

EIMAC Spring 2008 Meeting
General Statistics Subcommittee
April 22-23, 2008
Chair: Meg Ropp, Michigan
Chair Elect: Levette Williams, Georgia

Tuesday, April 22, 2008

Race/Ethnicity Data Collection

Pat Sherrill of the US Department of Education and Bethann Canada of the Virginia Department of Education presented on the Race/Ethnicity Data Collection.

Key presentation and discussion points include:

- According to Federal Guidance provide to education institutions with regards to how to collect and maintain racial and ethnic data for staff and students, self identification should be used in a two question format.
- A Task Force was formed by the NCES Forum to address this issue in February, 2007. They were tasked with finding the following:
 - the best practices for collecting and storing race/ethnicity data,
 - the best practices for aggregating and reporting race/ethnicity data, and
 - how to promote awareness among vendors of the change in race/ethnicity data collection and reporting.
- “Race unknown” is not an allowed reporting variable. Observer identification should only be used as a last resort.
- USED is strongly encouraging re-identification. However, there is a timing issue with states and districts and there will be an increased burden on schools to re-identify students.
- When coding data for state reporting, reusing codes should be avoided and only federal aggregates should be reported.

Main discussion issues included:

- Observer identification
- Local student information system changes
- Local human resources system changes
- The best time for re-identification
- Coding structures

Highly Qualified Teachers: Reporting Needs for CSPR, EDFacts, and OSEP

Libby Witt, Bonnie Jones and Kelly Worthington of the US Department of Education presented on the reporting needs Highly Qualified Teachers for CSPR, EDFacts and OSEP.

This presentation answers questions surrounding Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT) definitions found in NCLB and IDEA and their effects on data collections. Specifically, where do the definitions overlap in NCLB and IDEA data reporting, and how is information on HQT’s reported differently for different data collections?

HQT Definition:

- NCLB 9101 (23): applies only to teachers who teach core academic subjects
 - Must have full state certification; hold a minimum of a bachelor's degree; and demonstrate subject-matter competency in each subject taught
- HQT and Special Education: IDEA 602(10)
 - Special Education teachers who teach core academic subjects must be highly qualified (certified, degree, show subject-matter competency)
 - HQT Special Education teachers who do not teach core subjects or who only support HQTs in core subjects only have to be certified
 - Flexibility under IDEA:
 - IDEA 602(10)(C): Special ed. teachers who teach core academic subjects exclusively to students assessed against alternative academic standards must be highly qualified only at a subject matter level appropriate to the content and achievement standards of the students.
 - IDEA 602(10)(D): Special ed. teachers new to the profession who teach multiple core academic subjects and are highly qualified in mathematics, language arts, or science at the time they are hired, have two additional years to become highly qualified in other academic subjects they teach.

HQT Data Collection: NCLB vs. IDEA

- Data collection:
 - NCLB: OESE collects data via the CSPR;
 - IDEA: OSEP collects via Table 2 and/or EDFacts file specifications N070, N094 and N112
- Unit of analysis:
 - NCLB: classes in core academic subjects—not teachers;
 - IDEA: data are reported in FTE for Fully Credentialed Personnel serving children with IEPs
- NCLB data do not differentiate between regular and special ed. classes; IDEA includes data for personnel contracted or employed to work with children with disabilities (3-21)

Discussion:

- Question regarding provisional certification for new teachers:
 - Same as full certification; cannot include emergency credentials given to persons who would not normally be certified (usually results from an inability to find a fully-certified teacher to fill a position)

Migrant Student Information Exchange

Deborah Newby of the Council of Chief State School Officers walked through a presentation submitted by the Office of Migrant Education and then led a discussion.

Key presentation and discussion points included:

- The Office of Migrant Education has hosted “train-the-trainer” trainings to inform program people about MSIX and how to use it. State data people want to be invited to the “train-the-trainer” sessions. They feel an integral part is missing in the MSIX plan. It is important to note that program people understand data differently than data people.

- States are questioning what the actual role of MSIX is and are asking if the original intent has changed.
- The Office of Migrant Education released small grants to the states to develop an MSIX interface. States questioned how useful is this now that most have already created the interface.

Teacher Compensation Survey

Frank Johnson and Stephen Cornman from the Teacher Compensation Survey (TCS) presented to the Subcommittee.

Important takeaways from their presentation include:

- Teacher compensation data is now being collected because people now realize the importance of collecting this data and more data needs to be available.
- In the 2007 pilot, seven states participated. These states include: Arkansas, Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Missouri and Oklahoma. From this initial pilot survey, 509,225 records have been collected for 497,927 teachers. There are more records than teachers because each teacher has a record for each school they teach in.
- The 2008 TCS will consist of twenty states and will include data from the following categories:
 - Base salary
 - Total pay
 - Health benefits
 - Retirement and other benefits
 - Years of experience
 - Highest degree attained
 - Full-time equivalent
 - Demographics
 - Teacher FT/PT
 - Status
 - New teacher/returning teacher in state/district

Issues about the TCS raised by the subcommittee include:

- Summer school compensation – Including summer school compensation data in the total pay data could be complicated since many states count this work differently and sometimes teachers work in other districts than where they teach the rest of the year.
- Comparison concern – States receive funding for teacher compensation from various sources and this is not reflected in the survey. The survey is not adjusted by COLA across states.
- States do not want this survey to become part of an *EDFacts* data collection.
- States are concerned that the restricted user files might be inadvertently released.

Interoperability Discussion

Michael Sessa of the Postsecondary Electronic Standards Council and Laurie Collins of the SIF Association presented on how they to work together in the quest for interoperability.

Important topics from this discussion include:

- Due to the ever-increasing interconnectedness of education data, it is important that the two groups work together.
- The two groups hope to eventually share complete student records between P20 education.
- They are also looking at other areas of transfer, including from postsecondary to secondary.

Wednesday, April 23, 2008

School Program Definitions

Deborah Newby led the group in a discussion about the school definition project and the desire of NCES to create a base for common definitions.

Key takeaways from this session include:

- Common school definitions need to be created and shared between the state and federal levels.
- Pennsylvania has three different definitions terms used: school, building and program.
- California took nine months to discuss the definition of a school and could not reach a consensus among program offices. The state noted that this definition cannot be oversimplified.
- Defining what a school is is not as important as overcoming the membership/accountability collection problems.
- Georgia has separate ID numbers for the building that houses a school, the school itself and the programs within that school.
- It is important to also define how state charter schools and other charter schools are defined in a district.
- Funding needs to be taken into account when defining schools because funding is linked to accountability.

Graduation Rate Discussion

Meg Ropp led the subcommittee in a discussion about the graduation rate.

Important discussion points include:

- A better target to track would be the *growth* in graduation rates, not the actual graduation rate.
- States want the graduation rate to be aggregated and factored into AYP calculations.
- States should start using the interim rate right away and need further clarification on the rules.
- States are encouraged to attend regional training meetings in May to learn more about the changes to the graduation rate.

Early Childhood Education Data

Tom Schultz of the Council of Chief State School Officers presented on the topic of tracking assessment data of young children.

Key takeaways include:

- Be aware of the new interest and controversy surrounding the large-scale assessment of young children and that the approaches to assessment in early childhood and K12 education are different.
- The future of early childhood education data management and reporting might be to link the early childhood education ID number with the K12 ID number.
- The quality of early childhood assessment data needs to be increased and an overarching infrastructure needs to be created to increase consistency.

EIMAC General Statistics Subcommittee Election

Carmen Jordan, Arkansas, was elected as Chair Elect.

Recommendations for Chiefs

1. We appreciate the money designated for the EDFacts Data Coordinators that we requested in Spring, 2006, however this funding should be continued in the years to come as an investment in data quality. In the future this money should be enough to hire a FTE.
2. We would like guidance/clarity around the relationship between the EDFacts coordinator, the CCD coordinator and the CSPR coordinator.
3. With regards to Race Ethnicity, the first year of reporting should be used as a baseline, and safe harbor should be implemented in the second year. We recommend that the AYP workbook review process should be expedited. Schools that fail AYP solely due to a shift in reporting categories should be awarded safe harbor.
4. Be aware of the potential liabilities associated with the MSIX interconnectivity agreement. Encourage communication between the data departments, legal departments and the MSIX program people in making clear what the role of the state is.
5. Chiefs and states should respond to the NGA graduation rate and request clarification. Whereas the Graduation rate formula from NGA is appropriate for the general student population and for race/ethnic subcategories given appropriate numbers is ok, for other subpopulations such as special education, limited English proficiency, migrant, economically disadvantaged, and especially for Career and Technical Education (as required by Perkins) the formula may be inappropriate since they enter and exit programs over four years. The business rules need to be standardized across states with regards to the subpopulations. The NCES completer rate for graduates by NCLB will be more accurate than the NGA grad rate for subgroup categories.
6. We recommend clarification of school definitions, including the difference between a school and a program. A unit of accountability needs to be created and it needs to be acknowledged that this unit may change depending on the context. For example, NCLB, IDEA, membership reporting, E-rate and Perkins.
7. Follow DQC recommendations for responding to the FERPA published regulations. Encourage your governor's office to send in the NGA letter.