

**Supporting Statement:  
Charter School Program (CSP) Grant Award Database**

***PART A. JUSTIFICATION***

***A1. Circumstances Making Collection of Information Necessary***

This request is for OMB approval of a new data collection necessary for the *Charter School Program (CSP) Grant Award Database*. The CSP is authorized under Title V, Part B, Subpart 1, Sections 5201 through 5211 of the Elementary and Secondary Act (ESEA) of 1965, as amended by the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. Under Title V, Part B, Section 5205 of the ESEA, the Secretary reserves CSP funds to carry out national activities to provide charter schools with information, to evaluate and study charter schools, and to provide other types of technical assistance.

This new data collection will be coordinated with the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) to reduce respondent burden and fully utilize data available to the U.S. Department of Education (ED). Specifically, under the new data collection, ED will collect CSP grant award information from grantees (state agencies and some schools) to create a new database of current CSP-funded charter schools and award amounts. Once complete, ED will merge student demographic and performance information extracted from the EDEN database onto the database of CSP-funded charter schools. Together, these data will allow ED to monitor CSP grant performance and analyze data related to accountability for academic performance, financial integrity, and program effectiveness.

The remaining sections of this supporting statement describe the plans for new data collection. The plan for merging this database with EDEN is presented in Appendix A.

***Identifying Data Needs***

The first task in reaching the project's goals is to develop a reporting system to gather consistent and complete data on CSP SEA grantees and on charter schools nationally. The data required by ED are:

- Detailed financial information on states' implementation of CSP grant activities
- Data responding to ED and CSP performance and efficiency measures

- National charter school information from other data sources, such as the Common Core of Data and ED Facts

ED specified several aspects of program effectiveness and efficiency that the data collection should address. They include the program information needs outlined in the January 2005 Government Accountability Office (GAO) report, program information for determining achievement of the CSP Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) indicators, and other information to respond to the Office of Management and Budgeting (OMB) Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART).<sup>1</sup>

### GAO Reports

In January 2005, GAO issued a report entitled *To Enhance Education's Monitoring and Research, More Charter School-Level Data Are Needed* which examined (1) how states allow for charter school flexibility, (2) how states promote accountability for school performance and financial integrity of charter schools, (3) the implications of NCLB for charter schools, and (4) the role ED plays in charter school accountability. In the report, GAO recommended that ED help states, which are CSP grant recipients, track Federal funds to charter schools and report the number of charter schools started with CSP funds. In addition, GAO recommended that the CSP link its own data collection with the newly developed ED Facts data collection (formerly Performance Based Data Management Initiative, PBDMI). OMB approval of this collection will begin the process of accomplishing that recommendation.

### OMB Review of GPRA Indicators

Congress enacted the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) in 1993 in an effort to reduce waste and inefficiency in federal programs and promote accountability. GPRA called on each federal agency to produce annual performance plans and reports beginning in 1999 that were to include quantifiable and measurable performance goals and performance indicators for the programs in each agency. For CSP, the original GPRA goal was to encourage the development of a large number of high-quality charter schools. As a result, two indicators have been used to measure the success of this goal: (1) the number of charter schools in operation around the nation and (2) the number of states with charter school legislation.

OMB, which has responsibility for approving GPRA indicators, also reviews the value of the indicators and the processes used to gather the data. ED and OMB jointly reviewed the CSP using Performance Assessment Rating Tool (PART). Following the review, the CSP office has proposed three new GPRA performance indicators:

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budintegration/part\\_worksheet\\_competitive\\_grant\\_programs.xls](http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budintegration/part_worksheet_competitive_grant_programs.xls)

- The percentage of charter school students at or above proficiency in reading
- The percentage of charter school students at or above proficiency in mathematics
- The federal cost per pupil in a successful charter school (with “successful” defined as a school open for three or more years)

### Additional Reports

Charter school researchers have also pointed to the need for more complete data on charter schools, primarily in the interest of policy research. For example, Lake and Hill (2005) identified areas of state and local record keeping that need improvement. Writing for the National Charter School Research Project (NCSRP), they found that data on student characteristic data such as race/ethnicity, free/reduced-price lunch, special education, and English language learners (ELL) were hard to get from state charter school offices. NCSRP also had difficulty in obtaining data on how charter schools were performing within federal and state accountability systems, including the percentage of charter schools making adequate yearly progress (AYP) and the percentage of charters labeled as low-performing. Other charter school-related data NCSRP had difficulty finding from existing sources were charter school per-pupil funding, waiting lists, parent satisfaction, and class size.

### *Data to be Collected*

Based on the information needs of ED and the recommendations of the GAO and OMB, ED will create a new database of current CSP-funded charter schools and their award amounts. Funding for charter schools is provided in two ways: directly to the charter schools and through a state agency who awards grants to charter schools. ED will collect data from both state agencies and charter schools.

As of May 23, 2006, there are 45 active grants given to 36 state agencies. In addition, there are 36 active grants given directly to charter schools. Those grants are in the following states:

- AZ – 31 grants
- MS – 1 grant
- VA – 3 grants
- WY – 1 grant

The process for collecting data from the 36 state agencies and 36 charter schools receiving direct grants from the CSP is outlined below.

There are three important roles in the establishment and operation of charter schools: The charter developer, the authorized public chartering agency and the charter school itself. The charter developer refers to an individual or group of individuals (including a public or private nonprofit organization), which may include teachers, administrators and other school staff, parents, or other members of the local community in which a charter school project will be planned and implemented. The authorized public chartering agency refers to a State educational agency, local educational agency, or other public entity that has the authority pursuant to State law and approved by the Secretary to authorize or approve a charter school which may include, among other things, a local education agency (LEA), a university, a non-profit organization or an independent chartering board.

Charter schools must be established as a public school, and comply with applicable State and Federal laws regarding public schools. Section 5210(1) defines a charter school as, among other things, a "public school" that is created by a developer as a public school, or adapted by a developer from an existing public school, and operated under public supervision and direction. While the enactment of State charter school laws is solely a State prerogative, and the definition of a "charter school" under State law is a matter of State policy, in order to receive CSP funds, a charter school must meet the definition in Section 5210(1) of ESEA. In addition, a State charter school law defines whether or not the school is to be considered its own LEA or part of an LEA for purpose of the ESEA and IDEA.

These three roles could possibly be filled by a variety of entities within a combination of relationship, dependent on the State's charter law. For example, in one state an LEA approval of a charter developer's application results in a charter school that is defined as its own LEA and accountable directly to the State Education Agency in terms of NCLB. In another state if an LEA approves a charter developer's application, in accordance with the State's charter law, the charter school is considered part of the LEA for NCLB accountability purposes. ED will need to collect information on the identities of all three roles - the original CSP subgrantee, or charter developer, that proposed and implemented the charter school, the authorized public chartering agency, and the charter school.

**Collect CSP Subgrant Award Information from State Agencies:** Each state agency that received a Federal CSP grant will be asked to provide the information in Table 1 for the subgrants it awarded from Federal fiscal year funds. The collection form will be customized for each state agency to include the year, award number, and award amount of the CSP grants. Providing information on the CSP grants to the state agencies should assist them in gathering the information for this collection. Also at this time (first contact), information describing all phases of data collection, total burden, and the use of additional data sources (EDEN/EDFacts) to reduce burden will be provided to the state agencies.

## Collect CSP Grant Award Information from Charter Schools Funded by Direct

**Grants:** The CSP grant award information for the 36 grantees that are not states but received direct grants from ED will be extracted from the GAPS database. However, NCES IDs, which are required for linking of other information, are not always available in GAPS and will need to be collected from the recipients. ED will require the recipients to verify all of the same information described in Exhibit 1, and to fill in any missing information.

### Exhibit 1

*Data Elements Included in the Database of Current CSP-Funded Charter Schools and Award Amounts*

Information for Each Federal Fiscal Year 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005 CSP Subgrant	Detail
1. Subgrantee identification (the entity that received the funds)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subgrantee name</li> <li>• Subgrantee DUNS number (optional)</li> <li>• Subgrantee state ID</li> <li>• Subgrantee mailing address</li> </ul>
2. LEA of the subgrantee (will allow matching of subgrant award information to information from other sources)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LEA name</li> <li>• LEA DUNS number (optional)</li> <li>• LEA NCES ID</li> <li>• LEA state ID</li> <li>• LEA mailing address</li> <li>• LEA location address</li> <li>• Whether an LEA with only charter schools (yes or no)</li> <li>• Whether charter school acts as its own LEA (yes or no) (Note: Not all charter schools are approved by a separate LEA)</li> </ul>
3. Charter school(s) funded by the subgrant (including future schools) (will allow matching of subgrant award information to information from other sources)  Note: ED will assist states in obtaining NCES IDs for any charter school without an ID.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Charter school name</li> <li>• Charter school DUNS number (optional)</li> <li>• Charter school NCES ID</li> <li>• Charter school state ID</li> <li>• Charter school mailing address</li> <li>• Charter school location address</li> </ul>
4. Subgrant information	<p>For each charter school listed in #3 above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dollar amount of subgrant award from Federal fiscal year 2002 funds</li> </ul>

<p>Note: States will be provided with their award number, the total dollar amount of the award, the grant period, and draw-downs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dollar amount of subgrant award from Federal fiscal year 2003 funds</li> <li>• Dollar amount of subgrant award from Federal fiscal year 2004 funds</li> <li>• Dollar amount of subgrant award from Federal fiscal year 2005 funds</li> <li>• Month and year of each subgrant award</li> <li>• Type of subgrant (Preplanning, Planning and Program Design, Implementation, or Dissemination)</li> </ul>
<p>5. Charter school operation</p>	<p>For each charter school listed in #3 above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School year school first enrolled students (school year, or “not applicable” for future schools or closed schools)</li> <li>• Enrolled students for school year 2005-2006 (yes or no) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ If yes, number enrolled in school year 2005-2006</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Enrolled students for school year 2006-2007 (yes or no) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ If yes, number enrolled in school year 2006-2007</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

To assist the state agency, these data will be collected using a preformatted spreadsheet. For example, the form for each SEA will include the award number, the dollar amount of the award, the grant period, and draw-downs. As the state agency provides subgrant information (as described under #4 above) the total subgrants award amounts will equal the total obligation amount. The product of this data collection will be a database of subgrant award information from state agencies. As necessary, ED will contact the grantees to verify collected information described above to ensure an accurate and complete dataset. The product of this data collection will be a database of CSP direct grant awards.

***A2. Purpose and Uses of the Data***

The new data collection, combined with the student demographic and performance information extracted from the EDEN database, will create a dataset that allows ED to monitor CSP grant performance and analyze data related to accountability for academic performance, financial integrity, and, to a minimal extent, program improvement. This project satisfies Title V, Part B, Section 5205 of the ESEA, which calls for national activities related to the collection of information, technical assistance, and information dissemination regarding charter schools and the CSP.

As part of the GEPA 424 data collection, ED collects information on the allocation of federal grants by States who are recipients, including grants under CFDA 84.282. ED has collected the GEPA data for fiscal years 2002, 2003 and 2004. Charter School grants are forward funded. Therefore, the GEPA data currently available relates to school years 2002-2003, 2003-2004 and 2004-2005. The CSP data collection will begin with fiscal year 2005, which roughly corresponds to school year 2005-2006, and the information collected will be used in place of the GEPA data collection. The collection of grant information is needed for both GEPA and the Charter School Program. Note that all the demographic and performance data needed for the Federal Charter School Program office is also needed for other purposes. For example, both the Charter School Program and the Office of Special Education Programs need the number of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) in each Charter School.

Under NCLB, ED (as well as states) must ensure that new and expanding charter schools receive timely payment of federal grant funds for which they are eligible and meet NCLB's academic achievement goals. As the GAO report noted, however, ED gathers little information on the timeliness of when charter schools receive Title I and other grant payments, including CSP grants. This problem exists throughout ED because the department currently tracks payments to the fiscal agent, generally an SEA or LEA, and does not reach the school level. Changing the reporting system for CSP may alleviate this problem.

### ***A3. Use of Technology to Reduce Burden***

To assist state agencies and charter schools, the new data will be collected using a preformatted spreadsheet, which will be emailed to respondents and which can be completed electronically or printed and completed by hand. All data readily available to ED will be included in the spreadsheet. For example, the form for each SEA will include the award number, the dollar amount of the award, the grant period, and draw-downs. As the state agency provides subgrant information, the total subgrants award amounts will be expected to equal the total obligation amount provided on the form.

As the respondents complete the forms, additional assistance will be made available via email and telephone. A toll-free number and email address will be available to state agencies and charter schools to allow them to contact the project team with any questions or requests for assistance as they use the form to submit data. This information, along with the names of project contact persons, will be printed on the data collection forms and all correspondence.

#### ***A4. Efforts to Identify Duplication***

Under NCLB, ED must ensure that new and expanding charter schools receive timely payment of Federal grant funds for which they are eligible. Although ED currently tracks payments to the fiscal agent (generally an SEA or LEA), it does not track payments to the school level. The proposed project will allow ED to track CSP grant funds to the school level and gather CSP-related financial information currently unavailable anywhere else.

The new data collection efforts under this project will gather CSP subgrant award information from state agencies and CSP grant award information from charter schools funded by direct grants. That data alone, however, does not provide enough information to draw conclusions about program effectiveness and efficiency. To ensure that a complete dataset is available, ED will combine the new CSP database with data extracted from EDEN. This will create a complete dataset, maximize the use of existing data sources, and reduce the data collection burden on state agencies and charter schools.

#### ***A5. Methods to Minimize Burden on Small Entities***

The proposed data reporting will collect data primarily from SEA officials in charge of CSP grants in each state. The exception to this occurs among the 36 CSP-funded schools in Arizona, Mississippi, Virginia, and Wyoming. Schools in these states received direct grants from the CSP, making them individually responsible for providing the requested data. Regardless of whether the reporting is done by SEA officials or individual schools, the impact on small entities is expected to be minimal.

#### ***A6. Consequences of Not Collecting the Data***

The proposed data collection and subsequent merging of CSP data and EDEN data will provide ED with the data necessary to effectively monitor the performance and financial stewardship of CSP. The data collection process will be transparent, and the data to be collected will be consistent and easy to consolidate. Failure to collect the new CSP funding data – data not available in EDEN – would seriously hinder ED’s ability to assess CSP’s financial integrity and the link between funding and student outcomes. Further, only by combining CSP financial data with performance data derived from EDEN can ED measure CSP’s three GPRA indicators: (1) the percentage of CSP-funded charter school students at or above proficiency in mathematics; (2) the percentage of CSP-funded charter school students at or above proficiency in reading; and (3) the federal cost per pupil in a successful CSP-funded charter school.

**A7. Special Circumstances**

This information collection fully complies with 5 CFR 1320.5.

**A8. Federal Register Comments and Persons Consulted Outside the Agency**

A 60-day notice about the study was published on July 18, 2006 in the Federal Register inviting comment on the proposed data collection – however, we received none. A 30-day notice was published on September 22, 2006 also inviting comment. Upon approval, we will place the OMB control number on all data collection forms and related correspondence.

ED will obtain the expertise of persons outside the agency from an advisory panel it created. This group, comprised of five CSP SEA grantees, will provide feedback regarding ED’s data reporting design and burden associated with aggregating and providing information.

*Advisory Panel Members*


As an early step in the development of the data reporting, WestEd conducted a focus group with the advisory panel following a coordinators’ meeting in December 2005. In addition to the five CSP SEA grantees, representatives from the OII, the CSP, and the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools participated. The researchers and focus group participants reviewed CSP reporting requirements and discussed data elements and possible training needs associated with the new project. Their input influenced the data elements ED will collect.

Future focus group meetings will be held annually in Washington, D.C. These meetings will allow CSP SEA grantees and others to provide ongoing feedback on design and content of data reporting and the resulting CSP-funded charter schools database.

**A9. Payment or Gifts**

There are no payments or gifts to respondents other than the allocation of federal funds that result from the information collection.

### ***A10. Assurance of Confidentiality***

This collection will not involve collecting any confidential information. Therefore, no assurances of confidentiality are required. While the project will ask CSP officials to report on the number of students at or above proficiency in reading and mathematics, these will be school-level figures used only to calculate the percentage of charter school students at or above proficiency in each subject. No student-level data will be collected.

Once collected, we will employ stringent measures to protect and secure the data. All data will be contained on secure servers, with appropriate backup and maintenance procedures. Access will be provided via password-protected login and administrative rights will be provided only to access reports and data as needed.

### ***A11. Justification of Sensitive Questions***

This project will not include any questions of a sensitive nature. As required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, we will provide information to respondents about purposes of the data collection and how the information will be used by ED to monitor CSP grant performance and analyze data related to academic and financial accountability.

### ***A12. Estimates of Hour Burden***

The estimated annual response burden is 81 person-hours. Exhibit 2 aggregates the estimated total hours and costs to participants. The following section explains how burden estimates were calculated. The hourly rates of pay for SEA and LEA/school officials were estimated from California Department of Education Financial Data.

#### **Exhibit 2**

##### ***Estimating the Burden for Reporting***

Type of Respondent	Number of Respondents	Number of Subgrants and Direct Grants	Total Hours per Grant	Total Hour Burden	Hourly Rate	Monetary Burden
SEA CSP grantee	36	45	1	45	\$52	\$2,340
LEA/School grantee	36	36	1	36	\$36	\$1,296
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$3,636</b>

The respondents in this data collection are the CSP grantees. Some grantees are SEA officials coordinating and managing the CSP subgrants in each state. Other grantees are officials

from CSP-funded schools in Arizona, Mississippi, Virginia, and Wyoming. Schools in these states apply directly to ED for CSP funds, making them individually responsible for providing the data requested by ED.

There are currently 40 states, plus the District of Columbia, with charter school laws. For 36 of these states, the SEA CSP official will be responsible for submitting data to ED on all the subgrants awarded by the state. In the four states in which CSP grants are awarded directly to charter schools, 36 schools currently receive CSP grants. Each of these schools will also submit data to ED, making the total number of respondents 72.

For SEA respondents, the total burden will vary depending upon the number of subgrants their state awards. The 36 states that receive CSP grants currently award 45 subgrants to individual schools. This means that some SEA respondents will enter data for multiple schools. In the case of schools or LEAs that receive their grants directly from ED, the number of grants for which each respondent will enter data is one.

We estimate that submitting the data for each CSP grant will take, on average, one hour. This includes the time respondents take to gather the data across multiple databases and enter the data into the data-collection form. The total burden for SEA officials will depend upon the number of subgrants they award. The estimated total time for the reporting is 81 person hours at an estimated total cost of \$3,636.

### ***A13. Estimate of Cost Burden to Respondents***

There are no additional respondent costs aside from those outlined in section A12.

### ***A14. Estimate of Annual Cost to the Federal Government***

The total cost to the Federal government for the data collection is \$250,000 annually. These costs are associated with: 1) determining the data elements to be included in the reporting; 2) providing training and technical assistance to respondents on how to complete the data collection form; 3) merging the CSP grant award information with EDEN data to create a complete dataset of financial, demographic, and achievement data for CSP schools; and 4) analyzing and reporting on the data from all CSP grantees for ED. The project is funded for one year with the option for four additional years. The total cost across all 5 years would be \$1,250,000.

### ***A15. Program Changes or Adjustment***

This request is for a new information collection.

### ***A16. Plans for Tabulation and Publication of Results***

One of the data collection requirements is to analyze, report, and summarize the data obtained from SEA grantees. We will develop an analysis plan that will address various aspects of program effectiveness and efficiency such as the program information needs outlined in the January 2005 GAO report, program information required to determine achievement of CSP GPRA indicators, and other information to successfully respond to the OMB PART. From this analysis, ED and the CSP will be able to effectively monitor CSP grant performance and analyze data related to accountability for academic performance and financial integrity.

We will produce annual reports summarizing the data collection and analysis process. The report will be written and organized with a national audience in mind, therefore making the content usable for a variety of readers, including charter school developers, operators, board members, teachers, parents, researchers, and authorizers. We will also include a non-technical, stand-alone executive summary of findings written in a manner suitable for public dissemination. Further, we will be prepared to brief program staff and/or policy makers about results as needed throughout the study's duration.

Finally, we will prepare a data file containing all data collected. This data file will include an explanation of contents, including variable and category labels, weights, a description of how missing data were addressed, and the unit of observation for each data file.

### ***A17. Approval to Not Display OMB Expiration Date***

No request is being made for exemption from displaying the expiration date.

### ***A18. Explanation of Exceptions***

This collection of information involves no exceptions to the Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions.

## ***PART B. COLLECTIONS OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS***

The results of this information collection will not be published for statistical purposes.

## Citations

Government Accountability Office (January 2005). *Charter Schools: To enhance Education's monitoring and research, more charter school-level data are needed*. Washington, D.C.: Government Accountability Office.

Government Accountability Office (October 2005). *Education's Data Management Initiative: Significant progress made, but better planning needed to accomplish project goals*. Washington, D.C.: Government Accountability Office.

Kolderie, Ted (October 2003). *Evaluating chartering: A case for assessing separately the institutional innovation*. St. Paul, MN: Education Evolving.

Lake, Robin J., and Paul T. Hill, Editors (November 2005). *Hopes, fears, & reality: A balanced look at American charter schools in 2005*. Bellingham, WA: National Charter School Research Project, Center on Reinventing Public Education, Daniel J. Evans School of Public Affairs, University of Washington.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **Plan for the Collection of Data for the Charter Schools Program**

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1855-?. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 45 minutes per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4651. If you have comments or concerns about the contents of this form, please contact:

Sharon Kinney Horn  
Director of Evaluation and Dissemination  
Office of Innovation and Improvement  
400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Suite 4W332  
Washington, D.C. 20202-5900  
Fax # 202-401-4123  
Phone # 202-205-4956

## **Plan for the Collection of Data for the Charter Schools Program**

The purpose of this collection is to obtain student demographic and performance data on charter schools funded by the Charter School Program (CFDA #84.282A and B). For data analysis, ED will collect the total number of charter schools in each State and the total number of students enrolled at charter schools in each State. To maximize data usage from EDEN/EDFacts and thus reduce grantee burden, the data collection will be done in phases.

### **Data Collection Phases and Activities**

#### ***Phase 1 – Construct a Database of Current CSP-Funded Charter Schools and Award Amounts***

These are the three main activities in Phase 1, each described in detail below:

1. Collect CSP subgrant award information from state agencies
2. Collect CSP grant award information from charter schools funded by direct grants
3. Create single database of current CSP-funded charter schools and award amounts

#### ***Activity 1 – Collect CSP Subgrant Award Information from State Agencies***

There are three important roles in the establishment and operation of charter schools: The charter developer, the authorized public chartering agency and the charter school itself. The charter developer refers to an individual or group of individuals (including a public or private nonprofit organization), which may include teachers, administrators and other school staff, parents, or other members of the local community in which a charter school project will be planned and implemented. The authorized public chartering agency refers to a State educational agency, local educational agency, or other public entity that has the authority pursuant to State law and approved by the Secretary to authorize or approve a charter school which may include, among other things, a local education agency (LEA), a university, a non-profit organization or an independent chartering board.

Charter schools must be established as a public school, and comply with applicable State and Federal laws regarding public schools. Section 5210(1) defines a charter school as, among other things, a "public school" that is created by a developer as a public school, or adapted by a developer from an existing public school, and operated under public supervision and direction.

While the enactment of State charter school laws is solely a State prerogative, and the definition of a "charter school" under State law is a matter of State policy, in order to receive CSP funds, a charter school must meet the definition in Section 5210(1) of ESEA. In addition, a State charter school law defines whether or not the school is to be considered its own LEA or part of an LEA for purpose of the ESEA and IDEA.

These three roles could possibly be filled by a variety of entities within a combination of relationship, dependent on the State's charter law. For example, in one state an LEA approval of a charter developer's application results in a charter school that is defined as its own LEA and accountable directly to the State Education Agency in terms of NCLB. In another state if an LEA approves a charter developer's application, in accordance with the State's charter law, the charter school is considered part of the LEA for NCLB accountability purposes. ED will need to collect information on the identities of all three roles - the original CSP subgrantee, or charter developer, that proposed and implemented the charter school, the authorized public chartering agency, and the charter school.

Each state agency that received a Federal CSP grant will be asked to provide information – see Table A-1 below – for the subgrants it awarded from Federal fiscal year funds. The collection form will be customized for each state agency to include the year, award number, and award amount of the CSP grants. Providing information on the CSP grants to the state agencies should assist them in gathering the information. ED will also provide information describing all phases of data collection, total burden, and the use of additional data sources (EDEN/EDFacts) to reduce burden to the state agencies.

- Method: These data can be collected through a preformatted spreadsheet. To assist the state agency, the spreadsheet will be pre-populated with the award number, the dollar amount of the award, the grant period, and draw-downs.
- Product: The product of this data collection will be a database of subgrant award information from state agencies.

**Table A-1**

*Data Elements Included in the Database of Current CSP-Funded Charter Schools and Award Amounts*

<b>Information for Each Federal Fiscal Year 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005 CSP Subgrant</b>	<b>Detail</b>
1. Subgrantee identification (the entity that received the funds)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subgrantee name</li> <li>• Subgrantee DUNS number (optional)</li> <li>• Subgrantee state ID</li> <li>• Subgrantee mailing address</li> </ul>
2. LEA of the subgrantee (will allow matching of subgrant award information to information from other sources)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LEA name</li> <li>• LEA DUNS number (optional)</li> <li>• LEA NCES ID</li> <li>• LEA state ID</li> <li>• LEA mailing address</li> <li>• LEA location address</li> <li>• Whether an LEA with only charter schools (yes or no)</li> <li>• Whether charter school acts as its own LEA (yes or no) (Note: Not all charter schools are approved by a separate LEA)</li> </ul>
3. Charter school(s) funded by the subgrant (including future schools) (will allow matching of subgrant award information to information from other sources)  Note: ED will assist states in obtaining NCES IDs for any charter school without an ID.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Charter school name</li> <li>• Charter school DUNS number (optional)</li> <li>• Charter school NCES ID</li> <li>• Charter school state ID</li> <li>• Charter school mailing address</li> <li>• Charter school location address</li> </ul>
4. Subgrant information  Note: States will be provided with their award number, the total dollar amount of the award, the grant period, and draw-downs.	<p>For each charter school listed in #3 above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dollar amount of subgrant award from Federal fiscal year 2002 funds</li> <li>• Dollar amount of subgrant award from Federal fiscal year 2003 funds</li> <li>• Dollar amount of subgrant award from Federal fiscal year 2004 funds</li> <li>• Dollar amount of subgrant award from Federal fiscal year 2005 funds</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Month and year of each subgrant award</li> <li>• Type of subgrant (Preplanning, Planning and Program Design, Implementation, or Dissemination)</li> </ul>
5. Charter school operation	<p>For each charter school listed in #3 above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School year school first enrolled students (school year, or “not applicable” for future schools or closed schools)</li> <li>• Enrolled students for school year 2005-2006 (yes or no) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ If yes, number enrolled in school year 2005-2006</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Enrolled students for school year 2006-2007 (yes or no) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ If yes, number enrolled in school year 2006-2007</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

*Activity 2 – Collect CSP Grant Award Information from Charter Schools Funded by Direct Grants*

The CSP grant award information for the 36 grantees that are not states, but received direct grants from ED, will be extracted from the GAPS database. However, NCES IDs, which are required for linking of other information, are not always available in GAPS and will need to be collected from the recipients. ED will ask the recipients to verify all the same information as collected in Activity 1 above, and to fill in any missing information.

- Method: These data will be collected through a prepopulated email or regular mail form, since there are so few cases (N = 36).
- Product: The product of this data collection will be a database of grant award information from other than state agencies.

*Activity 3 – Create Single Database of Current CSP-Funded Charter Schools and Award Amounts*

After Activities 1 and 2, ED will merge the two databases of federally funded charter schools into one database. The database would be updated each fiscal year for new grants (annually) (under separate tasking).

- Method: The databases from Activity 1 and Activity 2 will be merged to create one database.
- Product: The product of this activity will be a single database of CSP-funded charter schools and award amounts.

***Phase 2 – Review Student Demographic and Performance Information from CSP-Funded Charter Schools, Merge with Grant Award Information, and Make Available on EDFacts***

These are the three main activities in Phase 2, each of which is described in detail below:

1. Merge student demographic and performance information extracted from the EDEN database onto the database of CSP-funded charter schools from Phase 1.
2. Review the student demographic and performance information for the CSP-funded charter schools.
3. Make Database of current CSP-funded charter schools, award amounts, and student demographic and performance information available on EDFacts.

*Activity 1 – Merge Student Demographic and Performance Information Extracted from the EDEN database onto the Database of CSP-Funded Charter Schools from Phase 1.*

ED will extract from the EDEN database the student demographic and performance data for each of the CSP-funded charter schools in the database from Phase 1, matching on the unique school identifier. The specific student demographic and performance data to be extracted is described in Table A-2.

**Table A-2***Student Demographic and Performance Data for the CSP-Funded Charter Schools*

Description	Reference in EDEN	Reporting Period
Total number of students enrolled	DG 39 – Membership Tables (Grand total)	10/1
Total number of student enrolled by gender and by race/ethnicity	DG 39 – Membership Tables, by gender DG 39 – Membership Tables, by race/ethnicity	10/1
Total number of students enrolled who participate in free or reduced price lunch program	DG 565 – Free and Reduced Price Lunch Table (Grand total)	10/1
Total number of Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	DG 74 - Children with Disabilities School Age Tables (calculated total from gender data)	12/1 or Child Count Date
Total number of Limited English Proficient Children	DG 621 – All LEP Students Table (calculated total from gender data)	School Year
Total number of students who participated in state testing in reading and mathematics	DG 589 – Students Tested in Reading (Language Arts/English) Tables (when testing status is yes) DG 588 – Students Tested in Mathematics Tables (when testing status is yes)	Period of State assessment (usually Spring)
Total number of students who tested at or above proficient in reading and mathematics (separate figures)	DG 584 – Student Performance in Reading (Language Arts/English) Tables (crosswalking state performance levels to proficient and above) DG 583 – Student Performance in Mathematics Table, by performance level (crosswalking state performance levels to proficient and above)	Period of State assessment (usually Spring)
List of charter schools in the state	DG 27 – Charter School Status (list of all schools in a state with “yes” status)	10/1
Operational status of charter schools	DG 16 – Operational Status (“open,” “closed,” “inactive,” “future,” “added,” or “changed” for all schools with a “yes” status for DG 27)	10/1
LEA status of charter schools for federal funding	DG 653 – Charter School LEA Status (“yes” and “no” for whether the state considers the charter school an LEA for the purposes of IDEA and for the purposes of other federal funding (2 responses))	10/1
Number of students enrolled in charter schools	DG 39 – Student Membership Table (grand total for all schools with a “yes” status for DG 27)	10/1

- Method: Matching on the unique identifier, EDEN student demographic and performance data for the CSP-funded charter schools will be merged onto the database.
- Product: The product of this activity will be a database of EDEN student demographic and performance data for the CSP-funded charter schools ready for use in the review data collection of activity 2.

*Activity 2 – Review the Student Demographic and Performance Information for the CSP-Funded Charter Schools.*

For states that received a CSP grant, the data will be pre-populated into a collection form, and the SEA will be asked to review the data and provide any missing data. In states without a state-level CSP, the collection forms will be sent to the charter school grantees for review and to provide any missing data.

- Method: The data collection form for demographic and performance information of CSP-funded charter schools will be prepopulated and the forms sent out for review and to provide any missing data. Based on the data collection, the database will be updated.
- Product: The product of this activity will be a database of updated demographic and performance information for CSP-funded charter schools.

*Activity 3 – Make Database of Current CSP-Funded Charter Schools, Award Amounts, and Student Demographic and Performance Information Available on EDFacts*

ED will merge the databases of CSP awards and student demographic and performance information, will prepare the database for residence in EDFacts and upload it, and will create reporting templates to allow ED staff to access the database and report out the data. The database would be updated each fiscal year (annually) for new grants.

- Method: The databases from Phase 1 and Phase 2 will be merged, uploaded to EDFacts, and reporting templates will be created.
- Product: The product of this activity will be a database and reporting templates in EDFacts.

### ***Phase 3 – Review Charter School Flag for EDEN and CCD for all Charter Schools***

Currently, few SEAs have correctly labeled charter schools in the EDEN database. Correct identification of charter schools is needed not only for the Charter School Program but also for other program offices, including the National Center for Education Statistics. ED will work with the EDEN Coordinator, the CCD Coordinator, and the Charter School Director in each State with charter school legislation to ensure schools are correctly labeled.

ED will extract a list of all schools marked as charter schools, their operational status, and the total enrollment. The data to be extracted for review is described in Table A-2. ED will then provide the list of charter schools, their operational status, their LEA status for federal funding, and the total enrollment for each to each SEA for review. ED will also include a list of the CSP-funded charter schools in the state for comparison. SEAs will be asked to return their corrected review forms to ED and to also make corrections through an amended EDEN submission.

Method:	The EDEN team will extract from the EDEN database the Charter Flag, Operational Status, and Enrollment for schools where DG 27 (see Table A-2 below) is “yes,” and will create and email state reports of this information to the SEA for verification (along with a list of the CSP-funded charter schools). The EDEN Coordinator in each state will work with the CCD Coordinator and the Charter School Director to complete the data verification process. The state EDEN Coordinator will make corrections through an amended EDEN submission.
Product:	The product of this phase will be a corrected and updated Charter School flag (DG 27) in the EDEN/EDFacts database.