**SIF Data Model Extension Proposal Template**

*This template should be used by individuals or Project Teams to submit (and later track the progress of) proposed extensions to the SIF Data Model. These extensions can either be new data objects or revisions to the schema defining elements and / or attributes in existing ones.*

*It is designed to be a “living document” and contains two “status tracking” sections which should be maintained and updated as the change approval process for this extension evolves.*
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|  |
| --- |
| Extension Proposal Version Control |
| Version | Date: | Author/Organization: | Comments |
| 3 | 10/25/11 | James Yap | 3rd version has combined multiple objects into one and cleaned up the design to solve this missing data from the spec. |
| 4 | 12/18/2011 | James Yap | 4th version incorporates questions and revisions from Ron Kleinman |
| 5 | 02/03/2012 | James Yap | Revisions after Webinar |
| 6 | 02/07/2012 | Ron Kleinman | Revisions after revisions after webinar |

# **1 Identification**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposed Extension Name | StaffEvaluationInfo |
| Submitted by (Project Team or Individual) | James Yap |
| Date of initial submittal | 5/5/2011 |
|  |  |
| What is the base SIF Data Model release? | 2.6 |
| What is the base SIF Infrastructure release? |  |
|  |  |
| What existing SIF object(s) if any will be affected?  | None |
| What is the name of any new object(s)? | StaffEvaluationInfo |
|  |  |
| DM Extension ID (to be assigned when submitted) |  |

**Status Tracker Phase 1: Documentation and Approval**

*The steps in this initial phase document the proposed extensions to the SIF Data Model to the point where they can be reviewed and approved by the Tech Board as deserving of further effort. Completion of the detailed design and evaluation of the dependencies and migration impacts are left until Phase II.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Template Section** | **Draft Completed****(Owner / Date)** | **Reviewed (R) or Accepted (A)****(Owner / Date)** | **Comments** |
| Rational and Business Case  | Champion**Date:** | Tech Board (A)**Date:** | Assign to relevant Project Team(s) |
| Use Case(s) | Champion / Project Team**Date:** | Project Team (R)**Date:** |  |
| Proposal approval | Project Team**Date:** | Tech Board (A)**Date:** | Placed in Fast Track or Object Pipeline |

# **2. Proposal**

*This section should be completed by the “Proposal Champion”. A champion is usually one of the authors of the business case (although it may be SIF staff). This individual is responsible for driving the proposal through the qualification and acceptance cycle.*

*The following two subsections must be completed before the process can begin.*

## 2.1 Rational for Extension

*Explain the rational for the proposed extension to the SIF Data Model:*

* *What are the problems / limitations to be addressed?*
* *What is the additional information required?*

This proposal allows for the Staff Evaluation piece of the APPR of the Federal Regulations to be passed on to the states and eventually onto the federal level. Right now the SIF Specification does not have anything like this and it is definitely needed.

## 2.2 Business Case

*Provide a specific example of an example where the additional information defined in this proposal will be used in one or more educational processes*

*It should focus exclusively on the business problem to be solved and avoid proposing solutions.*

EvaluationInfo Object is needed due to the new APPR (Annual Professional Performance Review) Regulations that are rolled into the Race to the Top can be complied with and that state reporting can be supported.

# **3. Use Cases**

*The proposal champion or the assigned project team must provide one or more high-level use cases illustrating the interactions between “actors” (typically applications) that become possible if this proposal is adopted and successfully implemented. Use one copy of the form below for each.*

**Use Case Title:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type (Mandatory or Optional)** |  |
| **SIF Version** | 2.6 |
| **Summary Description** |  This is Staff Evaluation Object to meet the new APPR Regulations from the Federal government and are being enforced by the states |
| **Actors:** **Requesting Agent****Responding Agent**  | Requesting: State data warehouseResponding: HR System or Staff Evaluation System |
| **Preconditions** | Staff is in the Staff Evaluation electronic Database or system |
| **Main Sequence of Events / Action Steps** | * State requests information for Federal reporting around Staff Evaluation Information
* Staff Evaluation system responds with scores and subscores
* State gets data into their SLDS
 |
| **Alternative Sequence of Events / Action Steps** | * HR System acts as a go between the Staff Evaluation system and the SLDS and passes only the necessary information
* Data is sent to the local DW
 |
| **Post Conditions** | Data is sent to the SLDS or to a local DW |
| **SIF Mandatory Objects** | Staff Personal, LEA Info, Section Info, School Info, SchoolCourseInfo, StaffSectionAssignment |
| **SIF Optional Objects** | StudentPersonal, StudentSectionEnrollment |
| **Open Issues** |  |

**Status Tracker Phase 2: Execution of Proposed Changes**

*At this point the initial Data Model extension proposal has been accepted by the Tech Board and is either in the object pipeline, or being fast-tracked. The following sections have to be completed and (where indicated) reviewed and approved before this proposal can be reflected in the SIF specification.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Template Section** | **Draft Completed****(Owner / Date)** | **Reviewed (R) or Accepted (A)****(Owner / Date)** | **Comments** |
| Dependencies  | Project Team / Staff**Date:** | Internal Project Team review |  |
| Object Definition Table | Project Team**Date:** | Tech Board (R)**Date:** |  |
| Migration Plan | Staff / Project Team **Date:** | Tech Board (A)**Date:** | TB Approval is part of SIF Release cycle |
| Sample XML | Staff / Project Team **Date:** | Optional | Generally provided as part of published specification |

# **4. Impact Assessment**

*This section is the first to consider the actual implementation which will address the use cases previously identified. It requires assessing the impacts to both the existing objects and infrastructure, and to previously deployed applications. It would normally be produced by the Project Team (new or existing) assigned to this data model extension by the Tech Board at the time this proposal was approved.*

*In cases where a legacy object (one with no owning Project Team), is being changed, the task of assessing impact may be assigned to a Staff member to drive its completion.*

*The following two subsections must be completed.*

## 4.1 External Object Dependencies and Relation Map

*Identify any dependencies on existing XML entities in other SIF objects*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Proposed new Element or Attribute** | **Object & XML Entity dependency** **(Element, Attribute, Type)** | **Relationship / Reason** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 4.2 Infrastructure / International Dependencies and Relation Map

*Identify any dependencies on infrastructure technologies and / or deliverables from the International Technical Board (ITB) which are planned for a future release.*

*This could include requiring or relying on specific functionality from one or more of the following:*

* *Transport (ex: SOAP conventions)*
* *SIS Functional Profiles*
* *Identity Management Profiles*
* *Global Data Model Metadata*
* *Central Administration or Smart Zone*
* *Zone Services (ex: Assessment)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Proposed new Object, Element or Attribute** | **Infrastructure or International technology dependency** | **Specifics of dependency** |
|  |  |  |
| StaffEvaluationInfo |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# **5 Detailed Design**

*Place the detailed element by element, attribute by attribute breakdown of the Data Model Extension here. This work is normally done by members of the assigned Project Team.*

*The possible values of the “Char” column include*

*One of the following characteristics:*

* ***M – Mandatory****. Item must appear in every Add Event and Response message for the object*
* ***Q – ReQuired****. Item must either appear in an Add Event or eventually be included in a Change Event.*
* ***S – Supported****. Item may or may not appear in any message relating to the object. However if its value is supplied / available, it must be included by the sender in Event and Response messages.*
* ***C******– Conditional.*** *Item is required if the included conditions are satisfied*
* ***O – Optional****. Item may or may not appear in any message relating to the object. It need not be supported by the sender*

Plus one or more of the following characteristics if applicable:

* ***I –******Immutable.*** *Item value cannot be changed once supplied.*
* ***U –******Unique.*** *Item value is unique from all other objects containing that item (ex: RefId)*
* ***N –******Non-Queryable****. Item may not be used in a Request message. This would be true for elements which might be calculated by the object provider (ex: aggregates)*

Plus the following characteristic if applicable:

* ***R ­– Repeatable.*** *Item may appear more than one time.*

*The “type” of each item is either an XML type (ex: integer) or a named SIF Global Type.*

 *XML Facets can help to further define the value of an item. These can include length, range, and per-type value restrictions. They should be specified if known.*

*Fill out a separate copy of the following table for each affected new or existing SIF object.*

This is just a Request Only Object and does not publish Events.

The Responses only contain where all mandatory fields are filled.

**Object Name: StaffEvaluationInfo**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Object/Element/Attribute** | **Char** | **Object Description** | **Type** |
| StaffPersonalRefId | M | The staff being evaluated | GUID |
| SchoolInfoRefId | M | School the staff member resides and where they are being evaluated | GUID |
| NCESId | O | The school or district of the evaluator where they reside. | NCESId |
| EvaluatorStateProvinceId | O | The id that has been assigned by the state to the administrator that is administering the evaluation | StateProvinceId |
| BargainingUnit | O | This is the unit that the person being observed is part of | xs:normalizedString |
| EvaluationCycleName | O | The type of evaluation that will take place for that individual  | Xs:normalized String |
| EvaluationPreconferenceDate | O | When the Evaluation was first discussed and the goals for the evaluation were discussed | xs:date |
| ProjectedEvaluationDate | O | When the evaluation is anticipated to happen | xs:date |
| EvaluationDate | M | Date of when the evaluation actually was observed. | xs:date |
| EvaluationPostConferenceDate | O | Date of PostConference where the evaluation will be discussed | Xs: date |
| EvaluationSystem | M | This is the name of the tool being used | xs:normalizedString |
| EvaluationParts | O | The set of the Evaluation Parts | List |
| EvaluationParts/EvaluationPart | MR |  |  |
| EvaluationParts/EvaluationPart/Name | M | This is the name of a part that could receive a score- | xs:normalizedString |
| EvaluationParts/EvaluationPart/Score | M | This is a subscore that is part of the evaluation- | xs:normalizedString |
| EvaluationParts/EvaluationPart/Scale | M | This is the scale for the Subscore that is part of the evaluation- | xs:normalizedString |
| EvaluationHolisticScore | M | The overall Score for the evaluation  | Xs:normalized String |
| EvaluationHolisticScale | M | This is the overall Scale that is being used for the Evaluation | xs:Normalized String |
| EvaluationRecommendation | O | What was done because of a summative evaluation |  |
| EvaluationRecommendation/Code | M | The code for the decision taken during the summative evaluation. | CEDS 000102 |
| EvaluationRecommendation/OtherCodeList | O | The code for the decision taken during the summative evaluation. | OtherCodeList |
| SIF\_Metadata |  |  |  |
| SIFExtendedElements |  |  |  |

#

# **6 Migration Plan (for proposed changes to existing objects only)**

*One of the mandatory components of every Data Model Change proposal is the Migration Plan. This section describes the impact of the proposed change to legacy SIF Zones and the techniques, best practices and deployment guidelines designed to minimize that impact. It is normally filled out in coordination with SIF Staff or an experienced SIF Data Modeler.*

*All migration plans have the same overarching goal: allow an existing SIF Zone to migrate to the new change incrementally ... by changing only one component at a time while maintaining at least the previous level of functionality, and “breaking” nothing in the process.*

*Several common strategies (in order of desirability) are:*

***1. Add new elements rather than modify old ones***

*This places a requirement on new agents to support duplicate entries in order to maintain backwards compatibility with agents conforming to earlier versions of the standard. To use this strategy, there must be a clear mapping provided for agent writers to utilize. This would include mapping any new code set values to the collection of previously existing ones.*

***2. Constrain the impact to the ZIS***

*In this case the ZIS will transparently “bridge” between agents supporting this change and earlier versions. To use this strategy, there must be a clear mapping provided for ZIS vendors to utilize, and at least two vendors must “sign off” on this section of the proposal.*

***3. Reduce the impact***

*This approach is effective for changing only those parts of the SIF specification which have been minimally adopted. Start by mapping the set of changed elements against the CSQ matrices to determine the number of existing SIF-certified applications that will be affected. Work with SIF Staff to alert impacted vendors (those with certified, and where known, uncertified products) and identify the number of sites which will be affected. Depending upon the size of the impact, the change may be accepted for a minor release.*

***4. Extended Elements***

*Use the extended element construct to add the new changes. This has the advantage that it standardizes how the functionality will be introduced, but suffers from the disadvantage that conformance to the changes cannot be easily verified, and a further change will be required when moving forward to the next major release. It is the least desirable way to introduce changes into a minor release, and a strong justification for this approach should be prepared.*

***5. Wait until the next major release***

*Defer the proposed change until the next major release because a clear incremental migration strategy for it cannot be constructed.*

**Migration Plan:**

*Using the above techniques or alternative ones, specify the recommended series of incremental component upgrades or deployments (of application, agent or ZIS) which must be performed before the data model changes introduced by this proposal can be successfully incorporated into an existing SIF Zone.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Component Replaced** | **Increased Functionality (if any)** | **Effect on Legacy components (if any)** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# **7 Issues**

*List any issues surrounding this proposal which the reviewers or approvers may need to consider.*

# **8 XML Example(s)**

*One or more examples of XML instances representing the items in the proposed extension should be placed here, as part of work done during the detailed design process.*

<StaffEvaluationInfo

<StaffPersonalRefId>DC9837A90CB28748EF81A8AA39270C2</StaffPersonalRefId>

 <SchoolInfoRefId>1947AB893C29F73910FEC3827A239CB1</SchoolInfoRefId>

<NCESId>421575003045</NCESId>

<StateProvinceId>L65432765</StateProvinceId>

 <BargainingUnit>RTA</BargainingUnit>

<EvaluationCycleName>P1</EvaluationCycleName>

 <EvaluationPreconferenceDate>2011-09-01</EvaluationPreconferenceDate>

 <ProjectedEvaluationDate>2012-10-12</ProjectedEvaluationDate>

<EvaluationDate>2012-10-13</EvaluationDate>

<EvaluationPostConferenceDate>2012-10-12</EvaluationPostConferenceDate>

<EvaluationSystem>My Learning Plan:OASYS</EvaluationSystem>

<EvaluationParts>

<EvaluationPart>

<Name> Using Assessment in Instruction </Name>

<Score>3</Score>

<Scale>1-4</Scale>

</EvaluationPart>

<EvaluationPart>

<Name> Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources </Name>

<Score>4</Score>

<Scale>1-4</Scale>

 </EvaluationPart>

 <EvaluationParts>

<EvaluationHolisticScore>100-Mastery</EvaluationHolisticScore>

<EvaluationHolisticScale>1-100 Mastery, Proficient, Standards Met, Below Standards</EvaluationHolisticScale>

 <EvaluationRecommendation>

<Code>02338</Code>

<OtherCodeList>

<OtherCode Codeset="Local">S</OtherCode>

<OtherCode Codeset="Text">Semester</OtherCode>

</OtherCodeList>

</EvaluationRecommendation>

</StaffEvaluationInfo>