FOR PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT SUBMISSION

Mandatory Civil Rights Data Collection

June 2013

SUPPORTING STATEMENT, PART A: JUSTIFICATION

ICRAS ICR ID and OMB Number: (1974.01) XXXX-XXXX

Revised XX/XX/XXXX

RIN Number: XXXX-XXXX (if applicable)

The Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC) is a longstanding and critical aspect of the overall enforcement and monitoring strategy used by the Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights (OCR) to ensure that recipients of the Department's federal financial assistance do not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, and disability. OCR relies on CRDC data as it investigates complaints alleging discrimination, determines whether the federal civil rights laws it enforces have been violated, initiates proactive compliance reviews to focus on particularly acute or nationwide civil rights compliance problems, and provides policy guidance and technical assistance to educational institutions, parents, students, and others.

The Department of Education (the Department) has collected CRDC data on school characteristics, programs, services, and student outcomes on a biennial basis since 1968. For many years, the collection operated as the Elementary and Secondary School Civil Rights Compliance Report (approved by OMB as control # 1870-0500). Recent administrations of the CRDC—2004, 2006, and 2009-10—were conducted primarily on-line through a survey tool in partnership with ED*Facts*. As such, through 2011, it was cleared under OMB control # 1875-0240. However, beginning with the 2013-14 CRDC, OCR is submitting this new separate clearance package for the CRDC.

With the exception of two state education agencies (SEAs), each Local Education Agency (LEA) that is included submits an LEA summary survey and a survey about each school in the LEA (one SEA provided all the data on behalf of its LEAs and another SEA provided some data on behalf of its LEAs during this time). Generally, the collection has included a sample of about 6,000-7,000 LEAs, although the 1976, 2000, and 2011-12 collections were universal collections from all LEAs. The CRDC is a mandatory data collection.

1. **Explain the circumstances that make the collection of information necessary. Identify any legal or administrative requirements that necessitate the collection. Attach a hard copy of the appropriate section of each statute and regulation mandating or authorizing the collection of information, or you may provide a valid URL link or paste the applicable section. Please limit pasted text to no longer than 3 pages. Specify the review type of the collection (new, revision, extension, reinstatement with change, reinstatement without change). If revised, briefly specify the changes. If a rulemaking is involved, make note of the sections or changed sections, if applicable.**

Section 203(c)(1) of the 1979 Department of Education Organization Act conveys to the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights the authority to "collect or coordinate the collection of data necessary to ensure compliance with civil rights laws within the jurisdiction of the Office for Civil Rights" (20 U.S.C. § 3413(c)(1), located at http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/20/3413).

The civil rights laws enforced by the OCR include: Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination based on race, color, and national origin; Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, which prohibits discrimination based on sex; and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability. OCR's implementing regulations for each of these statutes requires recipients of the Department's federal financial assistance to submit to OCR "complete and accurate compliance reports at such times, and in such form and containing such information" as OCR "may determine to be necessary to enable [OCR] to ascertain whether the recipient has complied or is complying" with these laws and implementing regulations (34 CFR 100.6(b), 34 CFR 106.71, and 34 CFR 104.61, located at http://www2.ed.gov/policy/rights/reg/ocr/index.html). In addition, pursuant to a delegation by the Attorney General of the United States, OCR shares in the enforcement of Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, which prohibits discrimination based on disability. Any data collection that OCR has determined to be necessary to ascertain or ensure compliance with these laws is mandatory.

OCR also works with Department offices to help them effectively carry out programs of Federal financial assistance that the Secretary of Education is responsible for administering. *See generally*, Sections 201, 202(g), 411(a), and 412 of the Department of Education Organization Act (20 U.S.C. §§ 3411, located at http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/20/3411, 3412(g), located at http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/20/3412, 3471(a), located at http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/20/3471, and 3472, located at http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/20/3472, respectively). OCR works with the

Department's Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, which is responsible for administering the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). Section 9533 of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. § 7913, located at http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/20/7913) prohibits discrimination in the administration of the ESEA in violation of the Fifth or Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution. In addition, Section 9534 of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. § 7914, located at http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/20/7914) prohibits discrimination in funded programs on the basis of race, color, religion, sex (except as otherwise permitted under Title IX), national origin, or disability. Thus, in addition to OCR's authority described above, the ESEA provides authority for the Department to mandate that LEAs respond to this data collection.

As with previous CRDC collections, the purpose of the 2013-14 and 2015-16 CRDC is to obtain vital data related to the civil rights laws' requirement that public LEAs and elementary and secondary schools provide equal educational opportunity. OCR has extensively analyzed the uses of every data element collected in 2011-12 and sought advice from experts across the Department to refine, improve, and where appropriate, add or remove data elements from the collection. The 2013-14 and 2015-16 CRDC redesign effort ensured that, while several new indicators were added to the collection, data elements also were removed where appropriate. OCR also made the CRDC data definitions and metrics consistent with other mandatory collections across the Department wherever possible.

The proposed additions and changes to the 2013-14 and 2015-16 CRDC reflect the need for a deeper understanding of and accurate data about the educational opportunities and school context for our nation's students. The information in the next few paragraphs summarizes the changes proposed for some general areas of information collected in the CRDC. For a more detailed list of what is proposed for 2013-14 and 2015-16, including retained elements and proposed additions, see Appendix 1 to this Supporting Statement A.

School and District Characteristics

The CRDC will continue to cover such topics as the number of magnet and alternative schools, districts operating under desegregation orders or plans, and student membership disaggregated by race, ethnicity, sex, disability, and English learner status. The proposed changes provide greater context to deepen OCR's understanding of the schools and districts in which students receive their education. For example, items about civil rights coordinators in each district will measure compliance with civil rights regulations and permit OCR to communicate with coordinators, and new items on the educational programs in justice facilities will provide a more accurate account of the educational opportunities available to students. (See attachment A-5 for a directed question on this topic.)

Discipline

The 2009-10 CRDC made public long-hidden data about indicators of school culture, including: numbers of students, broken down by demographic characteristics, who were suspended once and multiple times, expelled, and arrested in school; and new information about the use of restraint and seclusion in the classroom. The proposed changes provide additional information

about the amount of time students are suspended; this reflects the findings of OCR enforcement actions and other reports that have shown that disproportionality in discipline extends beyond the type of punishment (in- or out-of-school suspensions) to length of time out of class. Other proposed changes include additional attention to preschool discipline practices and corporal punishment. Proposed refinements to existing expulsion items are intended to make clear that such involuntary transfers from a student's school for discipline reasons constitute expulsion, regardless of label, and to track where such students are sent to receive educational services (regular or alternative school). Other proposed changes will incorporate into the CRDC critical data elements taken from the NCES School Survey on Crime and Safety to obtain school violence and safety information.

Harassment and Bullying

Safe environments are critical to learning. Since the 2009, the CRDC has provided a lens on school climate and the bullying and harassment that students too often endure on the basis of race, sex, and disability. The proposed changes add sexual orientation and religion to types of allegations of harassment that need to be counted, but the proposal does not extend the reporting requirements about demographic data of the alleged complainant or harasser. (Note that the proposed changes will not authorize schools to inquire about the sexual orientation or religion of students. In classifying the allegations of harassment or bullying, respondents are directed to look to the likely motives of the alleged harasser/bully, and not the actual status of the alleged victim. See more information in response to question 11.)

Early Childhood Education

The CRDC continues to cover such topics as children's access to and participation in LEA-operated early childhood education programs. In order to deepen OCR's understanding of services provided to our youngest students, OCR is proposing to expand the collection of early childhood experience elements to learn more about how programs serve the youngest children.

Pathways to College and Career

The CRDC continues to cover topics such as students' participation in Algebra and other college-preparatory subjects, grade-level retention, and access to Advanced Placement (AP) courses. The proposed changes provide a more accurate account of course taking and passing opportunities. The previous collection allowed masking of important trends including middle school math opportunities and whether or not students have access to dual enrollment and/or credit recovery. Proposed changes also reflect efforts to reduce burden (and better focus on STEM opportunities) by streamlining AP course-taking information. Another proposed change measures which schools have high and low chronic absenteeism rates. Chronic absenteeism can be a sign of serious school climate issues that are driving children out of school. It is also a warning sign of serious problems in the future for the child (e.g., dropping out).

School finance (funded with state and local funds)

Since 2009, the CRDC has been a source of information for exploring resource equity among schools within a district. The proposed changes would provide finer-grained data on total personnel expenditures between schools for teachers and instructional aides, administrators, and those who provide critical support services for students and instruction. (See Attachment A-5 for directed question on this topic.)

Teachers (funded with federal, state, and/or local funds)

Since 2009, the CRDC has been a resource for data on the number of first- and second-year teachers in schools, the number of high school counselors in schools, and teacher absenteeism. The proposed changes will add school support and security staffing data for every school. OCR also proposes to incorporate into the CRDC critical data elements taken from the NCES Schools and Staffing Survey. These data will deepen our understanding of how to make schools and communities safer and allow OCR to compare resources available to schools of different populations.

2. **Indicate how, by whom, and for what purpose the information is to be used. Except for a new collection, indicate the actual use the agency has made of the information received from the current collection.**

Since 1968, the CRDC (and its predecessor surveys) have served as the cornerstone for federal enforcement of children's civil rights in public schools. OCR relies on CRDC data as it investigates complaints alleging discrimination, determines whether the federal civil rights laws it enforces have been violated, initiates proactive compliance reviews to focus on particularly acute or nationwide civil rights compliance problems, and provides policy guidance and technical assistance to educational institutions, parents, students, and others.

In 2009, OCR extensively redesigned the CRDC. It sought input from a wide range of experts within the Department and throughout federal government, and from stakeholders from state and local education agencies and the broader education community, through meetings and two public comment periods. Sources of advice and expertise included the Education Information Management Advisory Committee (a committee of the Council of Chief State School Officers), the National Center for Education Statistics Forum, state data coordinators from the Department's ED*Facts* data submission system, and a sampling of LEAs to ensure coordination among data collections and to minimize the burden on LEAs. OCR attorneys and staff from throughout the country were heavily involved to ensure the collection's maximum utility in the investigatory process. The resulting 2009-10 CRDC was more detailed, providing new data on college and career-readiness, discipline, teacher equity, retention, access to pre-K programs, bullying and harassment, and school-level expenditures, and disaggregating data by race, ethnicity, sex, disability, and English learner status.

The transformed 2009-10 CRDC has been heralded as a first-of-its-kind opportunity gap data tool that is allowing citizens and schools nationwide to identify educational equity-related problems and their solutions. For OCR staff across the country, as they launch investigations, the

CRDC is used to prepopulate their data requests so that recipients do not have to make duplicate reports and submissions. This expedites investigations and reduces the reporting burdens.

The 2011-12 CRDC built on these efforts by adding more data checks (to ensure the data's integrity), and by combining the fall snapshot data and spring outcome data collection periods into a single collection period (to minimize the burden to respondents).

The CRDC's utility reaches far beyond OCR to the entire Department, to other agencies and to researchers and policymakers across the nation. CRDC data have also been used by other Department offices for purposes such as monitoring compliance with requirements for federal professional development funding, monitoring states under ESEA flexibility waivers, defining program requirements on discipline disparities in the Race to the Top district competition, and evaluating the Office of English Language Acquisition's (OELA) programs and activities. Individual offices also rely on CRDC data to analyze issues and prepare reports on topics such as achievement gaps.

State and federal agencies, policymakers, researchers, and many others outside of the Department also use the CRDC data. (Data are available to the public via the Web in privacy-protected format.) For each of these constituencies, the CRDC is an invaluable source of information about access to educational opportunities in our nation's public schools. Researchers, advocacy organizations, and news media have used CRDC data to identify possible civil rights concerns in our nation's schools and to find models of success. State legislatures and state boards of education have relied on CRDC data in crafting and revising educational policies. And for LEAs and schools across the country, the CRDC data is a critical tool for self-analysis and a mechanism for highlighting and correcting areas of educational concern.

3. **Describe whether, and to what extent, the collection of information involves the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or forms of information technology, e.g. permitting electronic submission of responses, and the basis for the decision of adopting this means of collection. Also describe any consideration given to using technology to reduce burden.**

Like recent collections, the primary collection instrument for the 2013-14 and 2015-16 CRDC will be a Web-based system; users will either upload data files and/or enter the data in response to questions displayed on the screen; and the data will be transmitted directly into a database. To reduce burden, the Department will utilize a user-friendly interactive tool that ensures schools and LEAs only have to answer applicable questions. Guiding questions facilitate this approach and may precede data group tables. For example, if a user indicates the school serves only elementary students, the questions about high schools will not be presented. Similarly, a high school will be asked if the school provided Advanced Placement (AP) courses. If the user answers "No," then the series of tables about AP will be skipped; if the user answers "Yes," then the tables about AP will be presented.

Flat file submissions, such as Excel files, are allowed for districts that have the capacity to create them; and paper submissions are allowed for LEAs with no Internet connectivity or limited Web access. States that wish to submit data on behalf of their LEAs are allowed to do so, as they have been in the past.

Before 2011-12, LEAs had to choose to submit all their data either by flat file submission (FFS) or through the Web-based system. For the 2011-12 CRDC, OCR implemented improvements to the web collection tool to allow LEAs the flexibility to use both methods of submitting their data to the CRDC. As a result, the percentage of LEAs using FFS increased significantly, from 6% in 2009 to 26% in 2011.

The flexibility in submission methods allows LEAs to submit whatever portion of the CRDC is included in their student information system in flat files. These flat files then "pre-populate" the Web-based screens and allow the school (or another department within the school district) to either verify or complete the remaining sections of the CRDC. This option will continue to be available in the 2013-14 and 2015-16 collections.

Through computer control of the data collection process and the monitoring of responses, the computer-based system offers the capacity for substantial improvements in data quality and data collection efficiency over a survey conducted using paper and pencil. Incidents of missing and inconsistent data are greatly reduced since questionnaire skip patterns are computer controlled. Moreover, invalid entries, contradictory entries, or entries inconsistent with available data on the school or LEA are questioned by the computer and must be resolved or confirmed by the respondent during the self-directed Web instrument data collection.

4. **Describe efforts to identify duplication. Show specifically why any similar information already available cannot be used or modified for use for the purposes described in Question 2 above.**

The CRDC is the unique source of data for the vast majority of data elements collected. Starting with the 2009-10 CRDC, OCR leveraged data submitted to the Department by state departments of education to reduce the burden on LEAs. In addition, in planning the 2009-10 CRDC, OCR carefully examined all data groups already collected by ED*Facts* and dropped several tables previously in the CRDC because the data are available through the state-based portion of ED*Facts*, the EDEN Submission System (ESS). OCR continues to use this approach for the CRDC.

For the 2013-14 and 2015-16 CRDC, OCR also met with program offices across the Department to eliminate any duplication of data items and, where possible, ensure the CRDC uses definitions consistent with those used by other program offices. For example, OCR worked closely with the National Center on Educational Statistics (NCES) to align the definitions used for the collection of school-level expenditures with the definitions used by NCES and Census in the collection of district-level expenditures. In order to consolidate and centralize preschool-12 data collections, definitions need to be standardized. If the same term has multiple definitions, the reporting

burden on LEAs and SEAs increases significantly. Therefore, the same definitions of terms are used whenever possible.

To coordinate the definitions used and identify possible duplication of data elements, OCR met with key staff throughout the Department and convened a two-day technical working group, including participants from NCES, the Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, the Office of English Language Acquisition, the Office of Special Education Programs, and the Correctional Re-Entry Group, to review the proposed 2013-14 and 2015-16 CRDC. This cross-program office coordination provided an opportunity for experts in content areas and survey design to raise potential areas of overlap.

5. **If the collection of information impacts small businesses or other small entities, describe any methods used to minimize burden. A small entity may be (1) a small business which is deemed to be one that is independently owned and operated and that is not dominant in its field of operation; (2) a small organization that is any not-for-profit enterprise that is independently owned and operated and is not dominant in its field; or (3) a small government jurisdiction, which is a government of a city, county, town, township, school district, or special district with a population of less than 50,000.**

The CRDC allows small districts with limited or no Web access to submit via a paper form. For the 2011-12 CRDC, 0.1% (16 out of nearly 17,000) of LEAs submitted the CRDC through a paper form. Additionally, smaller LEAs often face additional challenges with the timing of the CRDC collection. At the close of the school year, small and rural LEAs "roll over" their data systems, effectively closing out one school year and beginning the next. The end of year "roll over" can make accessing data from the prior school year challenging. With advice from the CRDC workgroup, which includes representatives from geographically diverse LEAs and SEAs, OCR created a set of pre-collection tools to allow smaller LEAs to collect and store their CRDC data in a format that could be easily uploaded into the CRDC submission system. With these tools, smaller LEAs could store their CRDC data in ready-to-use flat files once the survey submission website opened in the fall of the next school year. These pre-collection tools were widely used and OCR received many positive comments regarding their ease of use. As a result, OCR plans to continue to provide these tools for the 2013-14 and 2015-16 CRDC.

6. **Describe the consequences to Federal program or policy activities if the collection is not conducted or is conducted less frequently, as well as any technical or legal obstacles to reducing burden.**

Education in this nation is on an annual cycle where success and failure are measured and reported annually and civil rights complaints must be investigated and resolved on an ongoing basis. The most recent CRDC contained data from the fall and spring of school year 2011-12. It is critical that more recent information be available so that the Department can carry out its mandate to ensure civil rights under the applicable laws. Further, OCR enforcement offices rely

on data in the CRDC to prepopulate data requests to districts and schools when conducting investigations and compliance reviews. It is important that OCR have recent data to conduct these investigations.

7. **Explain any special circumstances that would cause an information collection to be conducted in a manner:**
   - **requiring respondents to report information to the agency more often than quarterly;**
   - **requiring respondents to prepare a written response to a collection of information in fewer than 30 days after receipt of it;**
   - **requiring respondents to submit more than an original and two copies of any document;**
   - **requiring respondents to retain records, other than health, medical, government contract, grant-in-aid, or tax records for more than three years;**
   - **in connection with a statistical survey, that is not designed to produce valid and reliable results than can be generalized to the universe of study;**
   - **requiring the use of a statistical data classification that has not been reviewed and approved by OMB;**
   - **that includes a pledge of confidentiality that is not supported by authority established in statute or regulation, that is not supported by disclosure and data security policies that are consistent with the pledge, or that unnecessarily impedes sharing of data with other agencies for compatible confidential use; or**
   - **requiring respondents to submit proprietary trade secrets, or other confidential information unless the agency can demonstrate that it has instituted procedures to protect the information's confidentiality to the extent permitted by law.**

This information collection activity does not have special circumstances that would include any of the requirements listed above.

8. **As applicable, state that the Department has published the 60 and 30 Federal Register notices as required by 5 CFR 1320.8(d), soliciting comments on the information collection prior to submission to OMB. Summarize public comments received in response to that notice and describe actions taken by the agency in response to these comments. Specifically address comments received on cost and hour burden.**

   Describe efforts to consult with persons outside the agency to obtain their views on the availability of data, frequency of collection, the clarity of instruction and record keeping, disclosure, or reporting format (if any), and on the data elements to be recorded, disclosed, or reported.

Consultation with representatives of those from whom information is to be obtained or those who must compile records should occur at least once every 3 years – even if the collection of information activity is the same as in prior periods. There may be circumstances that may preclude consultation in a specific situation. These circumstances should be explained.

The Department will provide the public an opportunity to comment through both 60-day and 30-day notices.

Additionally, during the two-day technical working group (referenced in response to question 4), OCR met with key staff throughout the Department who offered their recommendations on improvements to data items. Following the technical working group review of the CRDC data elements, the full list of proposed new data elements and data elements OCR proposed to no longer collect was reviewed and approved by the Department's Policy Committee, which sought to ensure the collection of these data elements was necessary, permitted and non-duplicative.

In addition to publishing a notice in the Federal Register, OCR will conduct outreach to LEAs and SEAs. On a semi-annual basis, OCR convenes a workgroup of representatives from geographically diverse LEAs and SEAs to provide guidance and advice on ways to improve the CRDC. The CRDC workgroup plays a vital role in understanding the availability of data, within either state or local data systems, and the burden of reporting new or continuing data items.

9. **Explain any decision to provide any payment or gift to respondents, other than remuneration of contractors or grantees with meaningful justification.**

There is no current remuneration for any school district or school.

10. **Describe any assurance of confidentiality provided to respondents and the basis for the assurance in statute, regulation, or agency policy. If personally identifiable information (PII) is being collected, a Privacy Act statement should be included on the instrument. Please provide a citation for the Systems of Record Notice and the date a Privacy Impact Assessment was completed as indicated on the IC Data Form. A confidentiality statement with a legal citation that authorizes the pledge of confidentiality should be provided. Requests for this information are in accordance with the following ED and OMB policies: Privacy Act of 1974, OMB Circular A-108 – Privacy Act Implementation – Guidelines and Responsibilities, OMB Circular A-130 Appendix I – Federal Agency Responsibilities for Maintaining Records About Individuals, OMB M-03-22 – OMB Guidance for Implementing the Privacy Provisions of the E-Government Act of 2002, OMB M-06-15 – Safeguarding Personally Identifiable Information, OM:6-104 – Privacy Act of 1974 (Collection, Use and Protection of Personally Identifiable Information). If the collection is subject to the Privacy Act, the Privacy Act statement is deemed sufficient with respect to confidentiality. If there is no expectation of**

confidentiality, simply state that the Department makes no pledge about the confidentially of the data.

There has been no assurance of confidentiality provided to the respondents beyond the agreement to protect individual student information under the Federal Educational Rights and Privacy Act. The CRDC does not collect any personally identifiable information (PII). Confidentiality issues with the CRDC are specific to the amount of data found in a "cell" that might make the identification of an individual student or staff member possible when combined with other information not collected in the CRDC. OCR is committed to protecting individual privacy by not making public any data in rows or columns where a single cell is below a certain threshold of size. OCR will continue to review the submitted data for any other security requirements.

11. **Provide additional justification for any questions of a sensitive nature, such as sexual behavior and attitudes, religious beliefs, and other matters that are commonly considered private. The justification should include the reasons why the agency considers the questions necessary, the specific uses to be made of the information, the explanation to be given to persons from whom the information is requested, and any steps to be taken to obtain their consent.**

As noted above in response to question 1, OCR proposes to collect data about the number of allegations received by a school of bullying/harassment on the basis of religion and sexual orientation. The questions are not intended or expected to elicit private information about students. The questions are intended to record, for any reported harassment, the school's understanding about the harasser's perceived motivation. In classifying the allegations of harassment or bullying, respondents are directed to look to the likely motives of the alleged harasser/bully, and not the actual status of the alleged victim. Because the questions are not focused on students' sexual behavior or attitudes or religious beliefs, OCR does not believe these questions are of a sensitive nature. Nonetheless, OCR provides the following justification for the proposed addition of these questions.

Beginning in 2009, OCR collected data at the school level regarding bullying/harassment on the basis of (1) sex, (2) race/color/national origin, and (3) disability. For each category, the CRDC collected the number of allegations of bullying/harassment received by a school, the number of students bullied/harassed, and the number of students disciplined for bullying/harassment. For the "students bullied/harassed" and "students disciplined" items, the CRDC collected disaggregated data by sex, race/ethnicity, disability, and LEP status.

Bullying and harassment of students on the basis of religion and sexual orientation is reportedly prevalent. The NIH's Health Behavior in School-Aged Children Survey reported that 8.5% of

students (grades 6-10) are bullied about their religion.[1] Another survey found that, of those who had been subjected to religious slurs and degrading language in school, Jewish and Muslim students were more commonly targeted.[2] Likewise, despite the lack of nationally representative or uniform school-level harassment data, bullying and harassment in educational settings of those perceived to be lesbian, gay or bisexual is reportedly common and has a negative impact on those students. For example, one 2011 analysis of 18 studies found that gay, lesbian, and bisexual youth were more likely to be verbally harassed and teased or physically and sexually victimized than heterosexual youth, and more likely to experience detrimental outcomes, such as suicidal thoughts and attempts.[3]

In May 2012, the Government Accountability Office noted the "prevalence of bullying of youths in certain vulnerable demographic groups is not known," and specifically highlighted that none of the four government-sponsored bullying-related national surveys collected information about harassment of students based on their sexual orientation. The GAO also stated more generally that collecting additional information about bullying and harassment "would better inform federal efforts to prevent and remedy bullying" and "could aid policymakers in determining whether additional actions are needed to protect vulnerable groups of students who are subjected to bullying."[4]

In response to the critical need for national data, OCR is proposing to expand its data collection to address more comprehensively the bullying and harassment in educational settings to include the number of allegations of bullying or harassment on the basis of religion and sexual orientation. Collecting these data would allow OCR to provide technical assistance where there are patterns of harassment and to assist with investigations in response to complaints. In 2010, OCR issued guidance regarding bullying and harassment that indicated that, under some circumstances, harassment against gay and lesbian students would violate Title IX (prohibiting sex discrimination), and that, under some circumstances, harassment against Jewish and Muslim

---

[1] GAO, *School Bullying: Extent of Legal Protections for Vulnerable Groups Needs to Be More Fully Assessed*, at 40, App. IV, tbl. 9 (May 2012), http://www.gao.gov/assets/600/591202.pdf; *see also* U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Peer-to-Peer Violence and Bullying: Examining the Federal Response* at 8-9 (Sept. 2011), http://www.usccr.gov/pubs/2011statutory.pdf (national survey shows 1.6% of students ages 12-18 reported being targeted by hate-related words based on religion; another survey shows 11% of all students in grades 7, 9, and 11 in California reported being subjected to bullying or harassment based on religion).

[2] Stephen L. Wessler and Lelia L. De Andrade, "Slurs, Stereotypes, and Student Interventions: Examining the Dynamics, Impact, and Prevention of Harassment in Middle and High School," *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 62, no. 3 (2006), http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2006.00471.x/full; *see also* U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *supra*, at 21 (collecting "demonstrative, albeit largely anecdotal, evidence" of harassment of Jewish and Muslim students, as well as those perceived to be Muslim).

[3] Alicia L. Fedewa and Soyeon Ahn, "The Effects of Bullying and Peer Victimization on Sexual-Minority and Heterosexual Youths: A Quantitative Meta-Analysis of the Literature," *Journal of GLBT Family Studies,* vol. 7, no. 4 (2011), as described in GAO, *supra*, at 10.

[4] *See* GAO*, supra*, at 27.

students would violate Title VI (prohibiting national origin discrimination).[5] In addition, these data would further the effective administration of programs under the ESEA.

OCR proposes to collect only the number of allegations received by a school of bullying and harassment on the basis of sexual orientation or religion. OCR is not proposing that schools collect data about students' sexual orientation or religion. OCR is not proposing that schools collect counts of students who were harassed or disciplined for harassment on those bases. School districts will not be required to include perceived sexual orientation or religious affiliation of students as part of their administrative records.

To assess whether even making an inquiry about the number of allegations of harassment received by a school might cause invasions of privacy, OCR contacted SEAs in some of the 10 states that currently collect such sexual orientation harassment data from their public school districts and none reported any student or parental complaints or known incidents of teachers invading student privacy in an effort to fill out the state's data reporting forms. OCR also contacted several school districts (of various sizes and urban/rural mix) in those states to determine whether these data reporting requirements had led to sexual-orientation notations on individual student records or had raised any complaints or concerns and none were reported.

12. Provide estimates of the hour burden of the collection of information. The statement should:

- **Indicate the number of respondents by affected public type (federal government, individuals or households, private sector – businesses or other for-profit, private sector – not-for-profit institutions, farms, state, local or tribal governments), frequency of response, annual hour burden, and an explanation of how the burden was estimated, including identification of burden type: recordkeeping, reporting or third party disclosure. All narrative should be included in Question 12. Unless directed to do so, agencies should not conduct special surveys to obtain information on which to base hour burden estimates. Consultation with a sample (fewer than 10) of potential respondents is desirable. If the hour burden on respondents is expected to vary widely because of differences in activity, size, or complexity, show the range of estimated hour burden, and explain the reasons for the variance. Generally, estimates should not include burden hours for customary and usual business practices.**

---

[5] *See Guidance Letter from OCR regarding Bullying*, at 8 (Oct. 26, 2010) ("When students are subjected to harassment on the basis of their LGBT status, they may also ... be subjected to forms of sex discrimination prohibited under Title IX."), http://www.ed.gov/ocr/letters/colleague-201010.pdf; *id*. at 5 ("[A]nti-Semitic harassment can trigger responsibilities under Title VI. … These principles apply not just to Jewish students, but also to students from any discrete religious group that shares, or is perceived to share, ancestry or ethnic characteristics (e.g., Muslims or Sikhs). Thus, harassment against students who are members of any religious group triggers a school's Title VI responsibilities when the harassment is based on the group's actual or perceived shared ancestry or ethnic characteristics, rather than solely on its members' religious practices.").

- **If this request for approval covers more than one form, provide separate hour burden estimates for each form and aggregate the hour burdens in the ROCIS IC Burden Analysis Table. (The table should at minimum include Respondent types, IC activity, Respondent and Responses, Hours/Response, and Total Hours)**
- **Provide estimates of annualized cost to respondents of the hour burdens for collections of information, identifying and using appropriate wage rate categories. The cost of contracting out or paying outside parties for information collection activities should not be included here. Instead, this cost should be included in Question 14.**

For the CRDC, the respondent is the LEA; the LEA must complete one LEA-level survey plus one school-level survey for each of its schools. For the 2011-12 CRDC, the burden was estimated to be 1,282,492 hours across 16,785 LEA respondents and their approximately 96,523 schools with students in membership, based on an estimated 12.8 hours per school survey and 2.8 hours per LEA survey on average. For elementary schools, the burden was estimated to be 8.1 hours per school survey since several of the data elements are only applicable to high schools. For high schools, the burden was estimated to be 14.9 hours per school survey.

The SY 2013-14 CRDC survey content will increase by approximately 17% percent for PS-12 schools. Approximately 17,620 LEAs will respond for themselves and their 101,849 schools to the request for data. This results in a total burden estimate of 1,499,890 hours. For elementary schools, the burden is estimated to be 8.9 hours per school survey since several of the data elements are only applicable to high schools. For high schools, the burden was estimated to be 15.8 hours per school survey. Since the number of schools per LEA varies so widely it should be noted that a district with only one school would, on the average, take 4.2 hours for the LEA survey and 14 hours for the school survey, for a total of 18.2 hours. An LEA with 10 schools would take 4.8 hours on the LEA survey and average 14 hours on each of the school surveys, for a total of 144.8 hours.

	Respondents	Hours/Response	Total Hours
Previous – CRDC (2011)	Schools: 96,523 LEAs: 16,785	Schools: 12.8 LEAs: 2.8	Schools:1,235,494 LEAs:46,998 Total: 1,282,492
New – CRDC (2013)	Schools:101,849 LEAs: 17,620	Schools: 14 LEAs: 4.2	Schools: 1,425,886 LEAs: 74,004 Total: 1,499,890
New Burden		Schools:+1.2hrs/survey LEAs: +1.4hrs/survey	Schools:190,392 LEAs: 27,006

The total respondent cost for the SY 2013-14 CRDC is estimated to be $67,495,050 (1,499,890 hours multiplied by an average wage of $45 per hour). There is a wide range of hourly salaries associated with the professionals that will provide this data, but $45/hour is a reasonable average.

13. **Provide an estimate of the total annual cost burden to respondents or record keepers resulting from the collection of information. (Do not include the cost of any hour burden shown in Questions 12 and 14.)**
    - **The cost estimate should be split into two components: (a) a total capital and start-up cost component (annualized over its expected useful life); and (b) a total operation and maintenance and purchase of services component. The estimates should take into account costs associated with generating, maintaining, and disclosing or providing the information. Include descriptions of methods used to estimate major cost factors including system and technology acquisition, expected useful life of capital equipment, the discount rate(s), and the time period over which costs will be incurred. Capital and start-up costs include, among other items, preparations for collecting information such as purchasing computers and software; monitoring, sampling, drilling and testing equipment; and acquiring and maintaining record storage facilities.**
    - **If cost estimates are expected to vary widely, agencies should present ranges of cost burdens and explain the reasons for the variance. The cost of contracting out information collection services should be a part of this cost burden estimate. In developing cost burden estimates, agencies may consult with a sample of respondents (fewer than 10), utilize the 60-day pre-OMB submission public**

comment process and use existing economic or regulatory impact analysis associated with the rulemaking containing the information collection, as appropriate.

- **Generally, estimates should not include purchases of equipment or services, or portions thereof, made: (1) prior to October 1, 1995, (2) to achieve regulatory compliance with requirements not associated with the information collection, (3) for reasons other than to provide information or keep records for the government or (4) as part of customary and usual business or private practices. Also, these estimates should not include the hourly costs (i.e., the monetization of the hours) captured above in Question 12.**

Total Annualized Capital/Startup Cost:

Total Annual Costs (O&M):

Total Annualized Costs Requested:

The collection of CRDC data for the foreseeable future will require no additional systems development efforts by the local agencies.

14. **Provide estimates of annualized cost to the Federal government. Also, provide a description of the method used to estimate cost, which should include quantification of hours, operational expenses (such as equipment, overhead, printing, and support staff), and any other expense that would not have been incurred without this collection of information. Agencies also may aggregate cost estimates from Questions 12, 13, and 14 in a single table.**

The estimated annual government cost for the next CRDC is $4.942 million. This estimate is based on contractual costs to develop a revised survey tool, provide technical support for all LEAs in the nation, and produce and analyze the resulting database of survey responses.

15. **Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments. Generally, adjustments in burden result from re-estimating burden and/or from economic phenomenon outside of an agency's control (e.g., correcting a burden estimate or an organic increase in the size of the reporting universe). Program changes result from a deliberate action that materially changes a collection of information and generally are result of new statute or an agency action (e.g., changing a form, revising regulations, redefining the respondent universe, etc.). Burden changes should be disaggregated by type of change (i.e., adjustment, program change due to new statute, and/or program change due to agency discretion), type of collection (new, revision, extension, reinstatement with change, reinstatement without change) and include totals for changes in burden hours, responses and costs (if applicable).**

The SY 2013-14 CRDC survey content will increase by approximately 17 percent resulting in an estimated 14 hours per school survey and 4.2 hours per LEA survey as a result of program

change due to agency discretion. Approximately 17,620 LEAs will respond for themselves and their 101,849 schools to the request for data. This results in a total burden estimate of 1,499,890 hours.

The annual government cost is similar to the cost of previous surveys, the last of which was the 2011-12 CRDC, conducted in 2012.

16. For collections of information whose results will be published, outline plans for tabulation and publication. Address any complex analytical techniques that will be used.

The Department presently makes CRDC results available on the Web with privacy protections in place. Additionally, the Department makes available on the Web national and state projections based on the raw data. The Department makes data available through a website that displays a "summary of select facts" for a district or school, which displays data about key issues through tables and charts. Users then have the option to access additional data for that district or school. The website also contains a Flexible Tables interface, which allows users to select data from more than one district or school, for the current CRDC and/or prior CRDCs.

In an effort to make the new CRDC easily usable by the public and OCR's investigators and attorneys, OCR designed a new Web-based data reporting tool that allows users to tailor the school-level indicators and produce visually intuitive graphic displays of school- and district-level tables, and made it available to the public in a privacy-protected format on OCR's website, http://ocrdata.ed.gov. The new website is also research-friendly. For example, users have enhanced ability to search and query the database for types of schools as well as schools or districts meeting certain criteria.

17. Provide the time schedule for the entire project, including beginning and ending dates of the collection of information, completion of report, publication dates, and other actions.

There are three distinct phases of the collection of CRDC data from LEAs:

- Notification and verification of reporting status,
- Collection of data by LEAs, and
- Survey submission window.

The first phase in the CRDC is to notify school districts of their obligation to report, designate a principal point of contact, and verify the reporting status of LEAs and schools. The result of this first phase is a full directory of LEAs and schools and their CRDC reporting status. For the 2013-14 collection, this phase will commence in Fall 2013 and for the 2015-16 collection, this phase will begin in Fall 2015.

During the second phase of the CRDC, LEAs gather and validate the required data to be submitted to OCR. During this time, OCR provides frequent training opportunities for school districts to understand the data elements collected on the CRDC and the survey submission process. A support center is also available to school districts to call or email questions regarding the content of the data to be collected. OCR has also provided pre-collection tools for school districts to gather and prepare flat files of the required data to prepare for the survey submission opening. For the 2013-14 collection, this second phase will take place between Fall 2013 and Summer 2014 and for the 2015-16 collection, this second phase will take place between Fall 2015 and Summer 2016.

During the third phase, the survey submission widow opens with email notification to all participating school districts. School districts are typically given a minimum of three months to submit their data to OCR. During the survey submission period, frequent communication occurs with participating school districts to offer technical assistance and, as the survey due date approaches, reminders are sent to school districts that have not yet certified their CRDC submission. For the 2013-14 collection, we anticipate this third phase will take place between Fall 2014 and Winter 2015 and for the 2015-16 collection, we anticipate this third phase will take place between Fall 2016 and Winter 2017.

Following the close of the survey submission window, OCR reviews the data to identify possible reporting anomalies and offer LEAs an opportunity to amend their CRDC submission as necessary. This process takes approximately three months. Following the data quality review, OCR then works to post the data on its reporting website (ocrdata.ed.gov) to provide the public with easy access and visually intuitive displays of the data.

18. If seeking approval to not display the expiration date for OMB approval of the information collection, explain the reasons that display would be inappropriate.

This collection will display the OMB approval date in all transmittal documents requesting the information from the state or local agencies and in any written discussion or representation of the collection. The OMB number will be properly displayed on any Web form and paper form used by the Civil Rights Data Collection.

19. Explain each exception to the certification statement identified in the Certification of Paperwork Reduction Act.

ED is requesting no exemptions from the Certification.

Appendix: List of New and Continuing CRDC Questions

Items that OCR is proposing to add are underlined.

School & District Characteristics

- Number of public schools *(LEA)*
- Grades offered (PS-12) (PS refers to preschool and excludes birth-2)
- Whether ungraded school has mainly elementary school age students; middle school age students; high school age students; elementary and middle school age students; middle and high school age students; elementary middle, and high school age students
- Number of students (PS through grade 12) served by LEA in LEA and non-LEA facilities *(LEA)*
- Total number of students (preschool through grade 12) enrolled in school (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-IDEA, disability-504 only, LEP)
- Number of students with disabilities (disaggregated by race, sex, LEP)
- Number of LEP students and number of students enrolled in LEP programs (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-IDEA)
- Whether the school is operating a magnet program for all students or some students within the school (and if so, whether entire school population participates in the magnet program)
- Whether the school is an alternative school (and if so, for academic or discipline or both)
- Whether the school is focused primarily on serving students with disabilities
- Whether the school is a charter school
- For justice facility only:
    - Type of facility (pre- or post-adjudication/conviction or both)
    - Number of days that makeup the justice facility's regular school year
    - Total number of hours per week that educational program is offered during regular school year
    - Number of students who participated in educational program for less than 15 calendar days; 15-30 calendar days; 31-90 calendar days; 91-180 calendar days; more than 180 calendar days.
- Whether co-educational school has one or more single-sex classes
- Number of single-sex academic classes (with males only; with females only) in the following courses/subject areas:
    - Algebra I, Geometry, and/or Algebra II
    - Other mathematics
    - Science
    - English/reading/language arts
    - Other academic subjects
- Whether LEA has civil rights coordinators for discrimination against students on basis of sex, race, and disability (and contact information) *(LEA)*
- Whether LEA is covered by desegregation order or plan *(LEA)*

Discipline

- Students (K-12) who received one or more in-school suspension:
  - Number of K-12 students without disabilities who received one or more in-school suspension (disaggregated by race, sex, LEP)
  - Number of K-12 students with disabilities who received one or more in-school suspension (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-504 only, LEP)
- Students who received one out-of-school suspension:
  - Number of preschool students who received one out-of-school suspension (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-IDEA, LEP)
  - Number of K-12 students without disabilities who received one out-of-school suspension (disaggregated by race, sex, LEP)
  - Number of K-12 students with disabilities who received one out-of-school suspension (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-504 only, LEP)
- Students who received more than one out-of-school suspension:
  - Number of preschool students who received more than one out-of-school suspension (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-IDEA, LEP)
  - Number of K-12 students without disabilities who received more than one out-of-school suspension (disaggregated by race, sex, LEP)
  - Number of K-12 students with disabilities who received more than one out-of-school suspension (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-504 only, LEP)
- Number of preschool students who were expelled (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-IDEA, LEP)
- Students (K-12) who were expelled (with educational services; without educational services; because of zero-tolerance policies):
  - Number of K-12 students without disabilities who were expelled (with educational services; without educational services; because of zero-tolerance policies) (disaggregated by race, sex, LEP)
  - Number of K-12 students with disabilities who were expelled (with educational services; without educational services; because of zero-tolerance policies) (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-504 only, LEP)
- <u>Students (K-12) who were removed for disciplinary reasons (to alternative school; to regular school):</u>
  - <u>Number of K-12 students without disabilities who were removed for disciplinary reasons (to alternative school; to regular school) (disaggregated by race, sex, LEP)</u>
  - <u>Number of K-12 students with disabilities who were removed for disciplinary reasons (to alternative school; to regular school) (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-504 only, LEP)</u>
- Students (K-12) who were referred to law enforcement agency or official:
  - Number of K-12 students without disabilities who were referred to law enforcement agency or official (disaggregated by race, sex, LEP)
  - Number of K-12 students with disabilities who were referred to law enforcement agency or official (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-504 only, LEP)

- Students (K-12) who were arrested for school-related activity:
  - Number of K-12 students without disabilities who were arrested for school-related activity (disaggregated by race, sex, LEP)
  - Number of K-12 students with disabilities who were arrested for school-related activity (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-504 only, LEP)
- Students who received corporal punishment:
  - Number of preschool students (ages 3-5) who received corporal punishment (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-IDEA, LEP)
  - Number of K-12 students without disabilities who received corporal punishment (disaggregated by race, sex, LEP)
  - Number of K-12 students with disabilities who received corporal punishment (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-504 only, LEP)
- Number of instances of corporal punishment that students (preschool through grade 12) received (disaggregated by students without disabilities, students with disabilities)
- Number of school days missed by students who received out-of-school suspensions (disaggregated by students without disabilities, students with disabilities (IDEA), students with disabilities (504 only)
- Documented incidents that occurred at the school that would trigger discipline, including referrals to law enforcement and arrests:
  - Number of incidents of robbery with a weapon
  - Number of incidents of robbery with a firearm or explosive device
  - Number of incidents of robbery without a weapon
  - Number of incidents of physical attack or fight with a weapon
  - Number of incidents of physical attack or fight with a firearm or explosive device
  - Number of incidents of physical attack or fight without a weapon
  - Number of incidents of threats of physical attack with a weapon
  - Number of incidents of threats of physical attack with a firearm or explosive device
  - Number of incidents of threats of physical attack without a weapon
  - Number of incidents of rape or attempted rape
  - Number of incidents of sexual battery (other than rape)
  - Number of incidents of possession of a firearm or explosive device
  - Whether any of the school's students, faculty, or staff died as a result of a homicide committed at the school
  - Whether there has been at least one incident at the school that involved a shooting (regardless of whether anyone was hurt)

Harassment and bullying

- Number of reported allegations of harassment or bullying of K-12 students on the basis of: sex; race, color, or national origin; disability; sexual orientation; religion
- Number of K-12 students reported as harassed or bullied on the basis of: sex; race, color, or national origin; disability (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-IDEA, disability-504 only, LEP)

Number of K-12 students disciplined for engaging in harassment or bullying on the basis of: sex; race, color, or national origin; disability (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-IDEA, disability-504 only, LEP)

Restraint and Seclusion

- Students (K-12) subjected to mechanical restraint:
  - Number of non-IDEA K-12 students subjected to mechanical restraint (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-504 only, LEP)
  - Number of K-12 students with disabilities (IDEA) subjected to mechanical restraint (disaggregated by race, sex, LEP)
- Students (K-12) subjected to physical restraint:
  - Number of non-IDEA K-12 students subjected to physical restraint (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-504 only, LEP)
  - Number of K-12 students with disabilities (IDEA) subjected to physical restraint (disaggregated by race, sex, LEP)
- Students (K-12) subjected to seclusion:
  - Number of non-IDEA K-12 students subjected to seclusion (disaggregated by race, sex, disability- 504 only, LEP)
  - Number of K-12 students with disabilities (IDEA) subjected to seclusion (disaggregated by race, sex, LEP)
- Number of instances of mechanical restraint, physical restraint, seclusion (disaggregated by students without disabilities, students with disabilities-IDEA, students with disabilities-504 only)

Single Sex Interscholastic Athletics

- Whether the school has <u>any students who participate in single-sex</u> interscholastic athletics
- Number of single-sex interscholastic athletics high school sports (with males only; with females only)
- Number of single-sex interscholastic athletics high school teams (with males only; with females only)
- Number of student participants on single-sex interscholastic athletics high school sports teams (with males only; with females only)

Early Childhood Education

- <u>Whether LEA provides early childhood program(s) for children birth-2</u> *(LEA)*
- Whether LEA's early childhood program(s) serve non-IDEA children birth-2 *(LEA)*

- Preschool length offered (full-day, part-day) and <u>cost (free, partial charge, full charge) *(LEA*)</u>
- <u>Number of students served by LEA in preschool programs in LEA and non-LEA facilities (disaggregated by age – 3, 4, 5)</u> *(LEA)*

- Whether preschool is provided to: all students, students with disabilities (IDEA), students in Title I schools, students from low income families *(LEA*)
- Whether preschool serves non-IDEA students age 3; age 4; age 5 *(LEA)*
- Number of students ages 3-5 enrolled in preschool (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-IDEA, LEP)
- Whether the school's preschool program serves non-IDEA students (disaggregated by age-- 3, 4, 5)
- Whether LEA is required to provide full-day or part-day kindergarten by state statute or regulation *(LEA*)
- Kindergarten length offered (full-day, part-day) and cost (free, partial charge, full charge) *(LEA)*

Pathways to College and Career

- Whether the school has one or more gifted/talented programs
- Number of students enrolled in gifted & talented programs (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-IDEA, LEP)
- Whether students are enrolled in distance education courses *(LEA)*
- Number of students enrolled in distance education courses (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-IDEA, LEP) *(LEA)*
- Whether any students participate in a dual enrollment/dual credit program
- Number of students enrolled in at least one dual enrollment/dual credit program (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-IDEA, LEP)
- Whether the school has any students who participate in at least one credit recovery program that allows them to earn missed credit to graduate from high school
- Number of students absent 15 or more school days (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-IDEA, disability-504 only, LEP)
- Whether the school offers the International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme
- Number of students enrolled in the International Baccalaureate (IB) Diploma Programme (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-IDEA, LEP)
- Whether students are enrolled in one or more AP courses
- Number of different AP courses provided
- Whether students are allowed to self-select for participation in AP courses
- Number of students enrolled in at least one AP course (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-IDEA, LEP)
- Number of students enrolled in at least one AP course in specific subject area (disaggregated by race, sex, disability, LEP)
    - AP math of any kind
    - AP science of any kind
    - Other AP subjects of any kind (including foreign language)
- Number of students who took one or more AP exams for one or more (which may include all) AP courses enrolled in (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-IDEA, LEP)
- Number of students who were enrolled in one or more AP courses but who did not take any AP exams (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-IDEA, LEP)

- Number of students who passed one or more AP exams for one or more (which may include all) AP courses enrolled in (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-IDEA, LEP)
- Number of students who did not pass any AP exams for the one or more AP courses enrolled in (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-IDEA, LEP)
- Number of classes in math and science (Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II, Advanced Math, Calculus, Biology, Chemistry, Physics)
- Number of students enrolled in Algebra I in grade 7 (total count)
- Number of students enrolled in Algebra I in grades: 8; 9&10; 11&12 (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-IDEA, LEP)
- Number of students who passed Algebra I in grade 7 (total count)
- Number of students who passed Algebra I in grades: 8; 9&10; 11&12 (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-IDEA, LEP)
- Number of students enrolled in Geometry in grade 8 (total count)
- Number of students enrolled in Geometry in grades 9-12 (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-IDEA, LEP)
- Number of students (grades 9-12) enrolled in other math and science courses, by subject (Algebra II, Advanced Math, Calculus, Biology, Chemistry, Physics) (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-IDEA, LEP)
- Number of students who took SAT, ACT, or both, anytime during school year (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-IDEA, LEP)
- GED preparation program *(LEA)*:
    - Whether LEA operated a GED prep program
    - Number of students ages 16-19 who participated in LEA-operated GED prep program (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-IDEA, LEP)
    - Number of students ages 16-19 who participated in LEA-operated GED prep program, succeeded on GED test, and received high school equivalency credential (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-IDEA, LEP)
- Whether LEA has policy that allows retention of third grade students who are not proficient in reading *(LEA)*
- Number of students retained in specified grade, by grade (K-12) (disaggregated by race, sex, disability-IDEA; disability-504 only, LEP)

School finance (funded with state and local funds)

- K-12 personnel FTEs and salaries at the school level (funded with state and/or local funds)
    - Number of FTE teachers and amount of their salaries
    - Number of FTE instructional staff (teachers & aides) and amount of their salaries
    - Number of FTE support services staff for pupils and amount of their salaries
    - Number of FTE support services staff for instructional staff and amount of their salaries
    - Number of FTE school administration staff and amount of their salaries
    - Number of FTE non-instructional staff and amount of their salaries

- Total amount of non-personnel expenditures at the school level

Teachers (funded with federal, state, and/or local funds)

- Number of FTE teachers (preschool through grade 12)
- Number of FTE first-year teachers (preschool through grade 12)
- Number of FTE second-year teachers (preschool through grade 12)
- Number of FTE teachers absent more than 10 school days (excluding professional development) (PS -12)
- Number of FTE school counselors (preschool through grade 12)
- Number of FTE psychologists (preschool through grade 12)
- Number of FTE social workers (preschool through grade 12)
- Number of FTE security guards (preschool through grade 12)
- Number of FTE school resource officers (preschool through grade 12)
- Number of FTE sworn law enforcement officers (preschool through grade 12)