**TO:** Joshua Brammer, ED OMB Desk Officer

**FROM**: Bonnie Jones, COR, Personnel Development Program Performance Reporting System, Office of Special Education Programs/OSERS/ED

**DATE:** August 31, 2011

**RE:** Reporting on terms of clearance for the collection: #1820-0530 (4363) Performance Report – Personnel Development Program Performance Reporting System.

**Note**: The Personnel Development Program (PDP) currently manages two contracts that collect data from PDP grantees. This August 31, 2011 Terms of Clearance update refers to the Student Data Report. Recently, OSEP received Terms of Clearance for the Service Obligation data collection. The OSEP Personnel Development Program personnel responsible for each Terms of Clearance are working collaboratively to assure a unified approach with data collection.

1. OSEP will work with IES to ensure that future Personnel Development data collection contracts allow IES and its contractors to access the data collected.

**Due dates**: Update to April 1, 2011 Memo on Terms of Clearance.

**Status:** Status reported in April 1, 2011 Memo. No further update needed.

2. OSEP will ensure that future contracts will collect data on the following three measures: a) Of the scholars who graduate, the number and percentage of scholars who teach in high-need schools [as defined by (1) the Administration’s 2010 ESEA reauthorization proposal or (2) high-need LEA as defined by Race to the Top, “High-need LEA means an LEA (a) that serves not fewer than 10,000 children from families with incomes below the poverty line; or (b) for which not less than 20 percent of the children served by the LEA are from families with incomes below the poverty line.”; b) Of the scholars who graduate, the number and percentage of scholars who teach in a school for at least three years. c) Of the scholars who graduate, the number and percentage who receive a positive teacher evaluation.

**Due dates:** Update to April 1, 2011 Memo on Terms of Clearance.

**Status:** OSEP staff met with OSEP management on April 7, 2011 and May 05, 2011 to plan sessions on merged contract that will include the collection of these data. OSEP has conducted the following meetings in preparation for the merged contract award:

* April 29, 2011 OSEP prepared description, benefits of use, and outputs document on proposed merged contract.
* May 11, 2011 met with CAM on contract considerations.
* June 1, 2011 received Memo from IES on analysis of data collection (See Attachment, Review of data collection approaches for GPRA measures that require information on participants after the end of their project services—Data Quality Initiative (DQI) programs only). This Westat/IES memo to OSEP provides a summary of data collection procedures for *Government Performance Results Act (GPRA)* measures that require information on participants after the end of their project services. The memo is limited to those ED Program Offices that have received technical assistance through the DQI contract with IES[[1]](#footnote-1) and is the result of a request from OSERS to learn how other programs collect placement, performance, and retention information on graduates of teacher programs as it moves forward with its data collection for the Personnel Development Program (PDP).[[2]](#footnote-2)
* July 21, 2011 met with OSEP grantees who are also grant recipients of Centers for Excellence from the Department of Health and Human Services on tracking system used for collecting longitudinal data from graduates.
* August 17, 2011 met with OSEP staff to clarify and coordinate contract specifications.
* August 22, 2011 met with ED’s Information Assurance Office and OSERS Security and IT Contact on contract proposal.
* August 24, 2011 met with CAM on contract considerations in processing contract workscope.
* Scheduled upcoming meetings regarding the merged contract on September 6, 2011 with ED’s Privacy Group Lead; on September 6, 2011 with the Director of Enterprise Architecture; and on September 8, 2011 with OSERS lead on Information Collection.

3. Upon reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, OSEP will resubmit the SDR form with new language reflecting ultimate Congressional action on this terminology in advance of the scheduled 3 year approval cycle.

**Status:** Status reported in January 2011 memo. No further update needed.

1. By March 2011, OSEP will provide OMB with an update on the progress it has made on determining a methodology for collecting data on the measures above, what OSEP has learned from consulting with other ED staff working on personnel preparation programs, the status of the new Personnel Development contract (including whether the contract can be merged with other contracts that collect similar information for general education personnel programs), and what the preliminary analyses by the Data Quality Initiative staff have found.

**Due dates:** Update to April 1, 2011 Memo on Terms of Clearance.

**Status:** Held follow-up teleconference with Emily Anthony, IES Program Officer for the Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems Grant Program at NCES, on April 12, 2011.

Data Quality Institute analysis of programs with measures that track graduates to be received by May 31, 2011. Received on June 1, 2011 (attached).

On April 12, OSEP teleconferenced with Emily Anthony about the Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems Grant Program at NCES, at the suggestion of Jonathan Jacobson of IES to determine the feasibility of collecting longitudinal data on program graduates through these state systems. The concept seems promising, but premature. The Program Officer stated that no state longitudinal data system grants have been able to link student information back to the preparation program of the K-12 student’s teacher. At this point, she stated that the capacity is not yet there among these grantees, that privacy issues are a barrier to moving forward at this time. Also, she stated that when the grants were first awarded, there was concern about the Federal government using these state data, so direct access to the data by a Federal program does not seem promising.

On March 31, OSEP received an update on the work that OSEP began in November 2010 to coordinate with IES on its Data Quality Initiative (DQI) contract. The purpose of the DQI contract is to provide support to selected ED programs to improve the quality of data on outcomes and impacts of those grant programs. OSEP’s Personnel Development Program was not among those targeted programs in need of technical assistance under the DQI contract; however, DQI offered to assist with TA under a task order for additional requests from ED. Prior to OMB’s Terms of Clearance, OSEP began planning with DQI on a request for TA to improve data quality on certain measures. OSEP subsequently asked DQI about the methodologies used to collect data on the three measures of interest to OMB, as outlined in item #2 of the Terms of Clearance.

IES agreed to analyze measures from all other ED programs that collect longitudinal data through its DQI contract. That report deadline, which was August 31, has been postponed until September 9, 2011. The Senior Study Director, Dr. Patty Troppe, wrote on August 26, 2011, that –

*I write with an update on the memo we are preparing for you on the review of data collection approaches for performance measures that require information on participants after the end of project services.  We are expanding our June 1, 2011 memo on this subject to include relevant measures we identified through our ongoing teacher performance measures inventory work.  Specifically, we are expanding the original memo to include information on relevant measures for programs that were not served through our Data Quality Initiative contract with IES.*

*We expect to deliver the expanded memo to you on September 9.  This is later than our original August 31 deadline, but the additional time will allow us to provide you with a more comprehensive document.  For example, the Troops to Teachers program has a measure very similar to one you are trying to field (i.e., the percentage of Troops to Teachers participants who remain in teaching for three or more years after placement in a teaching position in a high-need LEA).  The Department of Defense (DOD) administers this program and the data collection for the performance measures.   We obtained contact information this week for the DOD contact and expect to obtain details on the data collection approach in the coming week.*

**Directions from OMB on reporting on terms of clearance for the collection: #1820-0530 (4363) Performance Report – Personnel Development Program Personnel Reporting System.**

The above items #1(beginning in January 2011) and #4 (by March 2011) have specific start or due dates where you owe OMB an update. Please provide updates to #1 and #4 by March, 2011 at the latest. If possible, include a response to #2 at the same time. Item #3 relates to the SDR form and the need for updates in terminology prior to the scheduled 3 year approval cycle.

**Note: OSEP will send an update on #4 after we receive and review the DQI analysis of longitudinal data collection from other ED programs.**

1. Information about data collection approaches used by “teacher-related” Program Offices that have not received technical assistance through the DQI contract is forthcoming. DQI is gathering this information as part of a larger effort to develop an inventory of performance measures for ED Program Offices that award grants to provide services to teachers or individuals training to become teachers. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. In particular, OSERS requested information on other program’s data collection in measuring:

   a)  The scholars who graduate, the number and percentage of scholars who teach in high-need schools as defined by --

   (1) the Administration’s 2010 ESEA reauthorization proposal or (2) high-need LEA as defined by Race to the Top, “High-need LEA means an LEA (a) that serves not fewer than 10,000 children from families with incomes below the poverty line; or (b) for which not less than 20 percent of the children served by the LEA are from families with incomes below the poverty line.”;

   b) The scholars who graduate, the number and percentage of scholars who teach in a school for at least three years; and

   c) The scholars who graduate, the number and percentage who receive a positive teacher evaluation. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)