

OMB Supporting Statement for Proposed Data Collection
Part B. Statistical Methods

Study of State Implementation of the Unsafe School Choice Option

1. Potential Respondent Universe

The potential respondent universe consists of all 50 states; Washington, D.C.; Puerto Rico; American Samoa; Guam; Northern Mariana Islands; and the U.S. Virgin Islands. The study is not selecting a sample; therefore, the study will not employ statistical sampling or weighting methods.

We expect a 100% response rate given our experience with previous state-level interviews. Because we will be administering the interview to a small number of respondents, it is relatively feasible to follow up with respondents as needed.

2. Procedures for the Collection of Information

This study is collecting data from all SEAs, so stratification and other sampling procedures are not needed. This is a one-time data collection, so there is not a need to use periodic data collection cycles.

3. Methods to Maximize Response

We will follow up with non-respondents as needed via email and telephone.

4. Tests of Procedures or Methods

The proposed interview protocol was piloted with two states, one state that has identified “persistently dangerous” schools and one state that has not. Changes include:

- We removed a data collection form from this ICR. One state indicated that it did not collect the requested information and the second state indicated it would take many hours to complete the table. As such, we have added a question (21) to the end of the interview protocol about whether the state collects certain data. And, if so, we will then request the data from the state.
- We added a question (2) to better understand a state’s context around school safety and school choice. This will allow us to better understand the answers the state provides for the rest of the interview.
- We added a question (first part of 4) to understand the goal of the SEA’s policy. Both states suggested adding a question to this effect.
- We added a probe on “collaborate with other states” in question 5, due to a response from one of the states.
- We added a question (12) on supports that states provide to “persistently dangerous” schools, as both states felt this was a very important part of policy implementation. Similarly, we moved a probe on supports in question 13 to the main part of the question.
- We revised language in question 15 to say, “example of an exemplary corrective action plan” from “example of a particularly memorable corrective action plan,” based on a state’s feedback.
- The result of these changes was to increase the burden of the interviews from 52 hours to 70 hours, but the total burden for the study was reduced from 91 hours to 70 hours.

5. Individuals and Organizations Involved in This Project

The author of this data collection package was Erica Lee , Education Research Analyst, Policy and Program Studies Service (PPSS), Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development (OPEPD) (tel: 202-260-1463). The study plan was developed by PPSS in consultation with staff from the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education and the Office of Budget Service, Office of Finance and Operations.