education, Adult Programs, Federal Programs, Finance, the Data, Research & Evaluation team and Help Desk, and representatives from the SRS system. The session format was fluid to meet the needs of each group, depending on awareness level, area of expertise, and the time ultimately needed to answer questions about the project. The two key objectives of the meeting were to receive input on the dashboard project while increasing awareness and understanding, and for state stakeholders to validate the dashboard customizations planned for Nebraska based on stakeholder engagement meetings with the pilot districts.

### Engagement Methods

*Plenary & Plenary Q&A* - In each session, Double Line presented the project vision and overview and allowed participants to ask questions about the project scope and timeline.

*Dashboard Feedback* - For each session Double Line showed the attendees a core dashboard set. Stakeholders gave feedback on the dashboard pages most relevant to their current responsibilities. For example, the federal programs department provided in-depth review of the student information page. Despite the varied format of each session, at the conclusion of each most stakeholders verbally reported feeling as though the time spent was valuable, answered their questions, and deepened their understanding of the project.

Additionally, follow-up engagement meetings to discuss the statewide landscape of assessments were held with Jeremy Henegar, Dean Folkers, and Matt Hastings. The findings from these meetings can be found later in the report within the Assessment Team's section.

### Summary of Findings

The sections below detail the sessions individually with features, customizations and key findings identified from each group. Some customizations and feature requests were identified by multiple groups, however, the report only lists customizations and feature requests once to avoid excessive repetition and duplication of information. The Key Findings section identifies the critical discussion points and key findings from that specific group. Customizations are those changes considered routine in any dashboard implementation and will be incorporated into the Nebraska dashboard. The Feature Requests section identifies features requested by the stakeholders that will require either new or significant development and will be prioritized for inclusion in the initial pilot release with all other stakeholder requests. Lastly, each group's focus on their particular area led to great ideas about what the dashboard could eventually make possible for their students. While we made clear that the first phase of work would prioritize development of the highest value to the largest populations, we have captured these ideas for NDE to consider for future development.

#### **Session 1: Title I, Special Ed, Homeless Program Coordinators**

##### ***Key Findings:***

- Students in Nebraska have both a district ID and a state ID
- The state has mandated a minimum for courses in core subjects in order to graduate, but many districts go above this minimum
- The state does not have a standard number of credits required to graduate, and all districts use different values for credits (for example, one course may count as 1,3,4,5 credits depending on the district)

- The state’s definition of At-Risk will not be universally meaningful and is redundant to other program participation (for example, the Special Education and Title I indicators)

**Customizations** – NDE staff also made changes to the draft dashboards that are considered routine to any dashboard implementation. The below list of customizations to the Student Information page and all headers and legends have already been validated by the pilot districts and will be included within the scope of this project.

- Change Title I Participation to Title I Support to agree with Nebraska’s naming conventions
- English Language Learners instead of English as a Second Language
- Remove Over-Age
- Include Repeater for those students who have repeated a grade level.
- Remove At-Risk
- Change Expected Graduation Year to Cohort Year and allow it to first appear in 9<sup>th</sup> grade
- Remove Graduation Plan since there are not distinct graduation plans
- Remove check-boxes in “Special Services” box
- Add student’s state and district ID number to the header
- Change Gifted and Talented to High Ability Learner
- Single Parent/Pregnant Teen and Parent in Military will probably not be available
- Indicate whether a student is new to the district

**Feature Requests** - Following the meetings with the NDE staff, the Double Line team was able to determine requested features that would require new development based on what we heard during the meetings and the notes made directly on the feedback forms. These features are listed below and will be prioritized with all other stakeholder requests based on the prioritization method described with the recommendations section of this report.

- Remove Economically Disadvantaged from Teacher view per FERPA compliance
- Highly Mobile indicator (including moves from a non-structural change)
- Attended Pre-school indicator
- Progress reports at 4.5 Weeks into the quarter
- Include information if student is new to the school from a non-structural school change
- Metrics for missing assignments
- Include whether the student is a ward of the state (not protected)

**Long-term vision** – During the meetings, Double Line heard some interesting long term ideas that would enhance the functionality of the dashboard. Although, these items will not be prioritized in this report, they should be considered when creating a strategic plan for the long-term enhancements of the dashboard.

- Include perceptual data on the dashboard
- Include a parent portal
- Use this as an early warning system for students who need an intervention
- Ensure that students in alternate programs like juvenile justice or state health facilities are included in the dashboard

## **Session 2: Curriculum and Career Education**

### **Key Findings:**

Students in Nebraska are well-served by a strong career education system. Almost all students take a career education class at some point where the average across the state is 4.5 classes. One third of seniors in Nebraska are “concentrators”, meaning they complete a specific program of study. This program is rigorous and purposeful where 25% of Nebraska students overall take AP classes and 36% of concentrators take AP classes.

Nebraska emphasizes courses outside of the four core subject areas, including fine arts and career education. There are many programs of study across Nebraska’s districts; however, most students do not declare a program of study and it is usually determined by the courses the student has already completed.

***Feature Requests (will be prioritized with all other stakeholder feedback):***

- Other assessments
  - ACT Aspire
  - Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Test (ASVAB)

***Long Term Vision (will not be prioritized with all other stakeholder feedback at this time):***

- The strength of career education in Nebraska demands a robust picture of “career readiness”, much more than an afterthought of “college readiness”. Eventually, this team would like to see a separate page for career readiness with clear indicators of a career path for a student and progress toward required credentials. This could include connecting to external systems such as Career Cruising, Naviance, Kuder and OSHA certifications. Additionally, a “career readiness” page could incorporate student and school climate surveys to better understand a student’s career interests. Educators could utilize this information to identify what engages students in the classroom.
- A key use for the dashboard will be to connect career education to the school counseling team, helping counselors make data-driven decisions about students’ options.
- There is a new teacher evaluation initiative in Nebraska that would be a good fit into the dashboard. At this point, teachers are working with their principals to determine an appropriate student learning outcome(s) on which they will be evaluated at the end of the year.

**Session 3: Teacher Certification, Post-Secondary Readiness, Adult Education, and School Accreditation**

***Key Findings:***

- Teacher certification is standard in Nebraska, and teachers can have the following endorsements – Elementary (K-8 self-contained), Middle School (grade levels 4-9), High School subject endorsements, and Special Education (specific to population served). Teacher certifications should be housed in each district’s SIS, having already been cleared against the course codes the teacher is teaching.
- There is no requirement to provide enriched services for high-ability learners.
- Districts with lower-grades are moving toward standards-based reporting but there is push back from parents. Additionally, PowerSchool is having difficulty converting to standards-based reporting.
- Districts were trained as part of the STARS program that preceded NeSA to develop their own standards, learning objectives, and assessments.
- Other districts, outside of the pilot districts, in the state are giving the SAT.

***Customizations (included in fall pilot scope):***

- Show state course code on the transcript page

***Feature Requests (will be prioritized with all other stakeholder feedback):***

- Compass assessment
- Show dual credit earned on the college readiness page
- Progress reports at 4.5 weeks

***Long-Term Vision (will not be prioritized with all other stakeholder feedback at this time):***

- Connect the dashboard to Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports (PBIS) systems that some districts are using to track discipline.
- Create a learning objective repository to help teachers personalize instruction.
- Track students through their post-secondary education to determine college persistence.
- Target principals for training and dashboard adoption. Make sure that they are able to support the system as instructional leaders.
- There is interest in how this system will serve state agency stakeholders who are invested in the data. The state would like to become users of this system or other applications built on top of the data.
- Utilize the dashboard project as a tool for district accountability submissions in order to gain efficiencies at the district level.

**Session 4: Special Education and Early Childhood Education**

***Key Findings:***

The Student Record Service (SRS) system is widely used by Nebraska school districts, but there are other systems in the state that house special education data. The NDE does not interpret details of special education status as more protected than other types of student information. In other words, everyone with educational responsibility for a student should have access to his/her special education details.

Nebraska has a “birth mandate,” meaning that children with special needs are entitled to services from birth, even before they enter school. With this mandate there are instances of cessation of services, and a child may be designated with special needs early, but may move outside of the designation. Therefore, there is interest in a history of this exit date for students. These children are associated with the district they will eventually attend; therefore, they may be pulled in to the dashboard but will not be associated with a building, only a district.

***Customizations (included in fall pilot scope):***

- Change “Special Services” to “Special Education Services”
- Change “Primary Instructional Setting” to “Least Restrictive Environment”
- Include Monitored Year 1 and 2 for Limited English Proficiency

***Feature Requests (will be prioritized with all other stakeholder feedback):***

- Capture exit date for special education
- Designate whether student attended a public pre-school

***Long-Term Vision (will not be prioritized with all other stakeholder feedback at this time):***

- Enrich the data set for each student so that there is information available upon his/her entering school. Capture the milestones of a student before they become school-age.
- Connect SRS information to the dashboard if possible; particularly if that information is not in a second-tier of protection.

**Session 5: Assessment (including follow-up meetings with Jeremy Heneger, Matt Hastings, and Dean Folkers)**

***Key Findings:***

The NeSA was developed 4 years ago. Each subject, Math, Reading, and Science, has been phased in over time, except for Writing, which begin being phased in starting in 2011. Students are not required to demonstrate proficiency to be promoted to the next grade or graduate and students are not required to take the exam and therefore, no make-up tests exist. Additionally, students may take the general exam in a different language.

For Math, Reading, and Science, the scale score is 0-200. The cut scores are the same - below: 0-84, meets: 85-134, and exceeds: 135 and above. For Writing, the cut score for advanced differs in each grade level and if the writing test is written in a different language, it will not be scored. Students may take an Alternate exam, but it does not have to be in all subject areas. There is no Alternate Assessment for Writing.

Assessment staff communicated that there have been issues with duplicate test results from the vendor, DRC. It will be important for the information to be removed of duplicates before the Double Line pulls these records from the state. Currently, districts do not report NeSA exam results by standard to the state. However, detailed results (in accordance with the Table of Specifications for each subject area) are housed with the vendor, Data Recognition Corporation (DRC).

Many districts are meeting their needs for progress assessment with national vendors of norm-referenced tests (NRT). A full view of the number of districts submitting student results for each of the national standardized tests for NDE accountability purposes can be found in Appendix E. As mentioned in the previous section, pilot districts value these norm-referenced tests because it gives the district an understanding of how well their students are performing compared to other students across the nation taking the same tests.

In addition to NRT's, districts can also utilize the Check for Learning (C4L) tool as an interim assessment. Approximately 180 districts out of the total 249 districts utilize this tool to assess a student's level of understanding throughout the school year. Teachers use an "Item Bank" to create custom interim assessments. The indicators within the item bank align to the NeSA Table of Specifications for each subject allowing teachers to better understand which specific indicators they need to work on with a student prior to the annual NeSA exam. This data is also managed by DRC. NDE recognizes that some teachers do not want all C4L assessments to populate the dashboard. Therefore, a filtering or identification system needs to be created in order to determine which tests will be viewed in the dashboard. Concerns also surfaced around the length of time a student's C4L results would "live" in the dashboard, and Double Line clarified that C4L data could only populate the data during a given school year.

***Customizations (included in fall pilot scope):***

- The drill down for historical test results should be on the scale of 0-200.

***Feature Requests (will be prioritized with all other stakeholder feedback):***

- Add a drill down at the container level that shows the current year subject area scores in one view.

## Education Service Center Coordinating Council: Single Sign-On Project

### Single Sign-On

NDE, ESUCC, and Double Line met on February 12, 2014 to discuss the ESUCC's Single Sign-On (SSO) project and how it aligns with the dashboard project. NDE and ESUCC would like the dashboard to utilize the ESUCC's SSO solution for the dashboard login and authorization interface in an effort to honor pilot district requests for a "one-stop shop" for access education data and avoid the burden of multiple logins and passwords via multiple portals. The project teams determined that the technical solution is viable for integration and use with the dashboard. Follow-up technical meetings were held to determine the possible technical approaches to support both Microsoft Active Directory and Google domain authentication.

Additionally, both project timelines are in alignment to support the fall dashboard pilot. The Single Sign-On project will be implemented in parallel with the Ed-Fi Dashboard, and the dashboard will be the first application to deploy the SSO technology in Nebraska.

The ESUCC plans to utilize one or two of the nine dashboard pilot districts to also do an early independent pilot of the SSO technology. This approach will help mitigate the risks of executing both projects in parallel and integrating the SSO technology by validating as much of the SSO solution as possible prior to pilot integration with the dashboard.

## Overall Findings

After engaging with the three stakeholder groups and analyzing all feedback, there were key themes that surfaced. We have categorized these items into three areas - strengths, opportunities, and challenges.

### Strengths

All stakeholders that we engaged within the state of Nebraska were extremely receptive to the idea of a dashboard that could give them a quick pulse on how well their students were performing. At the end of each session, participants expressed excitement that the dashboard could improve the way the state uses data to make decisions around student performance.

### Opportunities

Currently, Nebraska has a decentralized culture where districts are given the autonomy to make district-level decisions in almost every area. While this strategy makes sense in most cases, since districts understand their needs best, it will be difficult to implement certain features, such as credit accumulation since this is not standardized. For NDE, it may be in the best interest of the state of Nebraska to consider centralizing some decisions and creating some state data standards. NDE will need to balance the needs of districts with the needs of the entire state when revisiting their current decentralized data strategy.

### Challenges

Although stakeholders clearly articulated the value of the dashboard, they also expressed concerns around how the dashboards would be customized to meet the individual needs of each district. Again, due to the decentralized culture in Nebraska, each district uses different types of assessments, credit values, and other student performance indicators. This has created tension around what will be included in the initial release of the Nebraska dashboard.

The competing needs across the pilot districts has also created concerns around the dashboard being “everything to everyone.” More risks are created if too many scope items are introduced too quickly. It will be critical to choose a few high impact features that affect the majority of the pilot districts in the first implementation phase. The successes seen among the pilot districts will garner more buy-in for the project across the state which will be critical to the statewide implementation phase.

Finally, this initiative will need to work to shift the paradigm of data use in Nebraska from one of compliance for accountability reporting to one of continuous student and school improvement. During multiple meetings with different stakeholder groups, questions arose around compliance submissions indicating that some districts are still focused on what the dashboard means for accountability reporting instead of what the dashboard means for the teacher and the value of having a full set of student-level information that updates daily to improve classroom decisions.

### Recommendations

Upon completing stakeholder engagement sessions with the Design Team, the Pilot Districts, and NDE staff, key findings were analyzed against dashboard customizations and feature requests. In order to categorize the prioritization process, the three criteria were: sustainability effort, impact, and level of effort. Table 7 outlines the criteria broken down into detailed descriptions for each level: high, medium, and low.

**Impact** – Pilot districts are a key stakeholder whose input must be prioritized accordingly to ensure a successful pilot roll-out. However, it will also be important to assess the pilot district needs against the needs of other key stakeholder groups. Therefore, each feature request, if warranted, was also analyzed based on statewide usage or need.

**Level of Effort** – Integration and development of new features for the dashboard requires varied levels effort depending on the level of involvement of data source vendors and work that can be leveraged from other Ed-Fi Alliance members.

**Sustainability Effort** – The level of effort necessary for long-term technical maintenance and support of the dashboard is an important criteria to prioritize for new development. Whether or not data source vendors are willing to maintain and support the requirements of the Ed-Fi data standards is one factor to consider when prioritizing feature requests. Additionally, the level of effort required to coordinate and roll-out implementations was considered when determining a feature’s level of sustainability effort.

The prioritization method used to rank the feature requests was shared with the pilot districts during the NDE Data Conference on April 14, 2014. Pilot districts were able to discuss the feature requests among each other and ask questions about the prioritization process. During the discussion, pilot districts were able to openly ask questions and express concerns. One of the districts expressed concerns around prioritizing features that were “easy to implement” versus “high impact”. Pilot districts also voiced concerns around the C4L assessment and the problems experienced this year. Additionally, pilot districts discussed the lack of importance of displaying ACT scores since the results are received so late in the student’s career. Moreover, districts found a common interest in making sure feature requests were prioritized with the frequency of data updates in mind. Districts found the most value in implementing those features that give teacher’s daily feedback on a student’s performance versus a one-time annual assessment, for example. Finally, the pilot districts decided to combine the Student Assistance Team indicator with the Response to Intervention indicator to give the feature robust functionality.

Through the prioritization method presented, pilot districts considered each of these factors while prioritizing all feature requests since the process allowed for each district to rank the features that are the most important to their district. Pilot districts had the opportunity to create a ranking strategy that best aligned to their district’s short and long-term needs. Table 10 below shows the average ranking by the pilot districts and also includes additional comments or notes by the districts. Furthermore, the pilot districts’ ranking of priorities coupled with teacher feedback during the pilot will give NDE a strong understanding of future dashboard enhancements.

**Table 7: Criteria Definitions for Prioritizing New Features**

Criteria	Low	Medium	High
<b>Impact</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1-2 pilot districts consider the new feature a priority</li> <li>Less than 25% of districts (by student enrollment) across the state consider the new feature a priority</li> <li>Design Team prioritized new feature in bottom third of list</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3-5 pilot districts consider the new feature a priority</li> <li>25%-75% of districts (by student enrollment) across the state consider new feature a priority</li> <li>Design Team prioritized new feature in middle third of list</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5-9 pilot districts consider the new feature a priority</li> <li>75%-100% of districts (by student enrollment) across the state consider the new feature a priority</li> <li>Design Team prioritized new feature in top third of list</li> </ul>
<b>Level of Effort</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standard development work required for any dashboard project (user interface changes - naming conventions, branding, etc.)</li> <li>No vendor engagement necessary to implement new feature</li> <li>Data is located in the SIS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New development required outside of standard customizations</li> <li>Vendor engagement may be necessary</li> <li>Some opportunity to leverage and/or share work done by the Ed-Fi community</li> <li>Data is located in one single source</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New development required outside of standard customizations</li> <li>Vendor engagement necessary</li> <li>No opportunity to leverage work done by the Ed-Fi community</li> <li>District specific configuration required.</li> <li>Data source is located in multiple sources (one/district)</li> </ul>
<b>Sustainability Effort</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ed-Fi interfaces are Vendor developed and maintained</li> <li>Vendor is responsible for Ed-Fi upgrades, maintenance, and support</li> <li>NDE is responsible for typical training and run-time support</li> <li>Customizations for terminology, labels and user interface look and feel</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NDE developed interfaces and ETL to a statewide or shared data source.</li> <li>NDE responsible for Ed-Fi upgrades, maintenance and support</li> <li>New minor customizations and features which are statewide. No district specific customizations required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NDE developed interface and ETL to new source data managed by individual districts</li> <li>NDE responsible for Ed-Fi core upgrades, maintenance, and support</li> <li>NDE developed features that are district specific</li> </ul>

**Pilot Implementation** – Table 8 below represents those items that Double Line considers as high priority actions and should be implemented as part of the fall pilot.

**Table 8: Prioritized Feature Request for Pilot Implementation**

Feature Request	Impact	Level of Effort	Sustain Effort	Core/New /Leverage	Additional Notes
1. Customizations identified in Table 9	HIGH	LOW	LOW	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Impact</i> - Input from the pilot districts and the state revealed that all statewide districts will benefit from these customizations as they using Nebraska specific naming conventions and practices.</li> <li><i>Level of Effort</i> - No vendor engagement is necessary to implement the customization list as all items exist on the user interface.</li> </ul>
2. Single Sign-On	HIGH	LOW	LOW	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Impact</i> –All districts across the state will need this component to access the dashboard</li> <li><i>Level of Effort</i> –No vendor engagement is necessary as existing relationships with the ESUCC and Network Nebraska will be utilized.</li> </ul>
3. Nebraska State Accountability (NeSA)	HIGH	LOW	LOW	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Impact</i> –the NeSA is administered to all Nebraska students. It appeared as a top priority by all three stakeholder groups.</li> <li><i>Level of Effort</i> – A standard state assessment currently exists in the Ed-Fi core schema. However, decisions around the level of detail to show in the dashboard need to be made by NDE.</li> <li><i>Sustainability</i> –The data files will be managed by NDE. Changes to the file will not need to be made at each district.</li> </ul>
4. Discipline feature removed from all teacher dashboard pages	HIGH	MED	LOW	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Impact</i> – All districts across the state have different discipline policies, and therefore, the feature must be disabled from the teacher view to accommodate each district’s policy.</li> <li><i>Level of Effort</i> – New development, but no vendor engagement required</li> </ul>

**Table 9: Customizations Included in Fall Pilot Scope**

Customizations	Dashboard Page
Remove Economically Disadvantaged per FERPA interpretation	Student Information
Remove Title I if school-wide participation	Student Information
Change Title I Participation to Title I Support	Student Information
Change Bilingual Program to Dual Language Program	Student Information
Change Gifted/Talented to High Ability Learner (HAL)	Student Information
Change English as a Second Language (ESL) to English Language Learners (ELL)	Student Information
Change “Special Services” to “Special Education Services”	Student Information
Change “Primary Instructional Setting” to “Least Restrictive Environment”	Student Information
Include Monitored Year 1 and 2 for Limited English Proficiency	Student Information
Remove Graduation Plan since there are no specific statewide graduation tracks	Student Information
Remove Single Parent/Pregnant Teen and Parent in Military	Student Information
Remove Over-Age	Student Information
Remove At-Risk	Student Information
Include Repeater	Student Information
Change Expected Graduation Year to Cohort Year – first appears in 9 <sup>th</sup> grade	Student Information
Remove check-boxes in “Special Services” box	Student Information
ACT/SAT/PSAT scores and whether taken	College and Career Readiness
Add student’s state and district ID number to the header	Every Header
The drill down for historical test results should be on the scale of 0-200	State Assessments
Show state course code on the transcript page	Transcript
Indicate if a student is new to the district	Student Information

**Optional Pilot Implementation** – Table 10 below represents those items that are also a high priority, but given the current time and resource allocations, should be implemented when possible only after the above items have been implemented. Additionally, the listed items are prioritized by importance after soliciting feedback from the pilot districts to rank the priorities in order from most important to least important (lowest ranking to highest ranking). The average ranking can be found in the last column. The “Additional Notes” column also considers the impact among both pilot districts and all Nebraska districts, the level of effort required for the new development, and the level of effort required to sustain the enhancements. This column also shows specific notes included by the pilot districts during the prioritization exercise.

**Table 10: Optional Feature Requests for Pilot Implementation**

Feature Request	Impact	Level of Effort	Sustain Effort	Core/New /Leverage	Additional Notes	Update Frequency	Average Ranking
1. Northwest Evaluation Association / Measures of Academic Progress (NWEA/MAP)	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	N/L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Impact</i> – The Design Team ranked this as the number two assessment behind NeSA for total and district votes. Additionally, seven out of the nine Pilot Districts use this assessment. Finally, MAP is the most widely used assessment (182 districts) to report accountability results to NDE.</li> <li><i>Level of Effort</i> – It has already been developed as an extension to Ed-Fi Core, but NWEA would like to make improvements to how the results were presented in the dashboard. This will require new development but can be shared as this is a widely used assessment across the Ed-Fi community.</li> <li><i>Sustainability</i> – Ideally, the vendor is willing to build, support and maintain the Ed-Fi connectors. On-going vendor support and maintenance will minimize sustainability effort and concerns for NDE. Once developed, promotion to Ed-Fi core is highly probable.</li> <li><i>Pilot District</i> - Would be very useful for our teachers. Elementary students are administered the MAP test three times per year.</li> </ul>	2-3 times per year depending on district	4.7
2. Standards-Based Grading	HIGH	MED	MED	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Impact</i> –Pilot districts show a wide range of grade reporting and creating a feature that accommodates grade reporting differences will be valuable to the entire state.</li> <li><i>Sustainability</i> –Once the extension is developed, minimal support and maintenance will be required at the state level. Districts will control the</li> </ul>	Daily	6.4

					metric threshold within the Metrics Settings of the dashboard.		
3. Add a drill down at the container level that shows the current year's NeSA scores for each subject in one view.	HIGH	MED	MED	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Impact</i> – All districts could benefit from this view of NeSA scores.</li> <li>• <i>Level of Effort</i> – New development required. No other states in the Ed-Fi community have implemented. The differing scale scores for each subject and version updates could make this view difficult to develop.</li> </ul>	Annually	7.4
4. Response to Intervention (RtI) indicator (including SAT info)	MED	HIGH	HIGH	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Impact</i> – Three out of the nine pilot districts.</li> <li>• <i>Level of Effort</i> – This would require new development. However, Pennsylvania is working on a similar indicator that could be leveraged by Nebraska at some point in the future.</li> <li>• <i>Sustainability</i> – Incorporate into statewide rollout once available in Ed-Fi core, thereby minimizing long-term sustainability effort and cost.</li> <li>• <i>Pilot District</i>– Especially with SAT plans.</li> <li>• <i>Pilot District</i> – This would be a helpful indicator as we have SAT teams at every building and RtI teams at our elementary teams working with the UNL consortium.</li> </ul>	Daily	8.6
5. Metric states – red/green visual cues that requires a unique district threshold (i.e. credits)	HIGH	HIGH	MED/HI	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Impact</i> –Pilot districts show a wide range of credit calculations and creating a feature that accommodates credit accumulation differences will be valuable to the entire state.</li> <li>• <i>Level of Effort</i> – Touches many subsystems and is a significant level of development work.</li> <li>• <i>Sustainability</i> – High levels of support and maintenance will be required at the state level as this may or may not be promoted to core.</li> <li>• <i>Pilot District</i> – Especially important for graduation credits.</li> <li>• <i>Pilot District</i> – Grades are updated in January and May.</li> </ul>	Varies by district	8.8
6. Metrics for	HIGH	MED	MED	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Impact</i> – All districts could benefit from a missing assignment metric.</li> </ul>	Daily	9.2

missing assignments					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Pilot District</i> - Our highest rated customization feature! The team thought this would be a great way for a teacher to see what missing assignments students had and would help to identify trends.</li> </ul>		
7. Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Learning Skills (DIBELS)	HIGH	MED	HIGH	C/N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Impact</i> –The Design Team ranked this assessment fifth on the priority list and seven out of the nine pilot districts use this assessment.</li> <li>• <i>Level of Effort</i> –DIBELS has already been developed in Ed-Fi Core. Pilot districts are fairly satisfied with the look and feel of what has already been developed; however, districts expressed concerns about not showing a more detailed drill-down view that shows subcategory performance. Some updates will be required, but the work done in other states (Arkansas, Delaware, and Texas) can be leveraged. Most significant part of the effort is coordination of accessing files to support all districts. Two phases (loading of data and modifying existing dashboard layout) could be implemented.</li> <li>• <i>Sustainability</i> –The vendor must be willing to build, support and maintain the Ed-Fi connectors. On-going vendor support and maintenance will minimize sustainability concerns for NDE.</li> <li>• <i>Pilot District</i> – Would like to see benchmark and progress monitoring scores in the dashboard.</li> </ul>	Varies by district	9.4
8. Attended Pre-school	HIGH	MED	MED	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Impact</i> – All districts across the state could benefit from a pre-school indicator.</li> <li>• <i>Level of Effort</i> – New development required. No other states in the Ed-Fi Alliance states have implemented.</li> </ul>	Annually	10.3

9. Check for Learning (C4L)	HIGH	MED	MED	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Impact</i> –Although neither the Design Team nor the Pilot Districts indicated the high need for this assessment, it is used by more than 70% of districts across the state.</li> <li>• <i>Level of Effort</i> – Discussions have been initiated with DRC with a positive response, but no definite commitment to build, support and maintain the connectors for the districts adoption. Ed-Fi core packages and loaders for local assessments can be utilized.</li> <li>• <i>Sustainability</i> –If the vendor, DRC, is willing to build, support, and maintain the Ed-Fi connectors, there will be minimal ongoing maintenance for NDE.</li> <li>• <i>Pilot District</i> – Our teachers do not use this on a regular basis. Occasionally students are given this test as a review for the NeSA test.</li> <li>• <i>Pilot District</i> – We feel this is a great tool, but not sure if a great deal should be invested to develop this feature when the C4L system has issues working and it seems to be available too late in the year.</li> <li>• <i>Pilot District</i> – Would be higher if the C4L system were more reliable.</li> </ul>	Daily	11.3
10. High mobility indicator	HIGH	MED	LOW	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Impact</i> – All districts could utilize this indicator.</li> <li>• <i>Level of Effort</i> – Ed-Fi community expressed a need for this indicator, but no one has implemented. An opportunity to share features across Ed-Fi Alliance community could be considered to increase overall capabilities of the dashboard.</li> </ul>	Daily	12.2
11. Aspire (replacing ACT Suite)	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Impact</i> – Five out of the nine pilot districts use the ACT suite (Plan and Explore) which will be replaced by Aspire this year. Additionally, 79 districts report administering this assessment to almost 13,000 students across the state for accountability purposes.</li> <li>• <i>Level of Effort</i> – New development required since this is a brand new assessment replacing ACT Plan and Explore. Other states are interested in this functionality and therefore, there is a possibility of shared development with Ed-Fi community.</li> </ul>	Varies by district	12.7

Nebraska Department of Education Dashboard Project: Stakeholder Engagement Findings Report Version 1.0

12. English Language Development Assessment (ELDA)	HIGH	MED	MED	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Impact</i> –All districts in the state with English Language Learner students administer this test per Federal mandate. However, not all districts have a lot of ELL students and was therefore rated as a lower priority.</li> <li>• <i>Level of Effort</i> – It has already been developed as an Ed-Fi core metric and there is an opportunity to leverage the work done in other states (Arkansas and Tennessee).</li> <li>• <i>Sustainability</i> – If ELDA data is managed at the district level, ongoing maintenance and support may be difficult. However, if the data files are stored at the state level, like NeSA, this would require significantly less maintenance and support.</li> </ul>	Annually	13.4
13. Progress reports at 4.5 Weeks in the quarter	HIGH	MED	HIGH	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Impact</i> – All districts could benefit from more frequent progress reporting.</li> </ul>	Every 4.5 weeks	13.6
14. ELL Level Indicator on Student Information Page	HIGH	MED	HIGH	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Level of Effort</i> – New development required as this type of assessment information is not typically presented on the student information page.</li> <li>• <i>Sustainability</i> – Higher sustainability effort as this is not a standard representation of the data. Additional effort may be required when upgrading to new Ed-Fi core versions.</li> </ul>	Varies by district	13.7
15. Track Criterion Reference Test (CRT) data over multiple year	LOW	HIGH	HIGH	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Impact</i> – One pilot district utilizes CRT’s.</li> <li>• <i>Pilot District</i> – We do not use but plan to in the future.</li> <li>• <i>Pilot District</i> – As discussed at one of our weekly conference calls, a generic type of screen with performance levels or quartiles for formative assessment would be beneficial. Any district would be able to use this and tailor the assessment to fit the levels. This would prompt teachers to use the dashboard more often because NeSA and MAP assessment information is a snapshot of one test at one time of the year.</li> </ul>	Varies by district	13.9

<p>16. District-level control of teacher access to discipline records</p>	<p>MED</p>	<p>HIGH</p>	<p>HIGH</p>	<p>N</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Impact</i> – Six out of the nine pilot districts restrict teacher access to discipline. A survey to understand the statewide impact would be beneficial.</li> <li>• <i>Level of Effort</i> – New development required. District-level customizations required. No other states in the Ed-Fi Alliance states have implemented.</li> <li>• <i>Sustainability</i> –There could be support costs associated with ongoing/revised policy regarding access to the district discipline records.</li> <li>• <i>Pilot District</i> – We do not have a problem with teachers seeing discipline records. If we choose to take the feature away from teachers, we would like the teacher to have some notification such as a date and/or time of discipline incident or a running count at least.</li> <li>• <i>Pilot District</i> – We don’t currently provide teacher access to student discipline information.</li> <li>• <i>Pilot District</i> – I don’t think this should be on the dashboard at all.</li> </ul>	<p>Daily</p>	<p>15.6</p>
<p>17. Compass</p>	<p>MED</p>	<p>HIGH</p>	<p>HIGH</p>	<p>N</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Impact</i> – Five out of the nine pilot districts administer the ACT Compass.</li> <li>• <i>Level of Effort</i> – New development required. No other Ed-Fi Alliance states have implemented.</li> <li>• <i>Pilot District</i> – Students take from college. We don’t always get scores.</li> <li>• <i>Pilot District</i> – Test results are only available to the school if the student chooses to share the results.</li> <li>• <i>Pilot District</i> – Some of our students take this assessment but we receive no scores from Compass. This isn’t necessary for our dashboard.</li> </ul>	<p>Varies by district</p>	<p>15.9</p>
<p>18. Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Test (ASVAB)</p>	<p>HIGH</p>	<p>HIGH</p>	<p>HIGH</p>	<p>L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Impact</i> – Seven out of nine pilot districts utilize this assessment. Additionally, NDE college and career readiness team identified it as a high priority in context with the statewide needs.</li> <li>• <i>Level of Effort</i> – This would require new development. However, Little Rock has implemented this assessment and their work could be leveraged by Nebraska if a reciprocity agreement is established.</li> </ul>	<p>Varies by district</p>	<p>16.3</p>

19. Indicator on Student Information page for entrance and exit date of SpEd students	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Level of Effort</i> – New development required. The source data is located outside of the SIS (SRS in some districts).</li> <li>• <i>Pilot District</i> – Not a necessary dashboard feature for our district. Our SPED teachers have access to a different system which houses the information they need.</li> <li>• <i>Pilot District</i> – I don't think this should be on the dashboard.</li> </ul>	Daily	16.6
20. Include whether the student is a ward of the state (not protected)	LOW	HIGH	MED	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Impact</i> – Not every school or district may have students that are ward of the state.</li> <li>• <i>Level of Effort</i> – New development required. The source data could be outside of the SIS. No other states in the Ed-Fi Alliance states have implemented.</li> </ul>	Varies by district	17.1
21. Acuity	LOW	HIGH	HIGH	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Impact</i> – One pilot district, Omaha, administers Acuity.</li> <li>• <i>Level of Effort</i> – New development required. No other Ed-Fi Alliance states have implemented.</li> </ul>	Varies by district	19.0
22. ITBS	LOW	MED	HIGH	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Impact</i> – One pilot district administers this assessment and 18 districts report administering this assessment to roughly 8,000 students across the state for accountability purposes.</li> <li>• <i>Level of Effort</i> – It has already been created by another Ed-Fi Alliance state (Arkansas) that could potentially be shared with Nebraska in exchange for the NWEA/MAP development since they have expressed interest in implementing the assessment.</li> </ul>	Varies by district	20.3
23. Asset	LOW	HIGH	HIGH	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Impact</i> – Three out of the nine pilot districts administer the ACT Asset.</li> <li>• <i>Level of Effort</i> – Due to the pencil and paper format of the test, additional development would be required to input test scores directly into the dashboard or develop a digital representation of test data to ingest. No other Ed-Fi Alliance states have implemented.</li> <li>• <i>Pilot District</i>– When a student takes it, we don't always get the scores. But when we do, it is usually paper.</li> </ul>	Varies by district	20.6

24. Terra Nova	MED	HIGH	HIGH	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Impact</i> – None of the pilot districts utilize the Terra Nova, but 37 districts report administering this assessment to almost 11,000 students across the state for accountability purposes. This will not be considered in the pilot, but due to number of districts that use this assessment statewide, it should be considered for the statewide rollout.</li> </ul>	21.8
----------------	-----	------	------	---	---	------

## Conclusion

Stakeholder engagement is a critical component to the success of the pilot roll-out and statewide adoption of the Ed-Fi dashboard project. The Nebraska Department of Education and Double Line Partners had three key objectives for the engagement sessions: 1) enabling stakeholders to understand the project vision, 2) reviewing the project's progress, and 3) allowing stakeholders to provide input into the design of the dashboard. An additional goal and byproduct of the sessions was to establish commitment and support around the dashboard project with expectations for all stakeholders to champion the dashboard project. Through identification of the appropriate stakeholder groups and strategic session planning, NDE and Double Line was able to successfully complete the stakeholder engagement stage of the project.

Double Line has created a list of recommendations for Nebraska's stakeholders to review and analyze. The goal is to give Nebraska a method of identifying those dashboard features that give pilot districts the most functionality while balancing the needs for the entire state of Nebraska. While this list of recommendations takes into consideration current factors affecting priorities today, stakeholders will need to constantly weigh the ever changing landscape of the educational space including district policies, standards, key success indicators, and assessments when determining what to include in the future implementations. Additional stakeholder engagement may be warranted, through high touch methods such as a survey to understand the changing needs of all districts across the state. NDE will also have an opportunity to gather user feedback directly through the dashboard and should utilize the data to understand future dashboard enhancements. Furthermore, for statewide adoption and long-term maintenance planning, NDE should stay in frequent communication with the Ed-Fi Alliance and Ed-Fi community to best understand what new features have been upgraded to Ed-Fi core and the enhancements that members are working on in order to leverage new development and prevent a duplication of efforts.

NDE understands the importance of leveraging external relationships in order to ensure that the project is financially sustainable long after the first phase of implementation. Working closely with key data source vendors, including other SIS and assessment vendors, will be critical to minimizing long-term costs associated with building, supporting, and maintaining dashboard upgrades across the state. Additionally, collaboration with the Ed-Fi Alliance and community will only help encourage data source vendors to support and adopt Ed-Fi standards and products in order to best serve their clients. The Ed-Fi Alliance also brings a valuable opportunity to share best practices and new development that can substantially decrease costs for collaborating states.

Finally, NDE and Double Line will work together to ensure that expectations are clearly set and communicated to all stakeholders with the long-term vision of the SLDS project and the phased approach at the forefront of every discussion.