From: Potter, Rachel F.

Sent: Thursday, November 16, 2006 7:09 PM

To: 'Hyler, James'

Cc: Horn, Sharon; Kern, Dean; Fiegel, John; Timm, Barbara; Mullan, Kate;

Arrington, Angela; Cole, Allison L.

Subject: RE: OMB Comments on Charter School Program Grant Award

Database

Thank you for these responses. We have some concerns with the proposed data collection in that it appears to collect duplicative data from States and subgrantees (the SEA Part B Form and the Direct Recipients Form are essentially identical). If the States have this data, it is not clear why ED would propose going to the subgrantee at all are we missing something in this regard?

Additionally, is there some reason that ED cannot collect the State portion of the data collection through the grantees annual performance reports? It would seem that having one rather than two reports to ED would be less burdensome to States (and may in fact increase response rates), but we realize there may be other issues we are not aware of.

I have attached some additional more specific questions below. It may be easiest to resolve some of these big picture issues via a conference call please let me know if there is a time tomorrow or Monday morning that would work for you all.

Thanks, Rachel

General:

1. Who are the subgrantees who are not LEAs or schools?

SEA Part B Form:

- 1. It appears that two of the questions are asked twice (see rows 16-19). Was this intentional?
- 2. On question 2, ED asks type of subgrant what are the types of subgrants? Should the universe be listed here for easy reference?

----Original Message----

From: Hyler, James [mailto:James.Hyler@ed.gov] Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2006 10:41 AM

To: Potter. Rachel F.

Cc: Horn, Sharon; Kern, Dean; Fiegel, John; Timm, Barbara; Mullan, Kate; Arrington, Angela

Subject: FW: OMB Comments on Charter School Program Grant Award

Database-

Rachel: Please see attached two docs. One is an updated CSP form, the other is questions to the questions you initially posed. Thanks! James

----Original Message----

From: Horn, Sharon

Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2006 10:18 AM

To: Hyler, James

Cc: Timm, Barbara; Kern, Dean; Fiegel, John

Subject: RE: OMB Comments on Charter School Program Grant Award

Database - First Draft

Importance: High-

lames and All,

Trying to build on Barbara's suggestion about the form WestED revised the actual electronic worksheets. Attached is the revision of the work sheets that will be sent to SEAs and charter grantees. The worksheet is separated into 4 sheets. The instruction sheet explains the data collection process and provides contact information, as well as directions for completing the remaining sheets. The remaining sheets are for the SEAs and the direct grant recipients.

I think this version is much clearer and is read to go to OMB. Please let meknow if you have questions.

Sharon-

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

----Original Message----

From: Hyler, James

Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2006 8:43 AM

To: Horn, Sharon

Cc: Timm, Barbara; Kern, Dean-

Subject: RE: OMB Comments on Charter School Program Grant Award

Database - First Draft

Sharon: Sorry to bug u -- Just checking where we are with updated form as I need to get everything to OMB today as promised. James

Original Message-

From: Horn, Sharon

Sent: Monday, November 13, 2006 6:18 PM

To: Timm, Barbara Cc: Hyler, James

Subject: RE: OMB Comments on Charter School Program Grant Award

Database First Draft

Barbara.

I am attaching for your review and comment the draft of the questions... Your comments will be valued.

Sharon-

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

----Original Message----

From: Timm, Barbara

Sent: Wednesday, November 08, 2006 10:18 AM

To: Horn, Sharon; Hyler, James; Kern, Dean-

Cc: Mullan, Kate; Arrington, Angela

Subject: RE: OMB Comments on Charter School Program Grant Award

Database - First Draft

Below is a first very rough draft on the responses to OMB.

OMB Comments on Charter School Program (CSP) Grant Award Database 1855-NEW

1. Can ED explain what data it currently has on grantees from 2002-2005 (e.g., from State applications, performance reports, other sources) and what additional data will be provided by this collection?

(Oll should describe what data it currently has on grantees.)

This data collection will provide ED with information on the subgrantees of the CSP. The CSP provides funds to a state agency which in turns makes subgrants to organizations. Those subgrantees actually create the charter schools. As part of ED's grant process, ED obtains information on the grantee but not on the subgrantees.

2. In the future will ED continue to collect data from grantees and collect this data separately? If so, why?

ED will have to collect the information on subgrantees from the grantees because this information is not available elsewhere.

3. Why can't all of the data for the CSP (or at least the data collected from States) be collected through EDFacts? If this is not possible, why is the information being collected through a spreadsheet and not the Eden survey tool?

The demographic and performance data on the charter schools funded through CSP will be extracted from the demographic and performance data that EDFacts collects on all schools. The data on the subgrantees can not be collected through EDFacts because EDFacts is designed to collect data on SEAs, LEAs and schools. The subgrantees of CSP are often not LEAs and schools. To be able to identify the charter schools that are funded through CSP, ED needs to first identify the entities associated with the three roles in the establishment and operation of charter schools discussed in section—"data to be collected." Collecting the data on the subgrantees will allow ED to identify which charter schools are funded through CSP.

As mentioned in question 2, the data on subgrantees will have to be collected each year. In future year, ED could use the EDEN survey tool. However, for this year, a spreadsheet would provide for maximum flexibility to the grantees in responding to the questions. Once ED has specific information on the length of fields that grantees need to respond and the questions that they want to provide additional information on, ED could use the EDEN survey tool.

4. Please send OMB a copy of the collection instrument (i.e., the preformatted spreadsheet).

(OII contractor)
5. Who will have access to the database created by this information collection effort? Will the dataset be publicly available? If not, why not?
(OII)
6. On pg. 6 "Charter School Operation", should there be a separate designation for schools that have been closed, instead of included schools that have been closed with future schools in the not applicable designation?
Yes. The data collection has been changed so that closed schools are not treated as "not applicable" for school operations data. Instead, the close school will provide the first year that it enrolled students or if students were never enrolled enter "no students enrolled."
7. On pg. 7, how will changing the reporting system for CSP alleviate problems with the timeliness of grants to individual charter schools?
(OII)
8. Pg. 12, can you give us more specifics about what will be included in the annual reports and how these reports will be used?

(OII)