

**Annual Mandatory Collection of Elementary and Secondary Education Data
through *EDFacts***

August 2010

Attachment G

**Response to Questions
from Office of Management
and Budget (OMB)**

CONTENTS

Introduction3

Questions from OMB.....3

Appendix A - Academic Achievement Data at the School Level.....12

Appendix B – Programs Included in the GEPA Collection Through ESS.....17

Appendix C – Ready-Made Reports in the EDFacts Reporting System.....19

INTRODUCTION

This attachment contains the responses to the questions from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) sent to ED on August 12, 2010.

QUESTIONS FROM OMB

- 1. Most of the student achievement/drop-out data are collected at the school level. Can the General Education Provision Act Section 424 (GEPA)/funding data be collected at the school level?**

We have struggled with the issue of GEPA/funding data at the school level since the beginning of this project. At this time, we do not recommend collecting school level GEPA or funding data.

First, collecting the data would be difficult. The LEA is the grantee or subgrantee for most programs. The LEA is responsible for allocating the grant resources to the schools. Some resources cannot be associated with a specific school, for example, a district-wide training program. While the LEA could allocate the grant funding to the schools, any allocation would be based on assumptions that could vary from LEA to LEA and from state to state.

Second, we believe that associating the grant funding with the LEA is appropriate and can serve to emphasize the LEA's accountability for operating the grant including allocating the resources. The data as currently collected can be used to analyze the grants available to the LEA and the results of that LEA's schools.

Third, we are currently studying school-level education resources and should wait for the outcome of that study before making decisions on the collection of these data. The Study of School-Level Expenditures (OMB 1875-0255) is examining the extent to which school-level education resources are distributed equitably within and across school districts.

- 2. Do all states provide achievement data at the school level? If not, where are the data gaps?**

For SY 2008-09, the 52 SEAs provided academic achievement data at the school level with two exceptions: Alabama and Alaska provided data at the school level for mathematics and reading/language arts but not for science. Appendix A contains the reports on the data submitted at the school level for academic achievement for SY 2008-09.

3. Does EDFacts collect data for all of ED's competitive grants, in addition to the formula grants? If not, could ED provide a list of the competitive grants for which it collects GEPA data?

EDFacts does not collect GEPA data for all of ED's competitive grants. For each fiscal year, we identify the programs for which the state receives funds that are distributed to local education agencies (LEAs). We collect the GEPA data for those programs through the EDEN Submission System (ESS). For the GEPA report, we combine the data collected using ESS with data from the Department's Grants Administration and Payment System (GAPS) on programs where funds are distributed by the Department directly to LEAs.

Currently, we are collecting the data for FY 2007. The data collection is always delayed because SEAs have the fiscal year as well as the 27 month period allowed by the Tydings Amendment to expend the funds.

Appendix B contains a list of the programs included in the FY 2007 GEPA collection through ESS. We have not sorted the list into competitive grants and formula grants but will do so if requested by OMB.

4. In the future, could EDFacts collect total school and district level funding (federal, state, and local)? What would it take to do that? This kind of data could be used to assist states and districts with maintenance of effort (MOE) and comparability reporting.

The technology used by the EDFacts system is capable of collecting data on funding.

We believe before any data on funding is collected by EDFacts we would need to study how the data to be collected relates to NCES' Common Core of Data (CCD), National Public Education Financial Survey (NPEFS) and Census Bureau's Survey of Local Government Finances: School Systems (F-33). As noted under question #1, we would also advise waiting on the outcome of the study of school-level expenditures which is looking specifically at whether resources are distributed equitably within and across school districts.

We would recommend working with the National Education Forum, NCES and Census Bureau to define what, if any, funding data should be collected through EDFacts or what, if any, data collected through NPEFS or F-33 should be combined with the EDFacts data set.

5. How does EDFacts interact with Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS)? Are SLDS grants increasing state ability to provide EDFacts data? How do these two efforts coordinate and work together?

Longitudinal Data Systems are indirectly supporting states' capacity to report EDFacts data by moving states toward more centralized collection and storage of data. This centralization

can simplify the creation of data marts and/or automated extracts that can be used in preparing data files for EDFacts. In addition, student level data systems should greatly improve the quality of data available from the states.

When the SLDS grants were being created, top level ED officials wanted to ensure that the new grants would produce data that would be reported to ED but the wording in the final grant announcements contained only weak requirements for that capability. Since that time ED staff in OPEPD and NCES have worked more closely together to ensure that the data systems being developed under these grants would also provide more complete, accurate, and timely data to ED through EDFacts.

A new state education information support services contract in OPEPD contains provisions to magnify the current coordination efforts. That contract will be put into place in September 2010.

6. As we look at the 2012 budget, what issues should we keep in mind as we review Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) and EDFacts?

The success of both the SLDS grant program and the EDFacts Initiative depend upon effective data management, including data quality and usage, within and among states and the federal government. In recent years, ED has utilized a portion of the SLDS appropriation for data coordination. Activities have ranged from supporting EDFacts Coordinators to establishing systems and processes which lead to greater automation for public and federal reporting to establishing a Privacy Technology Assistance Center within NCES. Other efforts, such as the National Forum on Education Statistics, also support effective data management and coordination.¹ In addition, projects like the Common Data Standards and the National Education Data Model promote effective data management. As the futures of EDFacts and SLDS are considered through the upcoming budget requests, it will be important for ED to continue supporting activities which increase coordination and improve data management.

It is also important to keep in mind the extensive impact that new or reauthorizing legislation might have on data management efforts. Such changes are expected to affect the education community, its resources and systems, as well as private industry, which has worked closely with the education community to provide tools and methods for managing and sharing education data. Even small policy changes can require changes in all systems and processes across the nation.

7. How does EDFacts support ...

¹ For example, in July 2009, the EDFacts Data Governance Board presented to the Forum recommendations for the Forum's guide on discipline data that would result in improvements to federal reporting. This month, the Forum returned to the EDFacts Data Governance Board a draft guide that includes those recommendations.

a. **Race to the Top (RTT) data collections? Will LEAs and schools be identified as having received RTT funding?**

Information about which schools and LEAs receive funding under RTT is gathered within the application process by the RTT program office. The EDFacts team will work with the program office to determine what information needs they may have that could be served by adding an indication of a school or district receiving RTT funds in the EDFacts data warehouse. If the benefits of adding the data to the warehouse are determined to be high enough, we will work with the program office, as the steward of the data, to properly load the data into the warehouse where it can be used in conjunction with the rest of the EDFacts data.

b. **Investing in Innovation (“i3”) data collections? Will LEAs and schools be identified as having received “i3” funding?**

Information about which schools and LEAs receive funding under i3 is gathered within the application process by the i3 program office, and within the GAPS system (which administers the distribution of funds to the grantees). The EDFacts team will work with the program office to determine what information needs they may have that could be served by adding an indication of a school or district receiving i3 funds in the EDFacts data warehouse. If the benefits of adding the data to the warehouse are determined to be high enough, we will work with the program office, as the steward of the data, to properly load the data into the warehouse where it can be used in conjunction with the rest of the EDFacts data.

c. **Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) data collections? Will LEAs and schools be identified as having received TIF funding?**

Information about which schools and LEAs receive funding under TIF is gathered within the application process by the TIF program office, and within the GAPS system (which administers the distribution of funds to the grantees). The EDFacts team will work with the program office to determine what information needs they may have that could be served by adding an indication of a school or district receiving TIF funds in the EDFacts data warehouse. If the benefits of adding the data to the warehouse are determined to be high enough, we will work with the program office, as the steward of the data, to properly load the data into the warehouse where it can be used in conjunction with the rest of the EDFacts data.

8. Access to EDFacts data – We appreciate ED’s willingness to work with OMB to allow us to gain access to EDFacts data. Specifically, we’d like to develop a plan to:

a. Train one or two OMB staff in the use of EDFacts.

We have a series of training modules. The modules start with basic information on how EDFacts data are structured and include lessons on how to pull and use data from the EDFacts Reporting System. We propose two half day training sessions about one or two weeks apart. During the first session, we would cover the first training modules on the data and the basic functionality of the system. A week or two later, we would cover the more advanced topics. This would allow the OMB staff to have some time to “play” with the system between the training sessions.

We would add the OMB staff to our listserv so that they would be notified of any system changes.

We propose that the OMB staff would send any questions that they have to the EDFacts Partner Support Center so that the questions can be logged into our tracking system. Most likely, the questions would need to be escalated by the Partner Support Center to ED staff. While this is an additional step, it is important for us to maintain accurate and complete records of the questions that rise about EDFacts.

We also propose that the OMB staff with EDFacts reporting system access meet with PIMS quarterly to discuss data usage.

b. Gain access to the data at the same level and manner as ED staff who have been trained to use EDFacts.

Access to the EDFacts system at the level ED staff have is currently managed through the Department’s “active directory” which means that a person must have an “ed.gov” mail box. We are requesting OCIO to provide approved OMB staff “ed.gov” mail boxes so that they can access the EDFacts system.

Once we receive approval from OCIO on how the OMB staff will obtain an “ed.gov” mailbox, we will work with OMB to provide selected OMB staff with access to the EDFacts reporting system.

c. Have access to ready-made reports. Can ED provide a list of the available reports?

OMB staff with access to the system will be able to run all ready-made reports. A list of ready-made reports that are currently available in the system is in Appendix C.

9. Can ED provide a plan and timeline for making EDFacts data available to the public?
a. For states

Our approach to making data available to SEAs is to provide multiple views of the data that the SEA submitted. We are not planning to provide SEA specific access to the full database. In other words, the SEA in Ohio will have multiple views of Ohio's data but not Missouri's data. We believe that an SEA's access to another state's data should be through the public access or through access provided to researchers.

SEAs have access to the data that they submit for their state. SEAs can review the data in "raw" form through the ESS.

We created reports that look similar to the legacy collection forms, which we call "pre-fill" reports. These pre-fill reports allow SEAs to see the data as they have always seen it. Pre-fill reports are available for the IDEA Section 618 tables and the CSPR. We will be building pre-fill reports for Perkins Consolidated Annual Report (CAR).

We are currently building data quality reports which will provide a better tool for SEAs to validate the data that they submit at the LEA and school levels.

b. For districts

We are not planning to provide district specific access. Districts would be able to see the data through views provided to the general public and researchers.

We believe that it is more appropriate for the SEAs to provide the access to the districts because that approach encourages the data steward relationship between the SEAs and the LEAs that is essential to high quality data throughout the education system.

c. For researchers

We currently provide data for evaluations and studies conducted by ED. Beyond the CRDC and CCD data sets, we do not currently provide data to outside researchers.

d. For the general public

We currently support all the reporting of data to the general public that existed under the legacy collections. NCES continues to report the Common Core of Data (CCD). OESE posts each state's Consolidated State Performance Reports (CSPR). OSEP continues to report the IDEA section 618 tables.²

² As explained in Attachment B-1, EDFacts currently provides data for Tables 1 through 6. States have to achieve congruency before the state submits data only through EDFacts.

We have not been able to expand significantly beyond the legacy collection reporting because of concerns about privacy. The concerns about privacy are not new. For example, complete reports on the Gun-Free Schools Act (GFSA) data have not been published for several years because of concerns about student privacy. We are working within ED (OPEPD, NCES, FPCO, and OGC) to develop uniform data privacy policies and quality control procedures that will allow data to be published in a manner that meets the standards of each ED program. For example, for the GFSA reports, we are working on an approach involving redacting data so that previous school year reports can be issued without compromising student privacy.

While we have not expanded significantly beyond the legacy collection reporting, we have made some progress. For several years we have published state profiles and congressional district profiles. The profiles contain an array of data that were never previously reported in a single venue. We worked with OESE on ED Data Express, a recently launched, interactive web site that hosts K-12 data. Previous to ED Data Express, OESE posted the CSPRs as pdf documents. ED Data Express allows access to the data in table format making the data more available to users. Finally, NCES is reviewing data obtained for other program purposes (e.g., more detailed data on dropouts and membership) for purposes of expanding the CCD. The expanded variables will need to go through NCES review before NCES could choose to report them.

10. What are ED's future plans for EDFacts and the collection of 0-5 years and post-secondary data, including workforce data? Has ED considered collecting data from non-SEAs (IDEA Part C can be administered outside of the SEA)?

The OPEPD/PIMS team is working with ED program offices and other federal agencies to lay the foundation for coordinating the multiple data collections that currently collect data on 0-5, post-secondary, and workforce data.

In most cases, data on 0-5, post-secondary, and workforce will come from state agencies other than the SEA that currently submit data to EDFacts. With some modifications, the ESS would be able to collect data from these state agencies. To ensure an audit trail, we would need to open multiple accounts for each state so that we could trace the data submitted to the state agency.

11. States report free and reduced price lunch (FRPL) data through EDFacts. The current reauthorization of the child nutrition programs includes changes in eligibility for free meals, specifically, some schools may adopt an approach that allows all students in a school to receive free meals, even if all do not qualify, in exchange for reductions in reporting burden. How is ED planning for potential changes in FRPL requirements and definitions?

The proposed changes in eligibility appear to build on the current regulations for provisions 1, 2 and 3 schools. Under provisions 1, 2 and 3, schools with significant percentages of students who are eligible for free and reduced price meals certify the students for more than one school year. Under provisions 2 and 3, schools are allowed to simplify the reimbursement using methods other than the daily meal counts.

Currently provision 1, 2, and 3 schools report student counts for free and reduced price lunch based on available data which could be reporting a certain percentage of the school as eligible.

We are assuming that schools would be eligible for this new approach because the schools have a significant percentage of the students eligible for free or reduced price lunches. We would encourage SEAs to report the free and reduced price lunch data using a reasonable method to estimate the number of students eligible. We would not expect the schools to determine the eligibility of individual students if that was not required by USDA as such a position would defeat what USDA is attempting to achieve.

12. For the new School Improvement Grants (SIG) data, in addition to identifying Tier I and Tier II schools,³ will the following schools also be identified:

- a. **All persistently lowest achieving (PLA) schools on the State's PLA list, regardless of whether the school receives SIG funds**

Yes. All persistently lowest achieving schools should be reported by each SEAs through the data group Persistently lowest achieving schools status (DG741). This data group was included in Attachment B-7. This data group is used for SFSF indicators (d)(3), (d)(4), (d)(5) and (d)(6).

b. Tier III schools

No. The EDFacts data set does not include collecting which schools are Tier III schools.

13. In the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) data elements, which elements are the three descriptors and how will information on those be collected?

Not all indicators and descriptors for the SFSF program are being proposed for inclusion within the EDFacts data collection at this time. With its authorization under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), the SFSF program exists only for a specific period of time (all funds are to be spent by 9/20/2011). For this reason, we identified only a subset of indicators which are being proposed for addition to the EDFacts data collection due to

³ To clarify, while we will be able to identify the Tier I and Tier II schools, we are not requesting that SEAs differentiate between Tier I and Tier II. In other words, we will know that a school is a Tier I or Tier II school but we will not know if the school is Tier I or if the school is Tier II.

their alignment with the policy directions for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which were outlined in the Blueprint earlier this year. Data on the remaining indicators and all descriptors under SFSF will be reported directly to the program office. If a determination is made that there are information needs of the program office, or of policy leaders, that would be best met by loading these data into the EDFacts data warehouse, there are no technical reasons that it could not be done. Discussion of the collection of the full set of indicators and descriptors for SFSF was discussed in an OMB clearance and public comment period in the fall of 2009 (OMB # 1810-0690)

14. **A fair amount of state-level grantee reporting does not flow through EDFacts. Is the goal to eventually use EDFacts for all state reporting, or are there some programs that will always ask for separate reports from states? Similarly, how does ED, as a whole, decide which collections are ripe for inclusion in EDFacts?**

The basic concept of EDFacts is that all stable universal, annual, objective, numeric data will be collected through the ESS while subjective narratives will be submitted to ED through other reports. The development of the EMAPS data collection process enables ED to collect and link subjective narratives to the EDFacts data. OPEPD/PIMS has established the EDFacts Data Governance Board to guide the decision-making for all EDFacts data-related issues. The Board brings together representatives from all offices in ED related to Elementary and Secondary education data to discuss and make recommendations regarding current and planned federal program data collections that might be incorporated into EDFacts.

There have been examples where the decision to use EDFacts was not left up to ED. Specifically the quarterly reporting under ARRA, Section 1512, is required to be collected through a centralized tool used by all Federal agencies for recipient and sub-recipient reporting during each quarter that ARRA funds are being actively spent. In this case, and in future cases where a single tool is used across all Federal agencies, it is not possible for ED to consider using EDFacts for state reporting.

APPENDIX A - ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT DATA AT THE SCHOOL LEVEL

This appendix contains reports on the submission of data on the SY 2008-09 statewide assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts and science.

Mathematics

The following table is the report on submissions at the school level for SY 2008-09 for mathematics. As shown in the report all 52 SEAs submitted school level data. In some cases, the submissions received are less than or more than the submissions expected as estimated by the SEAs at the beginning of the school year. While SEAs may update the estimates, they are not required to do so.

DG	File	State	Submission Type	School Submissions Expected	School Submissions Received	% Received over Expected
583	N075	AK	Student Performance Table - Math	498	498	100%
583	N075	AL	Student Performance Table - Math	1,352	1,335	99%
583	N075	AR	Student Performance Table - Math	1,048	1,048	100%
583	N075	AZ	Student Performance Table - Math	2,186	1,888	86%
583	N075	CA	Student Performance Table - Math	9,675	9,662	100%
583	N075	CO	Student Performance Table - Math	1,709	1,709	100%
583	N075	CT	Student Performance Table - Math	985	985	100%
583	N075	DC	Student Performance Table - Math	206	200	97%
583	N075	DE	Student Performance Table - Math	216	216	100%
583	N075	FL	Student Performance Table - Math	3,588	3,588	100%
583	N075	GA	Student Performance Table - Math	2,232	2,141	96%
583	N075	HI	Student Performance Table - Math	287	287	100%
583	N075	IA	Student Performance Table - Math	1,400	1,400	100%
583	N075	ID	Student Performance Table - Math	649	649	100%
583	N075	IL	Student Performance Table - Math	3,713	3,713	100%
583	N075	IN	Student Performance Table - Math	1,866	1,863	100%
583	N075	KS	Student Performance Table - Math	1,357	1,357	100%
583	N075	KY	Student Performance Table - Math	1,167	1,167	100%
583	N075	LA	Student Performance Table - Math	1,643	1,361	83%
583	N075	MA	Student Performance Table - Math	1,698	1,698	100%
583	N075	MD	Student Performance Table - Math	1,381	1,381	100%
583	N075	ME	Student Performance Table - Math	591	591	100%
583	N075	MI	Student Performance Table - Math	3,534	3,531	100%
583	N075	MN	Student Performance Table - Math	1,857	2,054	111%
583	N075	MO	Student Performance Table - Math	2,127	2,127	100%
583	N075	MS	Student Performance Table - Math	1,076	848	79%
583	N075	MT	Student Performance Table - Math	823	823	100%
583	N075	NC	Student Performance Table - Math	2,446	2,446	100%
583	N075	ND	Student Performance Table - Math	473	473	100%

DG	File	State	Submission Type	School Submissions Expected	School Submissions Received	% Received over Expected
583	N075	NE	Student Performance Table - Math	1,041	1,041	100%
583	N075	NH	Student Performance Table - Math	456	458	100%
583	N075	NJ	Student Performance Table - Math	2,489	2,220	89%
583	N075	NM	Student Performance Table - Math	863	790	92%
583	N075	NV	Student Performance Table - Math	607	607	100%
583	N075	NY	Student Performance Table - Math	4,630	4,336	94%
583	N075	OH	Student Performance Table - Math	3,546	3,546	100%
583	N075	OK	Student Performance Table - Math	1,791	1,729	97%
583	N075	OR	Student Performance Table - Math	1,273	1,273	100%
583	N075	PA	Student Performance Table - Math	3,024	3,024	100%
583	N075	PR	Student Performance Table - Math	1,494	1,494	100%
583	N075	RI	Student Performance Table - Math	250	294	118%
583	N075	SC	Student Performance Table - Math	1,075	1,088	101%
583	N075	SD	Student Performance Table - Math	674	674	100%
583	N075	TN	Student Performance Table - Math	1,630	1,662	102%
583	N075	TX	Student Performance Table - Math	7,523	7,523	100%
583	N075	UT	Student Performance Table - Math	951	877	92%
583	N075	VA	Student Performance Table - Math	1,860	1,853	100%
583	N075	VT	Student Performance Table - Math	305	305	100%
583	N075	WA	Student Performance Table - Math	2,110	2,110	100%
583	N075	WI	Student Performance Table - Math	2,060	2,060	100%
583	N075	WV	Student Performance Table - Math	733	763	104%
583	N075	WY	Student Performance Table - Math	337	337	100%

Reading/language arts

The following table is the report on submissions at the school level for SY 2008-09 for reading / language arts. As shown in the report 52 SEAs submitted school level data. In some cases, the submissions received are less than or more than the submissions expected as estimated by the SEA at the beginning of the school year. While SEAs may update the estimates, they are not required to do so.

DG	File	State	Submission Type	School Submissions Expected	School Submissions Received	% Received over Expected
584	N078	AK	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	498	498	100%
584	N078	AL	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	1,352	1,335	99%
584	N078	AR	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	1,046	1,046	100%
584	N078	AZ	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	2,186	1,883	86%
584	N078	CA	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	9,675	9,671	100%
584	N078	CO	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	1,709	1,709	100%
584	N078	CT	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	985	985	100%
584	N078	DC	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	206	200	97%

Attachment G

EDFacts Data Set for School Years 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13

DG	File	State	Submission Type	School Submissions Expected	School Submissions Received	% Received over Expected
584	N078	DE	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	215	215	100%
584	N078	FL	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	3,534	3,588	102%
584	N078	GA	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	2,232	2,141	96%
584	N078	HI	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	287	287	100%
584	N078	IA	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	1,400	1,400	100%
584	N078	ID	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	650	650	100%
584	N078	IL	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	3,712	3,712	100%
584	N078	IN	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	1,866	1,862	100%
584	N078	KS	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	1,357	1,357	100%
584	N078	KY	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	1,167	1,167	100%
584	N078	LA	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	1,643	1,361	83%
584	N078	MA	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	1,698	1,697	100%
584	N078	MD	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	1,381	1,381	100%
584	N078	ME	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	590	590	100%
584	N078	MI	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	3,534	3,533	100%
584	N078	MN	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	1,855	2,042	110%
584	N078	MO	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	2,122	2,122	100%
584	N078	MS	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	1,076	843	78%
584	N078	MT	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	823	823	100%
584	N078	NC	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	2,441	2,441	100%
584	N078	ND	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	473	473	100%
584	N078	NE	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	1,041	1,041	100%
584	N078	NH	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	456	458	100%
584	N078	NJ	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	2,489	2,220	89%
584	N078	NM	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	863	790	92%
584	N078	NV	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	607	607	100%
584	N078	NY	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	4,630	4,332	94%
584	N078	OH	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	3,546	3,546	100%
584	N078	OK	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	1,791	1,728	96%
584	N078	OR	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	1,273	1,273	100%
584	N078	PA	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	3,024	3,024	100%
584	N078	PR	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	1,494	1,494	100%
584	N078	RI	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	250	294	118%
584	N078	SC	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	1,075	1,088	101%
584	N078	SD	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	674	674	100%
584	N078	TN	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	1,630	1,659	102%
584	N078	TX	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	7,539	7,539	100%
584	N078	UT	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	951	880	93%
584	N078	VA	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	1,860	1,853	100%
584	N078	VT	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	305	305	100%
584	N078	WA	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	2,117	2,117	100%
584	N078	WI	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	2,060	2,060	100%
584	N078	WV	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	733	761	104%
584	N078	WY	Student Performance Table - Reading/Language Arts	337	337	100%

Science

The following table is the report on submissions at the school level for SY 2008-09 for science. As shown in the report 50 SEAs submitted school level data. AL and AZ did not submit data at the school level. In some cases, the submissions received are less than or more than the submissions expected as estimated by the SEA at the beginning of the school year. While SEAs may update the estimates, they are not required to do so.

DG	File	State	Submission Type	School Submissions Expected	School Submissions Received	% Received over Expected
585	N079	AK	Student Performance Table - Science	490	490	100%
585	N079	AL	Student Performance Table - Science	1,352	0	0%
585	N079	AR	Student Performance Table - Science	894	894	100%
585	N079	AZ	Student Performance Table - Science	2,186	0	0%
585	N079	CA	Student Performance Table - Science	9,675	9,358	97%
585	N079	CO	Student Performance Table - Science	1,670	1,670	100%
585	N079	CT	Student Performance Table - Science	883	883	100%
585	N079	DC	Student Performance Table - Science	206	162	79%
585	N079	DE	Student Performance Table - Science	205	205	100%
585	N079	FL	Student Performance Table - Science	3,520	3,520	100%
585	N079	GA	Student Performance Table - Science	2,140	2,140	100%
585	N079	HI	Student Performance Table - Science	285	285	100%
585	N079	IA	Student Performance Table - Science	1,400	1,400	100%
585	N079	ID	Student Performance Table - Science	603	603	100%
585	N079	IL	Student Performance Table - Science	3,542	3,542	100%
585	N079	IN	Student Performance Table - Science	1,435	1,435	100%
585	N079	KS	Student Performance Table - Science	1,357	1,357	100%
585	N079	KY	Student Performance Table - Science	1,163	1,163	100%
585	N079	LA	Student Performance Table - Science	1,643	1,359	83%
585	N079	MA	Student Performance Table - Science	1,487	1,487	100%
585	N079	MD	Student Performance Table - Science	1,360	1,360	100%
585	N079	ME	Student Performance Table - Science	522	522	100%
585	N079	MI	Student Performance Table - Science	3,534	3,267	92%
585	N079	MN	Student Performance Table - Science	1,610	1,868	116%
585	N079	MO	Student Performance Table - Science	1,945	1,945	100%
585	N079	MS	Student Performance Table - Science	1,076	754	70%
585	N079	MT	Student Performance Table - Science	823	823	100%
585	N079	NC	Student Performance Table - Science	2,161	2,161	100%
585	N079	ND	Student Performance Table - Science	469	469	100%
585	N079	NE	Student Performance Table - Science	1,041	1,041	100%
585	N079	NH	Student Performance Table - Science	456	441	97%
585	N079	NJ	Student Performance Table - Science	2,489	1,751	70%
585	N079	NM	Student Performance Table - Science	863	790	92%
585	N079	NV	Student Performance Table - Science	590	590	100%
585	N079	NY	Student Performance Table - Science	4,630	3,458	75%
585	N079	OH	Student Performance Table - Science	3,158	3,158	100%
585	N079	OK	Student Performance Table - Science	1,791	1,623	91%
585	N079	OR	Student Performance Table - Science	1,231	1,231	100%

Attachment G

EDFacts Data Set for School Years 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13

DG	File	State	Submission Type	School Submissions Expected	School Submissions Received	% Received over Expected
585	N079	PA	Student Performance Table - Science	2,899	2,899	100%
585	N079	PR	Student Performance Table - Science	1,466	1,466	100%
585	N079	RI	Student Performance Table - Science	250	286	114%
585	N079	SC	Student Performance Table - Science	875	886	101%
585	N079	SD	Student Performance Table - Science	653	653	100%
585	N079	TN	Student Performance Table - Science	1,630	1,660	102%
585	N079	TX	Student Performance Table - Science	6,820	6,820	100%
585	N079	UT	Student Performance Table - Science	951	870	91%
585	N079	VA	Student Performance Table - Science	1,860	1,845	99%
585	N079	VT	Student Performance Table - Science	305	305	100%
585	N079	WA	Student Performance Table - Science	2,013	2,013	100%
585	N079	WI	Student Performance Table - Science	2,010	2,010	100%
585	N079	WV	Student Performance Table - Science	733	761	104%
585	N079	WY	Student Performance Table - Science	312	312	100%

APPENDIX B – PROGRAMS INCLUDED IN THE GEPA COLLECTION THROUGH ESS

The table below lists all programs included in the GEPA collection through ESS for fiscal year 2007. This list includes competitive and formula programs.

Federal Program Code	Title of the Federal Program
84.002	Adult Education State Grant Program
84.010	Title I Grants to Local Education Agencies
84.011	Migrant Education – Basic State Grant Program
84.013	Title I Program for Neglected and Delinquent, or at Risk
84.027	Special Education - Grants to States
84.048A	Vocational Education - Basic Grants to States
84.083	Women's Educational Equity
84.128G	Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers Program
84.128J	Recreational Programs
84.144A	Migrant Education--Coordination Program
84.144F	MEP Consortium Incentive Grant
84.173	Special Education Preschool Grants
84.186A	Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities
84.195	Bilingual Education Professional Development
84.196	Education for Homeless Children and Youth
84.206A	Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Students Education Program
84.213	Even Start - State Education Agencies
84.214A	Migrant Education Even Start
84.215M	Grants for the Integration of Schools and Mental Health Systems
84.215S	The Partnerships in Character Education Project Program
84.243	Tech-Prep Education
84.282	Charter Schools Program
84.287	21st Century Community Learning Centers
84.298	State Grants for Innovative Programs
84.299A	Indian Education—Demonstration Grants for Indian Children
84.299B	Indian Education Professional Development
84.305	Education Research
84.318	Enhancing Education Through Technology
84.323A	State Program Improvement Grants
84.325	Special Education--Personnel Development to Improve Services and Results for Children with
84.326	Special Education--National Activities-Technical Assistance and Dissemination
84.327	Special Education--National Activities--Technology and Media Services
84.330C	Advanced Placement Incentive Program Grants
84.331A	Grants to States for Workplace and Community Transition Training for Incarcerated Youth
84.332A	Comprehensive School Reform Program
84.334	Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs

Federal Program Code	Title of the Federal Program
84.336	Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants
84.350	Transition to Teaching
84.356A	Alaska Native Education Equity
84.357	Reading First
84.358B	Rural and Low-Income School Program
84.359A	Early Reading First
84.359B	Early Reading First
84.360	School Dropout Prevention Program
84.361	Voluntary Public School Choice
84.362A	Native Hawaiian Education
84.362K	Hawaii 3R's - Repair Remodel Restore
84.363A	Expanding Hawaii's Pathways to Leadership
84.365A	English Language Acquisition, State Grants
84.366B	Mathematics and Science Partnerships
84.367	Improving Teacher Quality State Grants
84.369	Grants for State Assessments
84.374A	Teacher Incentive Fund
84.377	School Improvement Grants
84.902	National Assessment of Educational Progress
84.925	Advanced Certification or Advanced Credentialing
84.938A	Immediate Aid to Restart School Operations
84.938B	Assistance for Homeless Children and Youth
84.938C	Temporary Emergency Impact Aid for Displaced Students
84.938K	Hurricane Educator Assistance Program

APPENDIX C – READY-MADE REPORTS IN THE EDFACTS REPORTING SYSTEM

The table below list the ready-made reports in EDFacts Reporting System available to ED staff as of August 1, 2010. Reports are added to the system periodically. The columns in the table indicate the content of the ready-made reports:

- Outcomes - The report contains data on educational outcomes such as AYP status.
- Programs/Services – The report contains data on services provided by federal programs, for example, the number of students served by Title I.
- Students – The report contains data about students.
- Teachers/Staff – The report contains data about teachers or staff in SEAs, LEAs, or schools.
- Financial Data – The report contains financial data.
- Grants – The report contains data about grants.
- Education Technology – The report contains data about technology integration in LEAs and schools.
- Submission Data – The report contains data about what data SEAs have submitted to EDFacts.
- Educational level – The last three columns indicate what level(s) of data is in the report
 - o SEA
 - o LEA
 - o School

Report Name (Report ID)	Outcomes	Programs/Services	Students	Teachers/Staff	Financial Data	Grants	Education Technology	Submission Data	SEA	LEA	School
CSPR Prompted Report (CSPR017)	X	X	X	X					X		
Public School Choice (CSPR001)	X		X						X		
Supplemental Educational Services (CSPR002)	X	X	X						X		
Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (CSPR003)				X					X		
High Quality Professional Development (CSPR004)				X					X		
State Assessment Data for Mathematics (CSPR006)	X		X						X		

Report Name (Report ID)	Outcomes	Programs/Services	Students	Teachers/Staff	Financial Data	Grants	Education Technology	Submission Data	SEA	LEA	School
State Assessment Data for Reading/Language Arts (CSPR007)	X		X						X		
Schools in Need of Improvement (CSPR008)	X										X
Districts in Need of Improvement (CSPR009)	X									X	
Student Academic Achievement (CSPR010)	X		X						X		
State Reported Graduation and Dropout Rates (CSPR011)	X		X						X		
Schools Making AYP (CSPR012)	X								X		
Student Participation in Test Administration (CSPR013)	X		X						X		
Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessments (CSPR014)			X						X		
School Directory Extract (EDEN017)	X								X	X	X
Persistently Dangerous Schools (EDEN016)									X	X	X
Participation in State Assessments - CSPR 1.2 (EDEN001)			X						X		
Student Academic Achievement - CSPR 1.3 (EDEN002)	X		X						X		
School and District Accountability - CSPR 1.4.1-1.4.8 (EDEN003)	X								X		
Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services - CSPR 1.4.9 (EDEN004)	X	X	X						X		
Teacher Quality - CSPR 1.5 (EDEN005a)				X					X		
Title III and Language Instructional Programs - CSPR 1.6 (EDEN006)		X	X						X		
Persistently Dangerous Schools - CSPR 1.7 (EDEN007)	X								X		
Education for Homeless and Youths Program - CSPR 1.9 (EDEN009a)		X	X						X		
Migrant Child Counts - CSPR 1.10 (EDEN010)			X						X		
Education of Migrant Children (Title I, Part C) - CSPR 2.3 (EDEN014a)			X						X		
Education of Migrant Children (Title I, Part C) - CSPR 2.3 (EDEN014b)			X						X		

Report Name (Report ID)	Outcomes	Programs/Services	Students	Teachers/Staff	Financial Data	Grants	Education Technology	Submission Data	SEA	LEA	School
Prevention And Intervention Programs For Children And Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At Risk (Title I, Part D, Subparts 1 And 2) (EDEN015)		X	X						X		
ESS Submission Status Report for CSPR SY 2008-09 - Part I (CSPR016a)								X	X		
Graduation Rates - CSPR 1.8.1 (EDEN008)	X		X						X		
Improving Basic Programs Operated By Local Educational Agencies (Title I, Part A) (EDEN013)	X	X	X						X		
ESS Submission Status Report for CSPR SY 2008-09 Part II (CSPR016b)								X	X		
Indian Education Formula Grant Personnel Budget Report (OIE002)						X					X
Indian Education Formula Grant Student Count and Budget Report (OIE003)			X			X				X	X
Grants Risk Dashboard (TRAN003)						X					
Grants Management Dashboard (MGMT009)						X					
Indian Education Formula Grant Personnel Budget Report (OIE002)											
Indian Education Formula Grant Student Count and Budget Report (OIE003)											
Award Transaction Summary by Payee DUNS (TRAN001)						X					
Awards Transaction Details by Payee DUNS (TRAN002)						X					
Grantee Obligated Amounts by Fiscal Year (MGMT001)						X					
Grantee Annual Award Balances by Program Office (MGMT002)						X					
Grantee Annual Award Balances by DUNS (MGMT003)						X					
Grantee Awards - Top 20% of Grantees by Obligated Award Amount (MGMT004)						X					
Grantee Look Up by Name (MGMT005)						X					
Grantee Look Up by DUNS (MGMT006)						X					
Grantees by State and Congressional District (MGMT007)						X			X		

Report Name (Report ID)	Outcomes	Programs/Services	Students	Teachers/Staff	Financial Data	Grants	Education Technology	Submission Data	SEA	LEA	School
Grants Manager Awards (MGMT008)						X					
Planned Awards vs. Actual Awards (MGMT010)						X					
Excessive/Insufficient Drawdown Indicator (RISK003)						X					
Unexpended Funds by Program Office (RISK004)						X					
Awards in Close Out Status by State (RISK005)						X			X		
Unexpended Funds by State (RISK006)						X			X		
Fiscal Year Unexpended Funds for Part B, Sections 611 and 619 and Part C of IDEA (OSEP013)						X			X		
Five-Year View of Unexpended Funds for Part B, Sections 611 and 619, and Part C of IDEA (OSEP014)						X			X		
Report of Student Enrollment Data for Mathematics Assessment (OSEP040)			X						X		
Report of the Participation of Students with Disabilities on Mathematics Assessment (OSEP041)			X						X		
Report of the Performance of Students with Disabilities on Mathematics Assessment (OSEP042)	X		X						X		
Report of the Student Enrollment Data for Reading/Language Arts Assessment (OSEP043)			X						X		
Report of the Participation of Students with Disabilities on Reading/Language Arts Assessment (OSEP044)			X						X		
Report of Performance of Students with Disabilities on Reading/Language Arts Assessment (OSEP045)	X		X						X		
Report of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Ages 3 through 5 Age by Disability for SY 2009-10 (OSEP004C)			X						X		
Report of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Ages 3 through 5 Race/Ethnicity by Disability for SY 2009-10 (OSEP005C)			X						X		
Report of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Ages 6 through 21 by Age and Disability for SY 2009-10 (OSEP006D)			X						X		
Report of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Ages 6 through 21 Race/Ethnicity by Disability for SY 2009-10 (OSEP007D)			X						X		
Report of Children with Disabilities Subject to Disciplinary Removal by Disability Category (OSEP030A)			X						X		
Report of Children with Disabilities Subject to Disciplinary Removal by Race/Ethnicity (OSEP031A)			X						X		
Report of Children with Disabilities Subject to Disciplinary Removal by Sex (OSEP032A)			X						X		

Report Name (Report ID)	Outcomes	Programs/Services	Students	Teachers/Staff	Financial Data	Grants	Education Technology	Submission Data	SEA	LEA	School
Report of Children with Disabilities Subject to Disciplinary Removal by Limited English Proficiency Category (OSEP033A)			X						X		
Report of Educational Services During Expulsion (OSEP034A)			X						X		
Report of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Ages 3 through 5 Age by Early Childhood Environment for SY 2009-10 (OSEP008C)			X						X		
Report of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Ages 3 through 5 Disability Category by Early Childhood Environment for SY 2009-10 (OSEP009C)			X						X		
Report of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Ages 6 through 21 by Disability, Educational Environment, and Age Group for SY 2009-10 (OSEP010D)			X						X		
Report of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Ages 3 through 5 Race/Ethnicity by Early Childhood Environment for SY 2009-10 (OSEP011C)			X						X		
Report of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Ages 6 through 21 Race Ethnicity by Educational Environment for SY 2009-10 (OSEP012D)			X						X		
Report of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Ages 3 through 5 Early Childhood Environment by Sex (Membership) for SY 2009-10 (OSEP015A)			X						X		
Report of Children with Disabilities Ages 3 through 5 by Early Childhood Environment and Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Status for SY 2009-10 (OSEP016A)			X						X		
Report of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Ages 6 through 21 by Educational Environment and Sex (Membership) for SY 2009-10 (OSEP017A)			X						X		
Report of Children with Disabilities Ages 6 through 21 by Educational Environment and Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Status for SY 2009-10 (OSEP018A)			X						X		
Report of Children with Disabilities Exiting Special Education by Disability Category and Age for SY 2008-09 (OSEP001C)	X		X						X		
Report of Children with Disabilities Exiting Special Education by Basis of Exit and Age for SY 2008-09 (OSEP002C)	X		X						X		
Report of Children with Disabilities Exiting Special Education by Basis of Exit and Race/Ethnicity for SY 2008-09 (OSEP003C)	X		X						X		
Report of Children with Disabilities Exiting Special Education by Basis of Exit and Sex for SY 2008-09 (OSEP050)	X		X						X		
Report of Children with Disabilities Exiting Special Education by Basis of Exit and LEP Status for SY 2008-09 (OSEP051)	X		X						X		

Report Name (Report ID)	Outcomes	Programs/Services	Students	Teachers/Staff	Financial Data	Grants	Education Technology	Submission Data	SEA	LEA	School
Report of Special Education Teachers Serving Children with Disabilities (OSEP020A)				X					X		
Report of Special Education Paraprofessionals Serving Children with Disabilities (OSEP021A)				X					X		
Report of Related Services Personnel Serving Children with Disabilities Ages 3-21 (OSEP022A)				X					X		
CSPR Comment Viewer Report									X		
Indian Education Regular Formula Grantees' Progress on Their Objectives (OIE005)		X				X				X	X
Indian Education Formula Funding and Student Performance (OIE001)	X		X			X					X
Comparison of EDEN Data and EASIE Data for Indian Education Formula Grantees (OIE004)	X					X				X	X
National Submission Plan Execution Report (LEAD005)								X	X		
State Submission Plan Execution Report (LEAD004)								X	X		
State Submission Status Timeliness and Completeness Report (LEAD015)								X	X		
State Education Data Exchange Network Submission System (ESS) Bar Chart (LEAD012)								X	X		