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# Section A: Justification

## Introduction

The Department of Education (ED) seeks to renew the Mathematics and Science Partnerships Annual Performance Report, currently approved under OMB control number 1810-0669.

Implemented under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Title II, Part B, the Mathematics and Science Partnerships (MSP) program is a formula grant program strategically designed to improve the content knowledge of teachers and the academic performance of students in mathematics and science. By funding collaborative partnerships between science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) departments at institutions of higher education (IHEs), and high-need school districts, the MSP program enables the delivery of intensive, content-rich professional development intended to improve classroom instruction and, ultimately, to raise student achievement in math and science.

Because MSP is a formula grant program, the size of individual state awards is based on student population and poverty rates, with no state receiving less than one half of one percent of the total appropriation. Each state is then responsible for administering a competitive grant making process to determine the distribution of funds across proposed MSP projects.

## A.1. Circumstances Requiring the Collection of Data

Current legislation requires ED to collect impact information annually from each of the projects funded by the States (Appendix A: Title II, Part B, Section 2202 (f) of the *Elementary and Secondary Act* of 1965 as amended). Each funded MSP project is required to develop an evaluation and accountability plan to measure the impact of funded activities, defined by measurable objectives to increase teacher content knowledge and student achievement. Partnerships must report annually to ED on their progress toward achieving these objectives. Each year, approximately 600 projects report on their progress toward achieving MSP goals, helping to document the program’s impact on increasing teacher learning and student achievement. Other annual reporting requirements include standard descriptive information on the MSP projects; the professional development participants; the professional development models, content, and processes; the evaluation plans; and lessons learned. By structuring the reporting so that all MSPs are required to provide standardized data, the program office is better able to examine outcomes across funded partnerships.

In 2006, OMB approved MSP’s program-specific *online* Annual Performance Report (APR) data collection system (1810-0669), standardized to facilitate the process by which MSP projects meet reporting requirements. An updated version of this system was approved in 2010. This supporting statement seeks OMB approval to continue to collect the MSP APRs using this online APR data collection system.

## A.2. Purposes and Uses of the Data

MSP program data are collected to measure the program’s impact on improving math and science teachers’ content knowledge and improving the academic performance of students, as well as to describe the MSP projects across the country. Reporting is structured to require MSP projects to provide standardized data, allowing ED to examine outcomes at the project, state, and national levels.

The 2010 OMB-approved APR online data collection tool provides funded projects with the opportunity to describe the structure and scope of each partnership, document impact on teachers and students, and share professional development models. Information collected is sent directly to the project’s State Coordinator for review before final submission.

Additionally, the APR provides a streamlined process to collect and aggregate program information, allowing for more effective analysis of the range of program activities across all MSP projects. The APR collects both quantitative and narrative data which are used to report regularly on the implementation and impacts of the MSP program.

MSP program staff utilize both the quantitative and narrative data provided in the APR to report on the implementation and impacts of the MSP program. Aggregated APR data are analyzed to provide descriptive statistics (e.g., frequencies and means) on the characteristics of MSP projects and participants, providing a complete picture of the MSP program at the national level. Selected dimensions include the number of teachers served and students taught by those teachers, the amount of funding of the MSP program, methods of professional development delivery, and teacher and student achievement results.

Where possible, trend data is also provided, comparing data from the current performance period to data from previous periods. Narrative data further enhance our understanding of the MSP projects.

## A.3. Use of Information Technology to Reduce Burden

The MSP program employs information technology to maximize the efficiency and completeness of the information gathered for this evaluation and to minimize the burden the data collection places on the MSP projects.

MSP projects complete their reporting requirements through the online APR data collection system. The online system enables project staff and State MSP coordinators to track the data submissions as the MSPs fill in the forms.

Additionally, the online APR forms are prepopulated with relevant information from previous APRs, in order to reduce time burden on respondents. When the users log onto the system, they will be allowed to update this information but will not need to provide it as part of their submission.

## A.4. Efforts to Identify Duplication

Through regular communication with MSP State Coordinators, ED, and representatives from various MSP projects, the MSP Program Office is able to maintain an active and collaborative relationship with the full range of MSP stakeholders. By reporting on project findings, successful implementation and evaluation methods, and tools developed through annual reporting, the project website, and annual regional conferences, MSP projects are able to learn from each other and avoid duplicating efforts. Additionally, the OMB-approved APR online data collection system was customized for the MSPs and is the only federal data collection effort of the MSPs.

## A.5. Methods to Minimize Burden on Small Business Entities

This collection of information does not impact small businesses. Under EDGAR regulations, requirements for small entities are minimized.

## A.6. Consequences of Not Collecting the Information

Each eligible partnership receiving a grant or subgrant through the MSP Program is required to report annually to the Secretary regarding the eligible partnership's progress in meeting the objectives described in the accountability plan of the partnership (Title II, Part B, section 2202 (f) of ESEA). If MSP projects did not report regularly through the APR system, it would effectively prevent ED from meeting this requirement. Additionally, this data collection standardizes the required reporting across all MSPs. This greatly enhances the quality and comparability of the resulting data.

## A.7. Special Circumstances Justifying Inconsistencies with Guidelines in

There are no special circumstances associated with this data collection.

## A.8. Federal Register Comments and Persons Consulted Outside the Agency

Central to the effective implementation of the MSP program are the MSP State Coordinators, who work to administer the program within each of their respective states. On an ongoing basis, the MSP Program staff and its contractor work closely with State Coordinators to provide technical support and collaboratively review and revise the APR data collection instrument in effort to reduce undue reporting burden while still meeting the reporting requirements of ED.

To this end, we recently convened a series of webinars with several MSP State Coordinators. The purpose of these meetings was to review the proposed revisions for the data collection instrument, elicit ideas for additional changes, and obtain feedback from the State Coordinators. Revisions to the OMB-approved data collection instrument are based, in large part, on the discussions in these meetings. The primary objective in revising the APR, as described above, is to reduce burden on reporting entities while ensuring that needed data continue to be collected.

Additionally, ED holds annual regional meetings with MSP State Coordinators, project directors, and evaluators. Beyond offering a valuable venue for projects to share important progress and insights, the regional meetings serve as a forum for MSP projects to offer feedback about the data being requested and the process through which it is collected.

A 60-and 30-day Federal Register Notice was published with no comments.

## A.9. Payments or Gifts to Respondents

No payment or gift will be provided to respondents.

## A.10. Assurance of Confidentiality

There is no assurance of confidentiality.

## A.11. Questions of a Sensitive Nature

There are no questions of a sensitive nature.

## A.12. Estimates of Response Burden

Annually, all funded MSPs are asked to complete the OMB-approved APR online data collection instrument. We estimate, based on initial and ongoing feedback from respondents, that the APR takes an average of **13** hours for the project directors and/or evaluators to complete. The estimated total average burden for completing the APR form across the approximately **600** partnerships is **7,800** hours.

## A.13. Estimates of Cost Burden to Respondents

The cost to respondents is estimated to be 43 dollarsper hour,[[1]](#footnote-1) for a total estimated cost burden of approximately **$335,400** across all respondents for each year of data collection.

Exhibit 1: Estimated Annualized Cost Burden to Respondents

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Hourly Salary Estimate | Time per Response (hours) | Estimated Cost per Respondent | Approximate Number of Respondents | Estimated Annual Cost Across All Respondents |
| $43 | 13 | $559 | 600 | $335,400 |

## A.14. Estimates of Costs to the Federal Government

The total annualized cost to the federal government is fixed at **$361,146**, as shown in Exhibit 2.

**Exhibit 2: Estimated Cost to the Federal Government**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total | Collect Online APR Data | Web-based System Maintenance | Analyze APR Data and Prepare Reports |
| $361,146 | $204,486 | $39,607 | $117,053 |

## A.15. Program Changes or Adjustments

As described in section A.8 above, ongoing communication with MSP State Coordinators and project staff has informed the process of refining the APR data collection system to reduce response burden. In addition to incorporating this feedback, ED has worked to streamline the APR instrument by eliminating items that collect information not used in regular reporting, combining repetitive items, and providing clarification to the reporting instructions in some areas. It is estimated that these program changes have reduced the total burden per project by one hour, for a total reduction of -600 annual burden hours.

Examples of some of the more significant changes to the APR are listed below.

* Projects no longer need to enter name and contact information for each partner organization.
* Projects that focus on providing schoolwide professional development no longer need to enter information for each school (other projects never entered this information).
* Aligned list of content and practices more closely with Common Core Math Standards and Next Generation Science Standards.
* Projects will enter the primary goal rather than the primary target of the professional development.
* Projects no longer need to list each of the student assessments used; although they will continue to enter proficiency levels on state assessments.
* States no longer need to include length of award and year of implementation. Instead states will enter their definition of a high-need LEA and projects will list whether their partner LEAs meet their state definition.
* Clarified what should be included in each abstract so that they will be more consistent across projects.

## A.16. Plans for Tabulation and Publication of Results

There are no plans to formally publish the results of this data collection. Rather, the data obtained through this data collection will be used by ED to monitor the funded MSPs, to share the professional development work and findings across grantees, and to inform the Department’s Government Performance Results Act (GPRA) indicators.

The information collected for GPRA reporting includes the percentage of MSP teachers who significantly increase their content knowledge, as reflected in project-level pre- and post-assessments, and the percentage of students in classrooms of MSP teachers who score at the proficient level or above in State assessments of mathematics and science. Additionally, the APR collects information describing the MSP projects; the professional development participants; the professional development models, content, and processes; the evaluation plan; and lessons learned.

The MSP Annual Report, which includes aggregate information across grantees, is completed annually in late September and submitted to the Secretary. This report is also posted on the MSP public website.

## A.17. Approval to Not Display Expiration Date

All data collection instruments will include the OMB expiration date.

## A.18. Exceptions to Items 19 of OMB Form 83-I

No exceptions are sought.

1. Hourly salary estimate based on US Bureau of Labor Statistics data on Occupational Employment and Wages, May 2011: 11-9032 Education Administrators, Elementary and Secondary School: <http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes119032.htm#(4)>. The estimate of $43 per hour was calculated by averaging the annual wages for administrators at the school, district, and state levels – which comprise the majority of the MSP respondent universe. Hourly rate was derived assuming a 40 hour work week. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)