

**EIMAC Fall 2007 Meeting**  
**General Statistics Subcommittee**  
**October 16-17, 2007**  
**Chair: Meg Ropp, Michigan**  
**Chair Elect: Levette Williams, Georgia**

---

Tuesday, October 16, 2007

*National Class Size Database*

Representatives from the National Class Size Database presented their project to the Subcommittee. They demonstrated how the database works and how information will be inputted.

- Schools will submit their class size data to the web-based database, not districts or states
- The data reported will reflect the actual number of students in a classroom, not just the student/teacher ratio that is commonly reported; class size data is not required reporting
- The project still needs to be fully funded; hope a Bill is passed to mandate the collection of class size
- Is the project looking for accuracy or just a general picture of the data reported? – Class size data changes daily
- Why not use sampling instead of trying to collect from all schools in the country? – Want to get the most accurate data available
- The general consensus on the project was not positive

*General Statistics Permanent Standing Task Force Meeting Review*

- The transition with the OCR will not occur until 2012
- Position guidelines for EDEN coordinator were discussed
- The licensing issue with ED*Facts* has yet to be resolved

*E-Transcripts*

- What is meant by E-Transcript?
  - Many different definitions exist among the states
  - Electronic student record
  - Electronic transcript – What is transferred from high school to college when applying for higher education
  - Need a common definition for E-Transcripts and Student Records (Transcript used for 9-12; Record used for pK-8)
- The whole student record idea needs to be addressed
  - Consistent course number system/crosswalk between your state and SIF is needed
  - Common course code, but is it common rigor?
- Be cautious of vendors who claim to provide E-Transcripts
  - Oftentimes this is just a scanned copy of paper transcripts
  - Very few of the companies say they are able to extract the data; Many are print images and print files without data validation
  - Most vendors have a centralized system where the data goes through the system; could have peer-to-peer in the future

- Midwest Higher Education Compact – Selected vendor (Docufied) for E-Transcripts; XML capable
- Concern about transcript fraud – The vendor is the electronic seal
- Technical and people process needs to be established
  - Need everyone to agree with common course codes
  - Easier to fax a piece of paper than use the electronic system – For the person sending it but not the person receiving
  - Middle and elementary schools are more challenging to work with than high schools when it comes to transcripts
  - Stakeholder fears – What are they going to do with that data?; Use policies need to be developed
- Questions remain:
  - Is there a common data standard?
  - Are any states collecting transcript data?
  - How does the student's record/transcript follow them?
  - What elements are we going to include when talk about transfer exchange?
  - How are various data formats going to work together?
  - What is the data transmission method? Mailbox? Regional warehouse?
  - Which entities will the data be transferred between?
  - What years of student schooling will be included?
  - What security policies need to be established?
- EIMAC role
  - Structure/Best practices – Create starting guidance document?
  - Adoption of standards needs to be created before vendors are brought on board
- It is a national issues, not just K12

#### *Perkins Discussion*

- Legislation doesn't clearly define Career and Technical Education (CTE) students
- Perkins through history:
  - Perkins II – States were able to pick indicators they wanted to use
  - Perkins III – Mandatory secondary and post-secondary indicators to report
  - Perkins IV – Different secondary and post-secondary indicators; Reported differently on same indicators
- Discretionary funding stream – Formula funding is now based on local data; increased local accountability
- Is there a list of industry recognized certifications?; What are the standards and competencies?
- Is there a way to determine a state's selection is aligned with industry recognized standards?
  - Monitor for alignment from the exam to the assessment
  - Looking to make an inventory of assessments in the future
- Will this be reported through ED*FACTS*? – Don't yet know, but it is a possibility

#### *Civil Rights Data Collection*

Representatives from USED's OCR were present during this topic of discussion

- CRDC is becoming part of the EDEN submission system with the 2012 collection

- States need to plan for this transition within their 2007-2008 collection
- States do not want the CRDC to be part of *EDFacts* entirely; OCR has the ability to collect data directly from the states
- Two changes –
  - Requirement for a transition plan to be submitted will be lifted
  - Final full implementation year is 2012-2013
- OCR wants to switch to an annual collection from a biennial collection
- Some items are already collected in *EDFacts* and they are working on cutting out the duplication – Some information is CRDC and might migrate into *EDFacts*
- States feel some items collected are meaningless – CRDC will check on those items
- What else is the CRDC used for?
  - Compliance investigations and issues
  - Technical assistance will be provided to make the data more accessible
  - Multiple purposes for the use of the data has yet to be maximized
- Data collected through the CRDC is accurate
  - Never have had any indication of faulty data being submitted
  - LEA should certify to the SEA that the data is accurate
  - The information requested should be known and verified
  - SEAs can't provide more accurate data than they receive from their LEAs

### *Section Three*

- Federal Register Commenting
  - The template letter to place comments about items found in the Federal Register is beneficial to states; it allows for them to comment in an easy way
  - The frequency of the need to respond is intense; staff spends a lot of time to gather required approval to post comments
  - Increase in burden hours to having to respond and the detail of the responses that are necessary; need to prioritize what to respond to since many different items need responses
- How can EIMAC support states in this commenting?
  - Create a “Readers Digest” of items found in the Federal Register
  - Post comments/letters created by other EIMAC members for states to view and submit

Wednesday, October 17, 2007

### *Quality Counts*

- Christopher Swanson of the Quality Counts reviewed the Quality Council and answered questions from Subcommittee members; He gave an overview of the Council and the various publications they manage
- The data in Quality Counts 2008 will include:
  - AFT
  - CCSSO
  - DQC
  - NCES
  - NCTQ

- ECS
- Last year's report did not grade states and they are still undecided about grading the states this year
- Swanson reviewed the surveying process of the report
- Data is published both in print and online – Website usage peaks when these reports are released

### *EDFacts Data Elements and Analysis*

Beth Young of Quality Information Partners (QIP) reviewed the required data elements found within EDFacts to look for duplication

- Many of the data elements were similar, but not the same
- Most of the major issues previously found in these analyses are gone
- *Membership*
  - COS and OCR both collect membership data
  - This duplication might be solved with the merger of CCD and EDEN
- *Gender*
  - Data processes issue
  - Could be fixed in future collections
- *Academic subjects*
  - Four major groups; Two surround AP categories
  - Single sex classes are new – Nothing in the regulations that defines them
  - Need a technical amendment to fix the categories
- *Staff types*
  - No legislation or regulations for any staff categories
  - Count type varies – Both FTE and head count used
  - In some cases data groups have definitions and other data categories don't – Hard to compare
- *Discipline*
  - Sixteen data groups and eleven data categories
  - Biggest problem – Definitions have two parts
  - How to count is also a problem
- With membership, gender, teacher counts and discipline, run into times when not in line but need the data in certain ways
- EIMAC role
  - Comment during public comment period – Bring problems to the attention of decision makers and let them know they have to deal with it
  - Some issues are harder than others to resolve
- Some problems posed are probably administrative issues – As systems have evolved they might not have had a chance to address the smaller issues

### *Title III and Language Instructional Program*

- Items of clarification have been added to Section 1.6 definitions
  - At least 2 differences instances where the definitions should be changed
- Table 1.6.3.4.3
  - have to track students for 2 years
  - Takes some work to get the data where it needs to be

- Table 1.6.3.4.4
  - ED had a lot of discussion, unsure about if changes were made
  - Difficult to determine
- Table 1.6.3.6.1
  - Have hope pinned on LDS
  - Easier on states that already have student IDs in place already