

---

# NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

---

## Working Paper Series

---

The Working Paper Series was initiated to promote the sharing of the valuable work experience and knowledge reflected in these preliminary reports. These reports are viewed as works in progress, and have not undergone a rigorous review for consistency with NCES Statistical Standards prior to inclusion in the Working Paper Series.

---

# NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

---

Working Paper Series

---

## **Coverage Evaluation of the 1994–95 Common Core of Data: Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey**

Working Paper No. 2000-12

May 2000

Contact: Beth Aronstamm Young  
Elementary/Secondary and Libraries Studies Division  
E-mail: [beth\\_young@ed.gov](mailto:beth_young@ed.gov)

---

U. S. Department of Education  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement

**U.S. Department of Education**

Richard W. Riley  
Secretary

**Office of Educational Research and Improvement**

C. Kent McGuire  
Assistant Secretary

**National Center for Education Statistics**

Gary W. Phillips  
Acting Commissioner

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is the primary federal entity for collecting, analyzing, and reporting data related to education in the United States and other nations. It fulfills a congressional mandate to collect, collate, analyze, and report full and complete statistics on the condition of education in the United States; conduct and publish reports and specialized analyses of the meaning and significance of such statistics; assist state and local education agencies in improving their statistical systems; and review and report on education activities in foreign countries.

NCES activities are designed to address high priority education data needs; provide consistent, reliable, complete, and accurate indicators of education status and trends; and report timely, useful, and high quality data to the U.S. Department of Education, the Congress, the states, other education policymakers, practitioners, data users, and the general public.

We strive to make our products available in a variety of formats and in language that is appropriate to a variety of audiences. You, as our customer, are the best judge of our success in communicating information effectively. If you have any comments or suggestions about this or any other NCES product or report, we would like to hear from you. Please direct your comments to:

National Center for Education Statistics  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
U.S. Department of Education  
1990 K Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20006-5651

The NCES World Wide Web Home Page is  
<http://nces.ed.gov>

**Suggested Citation**

U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. *Coverage Evaluation of the 1994-95 Common Core of Data: Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey*, Working Paper No. 2000-12, by Tom Hamann. Project Officer, Beth Young. Washington, DC: 2000.

**May 2000**

## Foreword

In addition to official NCES publications, NCES staff and individuals commissioned by NCES produce preliminary research reports that include analyses of survey results, and presentations of technical, methodological, and statistical evaluation issues.

The *Working Paper Series* was initiated to promote the sharing of the valuable work experience and knowledge reflected in these preliminary reports. These reports are viewed as works in progress, and have not undergone a rigorous review for consistency with NCES Statistical Standards prior to inclusion in the Working Paper Series.

Copies of Working Papers can be downloaded as pdf files from the NCES Electronic Catalog (<http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/>), or contact Sheilah Jupiter at (202) 502-7444, e-mail: [sheilah\\_jupiter@ed.gov](mailto:sheilah_jupiter@ed.gov), or mail: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics, 1990 K Street, NW, Room 9048, Washington, DC 20006–5651.

Marilyn M. McMillen  
Chief Mathematical Statistician  
Statistical Standards Program

Ralph Lee  
Mathematical Statistician  
Statistical Standards Program

*This page intentionally left blank.*

**Coverage Evaluation of the 1994–95 Common Core of Data:  
Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey**

Prepared by:

Tom Hamann  
Governments Division,  
U.S. Bureau of the Census

Prepared for:

U.S. Department of Education  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
National Center for Education Statistics

May 2000

*This page intentionally left blank.*

# Executive Summary

## Introduction

The Common Core of Data (CCD) is the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) primary database on elementary and secondary public education in the United States. The annual CCD census is a comprehensive national statistical database of all public elementary and secondary schools and school districts that contains comparable data across all states. The CCD surveys are designed to provide an official listing of public elementary and secondary schools and school districts that can be used to select samples for other NCES surveys, and to provide directory information for a variety of users. In addition, the CCD provides basic information and descriptive statistics on public elementary and secondary schools, students, and staff. The CCD is an important resource for policymakers and researchers at the state and local levels.

## Objectives and Methodology Used for This Evaluation

This evaluation was conducted by the Governments Division of the U.S. Census Bureau which acts as the CCD data collection agent for NCES. Its objective is to determine the accuracy and completeness of the list of schools used for the 1994-95 Common Core of Data's Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe survey (referred to as the CCD file in this report). Thus, the CCD file was primarily compared to those files of two private firms - Market Data Retrieval (MDR) and Quality Education Data (QED). The CCD collects data on a mail survey for the schools in existence as of October 1 of the survey year. The MDR and QED files represent data collected by a mail and phone survey covering the 1994-95 school year. The CCD file was also compared to other sources, including the listings of schools from the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Department of Defense (DOD), and the Center for Education Reform's National Charter School Directory.

The comparison of data files for this evaluation was undertaken through several steps. First, survey forms and relevant documents containing definitions and classification criteria for the CCD, MDR and QED surveys were obtained. Next, it was verified that

these files were for approximately the same time period. The CCD survey definitions were then compared with those found in the MDR and QED survey materials. Fourth, differences in definitions and classification criteria that might affect coverage were identified. Fifth, common data fields were identified and the most efficient approaches to linking the files were determined. Finally, the CCD file was compared to each outside source (QED and MDR files, school directories, etc.) separately.

Initial school matches were made electronically on identification number between the CCD file and the MDR and QED files. However, not all schools listed on the QED and MDR files were assigned a CCD identification number. In these situations, efforts were made to "hand match" the schools without CCD identification numbers by school name or address. Many matches were found in this manner. Comparison matching between data files was conducted by school type, such as regular or vocational, and by agency or file type, such as regional, state, DOD, or BIA. This was accomplished for each state and outlying area of the United States<sup>1</sup>. Within a given state, all non-matching schools were categorized by school and agency/file type to determine the counts for each type. The matching of schools was then conducted by school or agency/file types. For example, schools coded as special education on both the CCD and MDR files were compared. Remaining non-matching schools on the CCD file were then compared to the entire MDR file, and non-matching schools in the MDR file were compared to the entire CCD file.

The objective of this data file comparison was to generate accurate counts of matching and, particularly, non-matching schools (schools counted as non-matching were those found in one database file that did not appear anywhere in the other databases) between the three data files. The process used to compare the CCD file to both the MDR and the QED files was identical.

---

<sup>1</sup>The CCD and QED surveys provided data for the outlying areas of the U.S. - American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the Department of Defense - while MDR did not provide these data.

## Overview of Major Findings and Recommendations

Several of the key findings and recommendations based on the comparison of the CCD, MDR, and QED data files follow below.

### Major Findings

This evaluation effort examined public schools by school type (regular, special, alternative, vocational, and adult), and by agency types - regional, state, federal, and other schools. Federal agencies included BIA and DOD schools. Most of the BIA schools in the CCD file were found (coded) under the federal agency type, while the DOD schools were found throughout the CCD file. In addition, there were charter and adult education (as classified in the MDR and QED files) schools that matched to schools in the CCD file. The CCD file does not specifically code adult schools, while the MDR file does not have a code for alternative schools. However, the MDR school type for regular, special education, and vocational schools includes schools with the *characteristic* of alternative education. Thus, alternative schools identified within the MDR data file are essentially a subset of the three school types - regular, special education, and vocational. The findings, as well as the organization, of this evaluation are presented by CCD school or agency type.

In 1994-95, a total of 86,220 public schools were included on the CCD file, in comparison with 83,953 schools on the MDR file and 87,135 on the QED file. The average number of schools included in only one of two files (e.g., on CCD but not on MDR) was about 3,000. With few exceptions, the discrepancy between the CCD file and the other two files was evenly distributed among all the states. Several states, in fact, had one percent or less of their schools appear on the MDR or QED files but not on the CCD file.

The coverage percentages presented below (Table A) show separate comparisons of the CCD file with the MDR and QED files. For example, 3.6 percent of schools included on the CCD file were not on the MDR file. Conversely, 3.3 percent of MDR's schools were not reported on the CCD file. In general, the CCD coverage of all schools and regular schools matched that of MDR and QED fairly closely. It is notable that regular schools, while accounting for over 90 percent of all the schools on all three files, accounted for between 1 and 2 percent of the schools included on only one of two files. Assuming that

larger numbers of schools reflect better coverage, the CCD appears to have a broader coverage of special education and alternative schools than do the other two files, while both MDR and QED include considerably more vocational schools than does the CCD file.

CCD School/ Agency Type	Percent schools on CCD but not:		Percent schools not on CCD but on:	
	MDR	QED	MDR	QED
Total	3.6	4.1	3.3	3.2
Regular	1.0	1.6	1.6	1.0
Special Ed.	47.9	57.0	34.8	26.3
Vocational	8.2	6.8	44.8	56.3
Alternative	73.5	79.3	20.1	17.0

Key: Total schools on CCD but not MDR/total schools on MDR = 3.6%  
 Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database, School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT.  
 Quality Education Data, School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ.  
 U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

Several points concerning these coverage comparisons should be kept in mind. First, when an MDR or QED school did not have a CCD identification number, a subjective assessment was made about whether cases on the two files were actually the same school. This may have led to an underestimate of the number of matches. Second, comparisons were made on school identification, not school type: a school that was listed as "vocational" on the CCD file and "alternative" on the QED file was still considered a match between the two files. Third, there were apparent situations of shared mailing addresses between schools, or of a school district's address being used for multiple schools. This could occur on one file but not on the other.

Cases of one-to-many correspondence were considered matches across the files. That is, if the CCD listed a Jefferson Elementary School and a Jefferson Middle School (or Jefferson Alternative School) at a single address, while the MDR listed only a Jefferson School at that same address, both of the CCD schools were considered to have a match on the MDR file. Finally, the comparisons do not take into account some inherent definition, categorization and coverage differences among the three surveys.

This means that some legitimate differences in coverage should be expected. For example, the QED and MDR collect information on adult schools, which are considered out of scope for the CCD. Between 15 and 16 percent of the schools found on the QED and MDR files but not on the CCD file are out-of-scope adult schools. The number and percentage breakdown of the schools found on the other two files but not on CCD file is shown below (Table B).

Schools:		CCD Schools			Total
		In-scope		Out-of-scope	
		PK only or K only	All other grades	Adult	
on MDR, not CCD	No. %	127 4.5	2,263 79.6	452 15.9	2,842
on QED, not CCD	No. %	238 8.5	2,118 76.0	430 15.4	2,786

Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database, School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT.  
Quality Education Data, School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ.  
U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

Missing information, such as students, is a serious omission when trying to understand the consequences of school undercoverage. Using data from the MDR or QED files, additional information can be learned about cases potentially missing from the CCD file. In this case, the number of potentially missing CCD students (based on the number of schools found on the QED or MDR files, but not on the CCD file) is not substantial. For example, the 941,360 students enrolled in the 2,786 schools found on the QED file, but not the CCD file, represent just 2.1 percent of the entire CCD student population (Table C).

Schools:	Number of Students	Percent of Total Student Population
On QED, not CCD	941,360	2.1
on MDR, not CCD	948,923	2.2
on CCD, not QED	481,533	1.1
on CCD, not MDR	337,024	0.8

Key: The student population of the schools found on the QED file but not the CCD file/the total CCD student population = 2.1 percent. The total student population of the CCD, QED, and MDR files is 44,031,399, 45,834,927, and 44,606,013, respectively.  
Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database, School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT.  
Quality Education Data, School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ.  
U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

Eliminating schools considered out-of-scope on the CCD file (such as adult schools) as well as those schools consisting of pre-kindergarten students and/or kindergarten students only lessens the percentage of potentially missing CCD students. Based on the enrollment of schools found only on the QED and MDR files, this percentage is reduced to 0.6 and 1.0 percent, respectively.

School type is an important piece of information for many users of these data files. There are cases in which a school appears on both the CCD and MDR or QED files, but is classified as a different type. These discrepancies are uncommon among the regular school listings. However, of the 1,783 special education schools included on the MDR file and the 1,520 special education schools on the QED file, some 109 and 110, respectively, are listed as a different type of school on the CCD file (Table D). This occurs for 43 of the 1,230 vocational schools on the MDR file and 85 of the 1,420 vocational school on the QED file; and 204 of MDR's 1,768 alternative schools and 230 of the 1,766 alternative schools shown for QED. Overall, the classification differences between CCD and the other files do not appear substantial.

<b>Table D. Classification Gap – Number of Schools for which the Common Core of Data and the Market Data Retrieval or Quality Education Data Files Differ in School Type: 1994-95 School Year</b>			
CCD			
Classification differs from:	Special Education	Vocational	Alternative
MDR listed as	109	43	204
QED listed as	110	85	230
Key: 43 vocational schools on the MDR file were listed as some other type on the CCD file.			
Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database, School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT.			
Quality Education Data, School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ.			
U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".			

**Recommendations**

Highlights of the recommendations based on the findings of this evaluation include the following:

**Reconcile state listing of non-matching schools and the CCD file to other sources to compile a more complete list of schools.**

State coordinators should review and reconcile their state's listing of non-matching schools (schools that appear on QED or MDR, but not on the CCD file, and vice-versa). This effort should provide information as to why discrepancies exist and allow a judgement to either impose the CCD scope and definition or restate the CCD scope and definition if a state appears to be excluding schools that should be on the CCD.

**Reconcile the varying classifications, definitions, and reporting of schools.**

There are cases in which a school appears on both the CCD file and MDR and QED files, but is classified as a different school type, that need to be examined. Efforts to reconcile such discrepancies should include the continued improvement of definitions, the addition of identifiers in the CCD file for schools that have an adult education component (much like what has been, or will be, done for charter, BIA and DOD schools), and the querying of respondents about their ability to report whether or not regular schools have special, alternative, vocational or adult components *in addition to* the main curriculum.

**Request the state coordinators to report the full legal name of each school.**

This would likely eliminate some confusion that might exist when comparing and attempting to match two schools that have similar names but different addresses, for example. This action may require a larger field length for school name (the CCD added 30 characters to the name field in 1998 for a total of 50 characters), but given that an additional field has been added to accommodate both mailing and physical location addresses for every school, it should not be a significant issue.

**Compare the CCD file to the MDR and QED files, the DOD and BIA lists, and the National Charter Schools Directory.**

Use the state non-matching school listings and files generated by this evaluation and add fields to the CCD file for the MDR and QED school identification numbers (assuming proprietary issues do not prevent this). Alternatively, work with the MDR and QED staffs to keep their identification number links up to date. Such an effort could be an annual CCD survey function, or perhaps more practically, periodic evaluative efforts such as the current one could be undertaken to address CCD school coverage issues.

**Summary**

Findings suggest that the CCD file is a quality data source and listing of public schools when compared to other sources. The CCD appears to have a broader coverage of special education and alternative schools than do the MDR and QED files. Despite the shortcomings outlined in this evaluation, the CCD is an accurate, comprehensive statistical database of this nation's public elementary and secondary schools, particularly so with respect to its coverage of regular schools. The specific recommendations made herein include methods that call for adopting an assertive approach for improving the CCD. Such an approach would involve creating a CCD school universe survey form that accommodates the various types of schools and state views and compiling a more complete CCD list. This would enable potential future reconciliation of the CCD file to the MDR and QED files, and ultimately, improve the CCD as a sampling frame for other surveys. For this approach to be effective, a primary use of the findings and results of this evaluation must be reconciliation by the state CCD coordinators of their states' non-matching schools. Undertaking the suggestions put forth in this report will help ensure a better CCD for the future.

## **Preface**

This evaluation was prepared for the National Center for Education Statistics by Tom Hamann of the Governments Division of the U.S. Census Bureau. Much of the initial research for this report was conducted by Gretchen Dickson, also of the Governments Division. Coverage, the completeness of the list of units surveyed, for the 1994-95 Common Core of Data (CCD) Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey was examined. The CCD coverage of elementary and secondary schools is of interest and concern to the National Center for Education Statistics and state education policymakers and researchers. The objective of this evaluation was to determine the accuracy and completeness of the CCD universe of schools survey. Areas for potential improvement in the compilation of the universe of schools were identified for consideration.

Reviewers of the draft copy of this report include Keith Rust, Westat, Helen D'Avanzo, Market Data Retrieval, Leslie Scott, ESSI, and from NCES: Lee Hoffman, Dan Kasprzyk, and Steve Kaufman.

# Contents

FOREWORD	iii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	vii
PREFACE	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS REPORT	xvi
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
Section 1.0 Scope and Purpose of Evaluation	1
Section 1.1 Limitations of the Evaluation	1
Section 1.2 Principal Findings	1
Section 1.3 Recommendations	4
CHAPTER 2. SURVEY BACKGROUND, DEFINITIONS, AND EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	7
Section 2.0 Introduction	7
Section 2.1 Public School Definitions	7
Section 2.2 Methodology and Organization	8
CHAPTER 3. COMPARISON OF DATA FILES BY SCHOOL TYPE	10
Section 3.0 Introduction	10
Section 3.1 Regular Schools	10
Section 3.2 Special Education Schools	11
Section 3.3 Vocational Schools	13
Section 3.4 Alternative Schools	14
Section 3.5 Adult Schools	16
CHAPTER 4. COMPARISON OF DATA FILES BY AGENCY AND FILE TYPE	24
Section 4.0 Introduction	24
Section 4.1 Regionally-Operated Schools	24
Section 4.2 State-Operated Schools	25
Section 4.3 Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools	27
Section 4.4 Charter Schools	28
CHAPTER 5. COMPARISON OF DATA FILES BY SCHOOL AND AGENCY TYPE FOR THE OUTLYING AREAS	34
Section 5.0 Introduction	34
Section 5.1 Outlying Area Schools	34
Section 5.2 Department of Defense Schools	34
APPENDIX A. IDENTIFIERS AND COUNTS FOR THE COMMON CORE OF DATA, MARKET DATA RETRIEVAL, AND QUALITY EDUCATION DATA FILES	A-1
APPENDIX B. TYPE CODES FOR THE COMMON CORE OF DATA FILE EDUCATION AGENCIES	B-1
APPENDIX C. STATE-BY-STATE LISTING TABLES	C-1
APPENDIX D. BIBLIOGRAPHY	D-1

## List of Tables

Table 1a.	Summary of Non-matching Schools – The Common Core of Data File Compared to the Market Data Retrieval and Quality Education Data Files: 1994-95 School Year	2
Table 1b.	Coverage Gap – Percent of Schools Included on Only One of Two Data Files: 1994-95 School Year	2
Table 1c.	Summary of Missing CCD Schools – The Common Core of Data File Compared to the Market Data Retrieval and Quality Education Data Files: 1994-95 School Year	3
Table 1d.	Potentially Missing CCD Students – The Common Core of Data File Compared to the Market Data Retrieval and Quality Education Data Files: 1994-95 School Year	3
Table 1e.	Classification Gap – Number of Schools for which the Common Core of Data and the Market Data Retrieval or Quality Education Data Files Differ in School Type: 1994-95 School Year	3
Table 1-1.	Sources and Types of Schools Compared to the 1994-95 Common Core of Data Survey File	6
Table 2.	Summary of Matching Schools – The Common Core of Data File Compared to the Market Data Retrieval and Quality Education Data Files: 1994-95 School Year	8
Table 3a.	Adult Education Schools Found on Both the Common Core of Data and Market Data Retrieval Files by CCD School Type: 1994-95 School Year	16
Table 3b.	Adult Education Schools Found on Both the Common Core of Data and Quality Education Data Files by CCD School Type: 1994-95 School Year	16
Table 3-1.	Comparison of the Market Data Retrieval (MDR) File to the Common Core of Data (CCD) File, by School Type and State, for the 1994-95 School Year	17
Table 3-2.	Comparison of the Quality Education Data (QED) File to the Common Core of Data (CCD) File, by School Type and State, for the 1994-95 School Year	18
Table 3-3.	Comparison of the Common Core of Data (CCD) File to the Market Data Retrieval (MDR) File, by School Type and State, for the 1994-95 School Year	19
Table 3-4.	Comparison of the Common Core of Data (CCD) File to the Quality Education Data (QED) File, by School Type and State, for the 1994-95 School Year	20
Table 3-5.	Special Education Schools on the Market Data Retrieval (MDR) and Quality Education Data (QED) Files Classified as Regular, Vocational, or Alternative on the Common Core of Data File: 1994-95 School Year	21
Table 3-6.	Vocational Schools on the Market Data Retrieval (MDR) and Quality Data Education (QED) Files Classified as Regular, Special Education, or Alternative on the Common Core of Data File: 1994-95 School Year	22
Table 3-7.	Alternative Schools on the Market Data Retrieval (MDR) and Quality Data Education (QED) Files Classified as Regular, Special Education, or Vocational on the Common Core of Data File: 1994-95 School Year	23
Table 4a.	Regionally-Operated Schools on the Market Data Retrieval File but Not on the Common Core of Data File, Counts By School Type: 1994-95 School Year	25

Table 4b.	Regionally-Operated Schools on the Common Core of Data File but Not on the Market Data Retrieval File, Counts By School Type: 1994-95 School Year	25
Table 4c.	State-Operated Schools on the Market Data Retrieval File but Not on the Common Core of Data File, Counts By School Type: 1994-95 School Year	26
Table 4d.	State-Operated Schools on the Quality Education Data File but Not on the Common Core of Data File, Counts By School Type: 1994-95 School Year	26
Table 4e.	State-Operated Schools on the Common Core of Data File but Not on the Market Data Retrieval File, Counts By School Type: 1994-95 School Year	26
Table 4f.	State-Operated Schools on the Common Core of Date File but Not on the Quality Education Data File, Counts by School Type: 1994-95 School Year	27
Table 4g.	Charter Schools on the National Charter School Directory Compared to the Common Core of Data File, Counts by State: 1994-95 School Year	28
Table 4-1.	Comparison of the Market Data Retrieval (MDR) File to the Common Core of Data (CCD) File, by File Type and State, for the 1994-95 School Year	30
Table 4-2.	Comparison of the Quality Education Data (QED) File to the Common Core of Data (CCD) File, by File Type and State, for the 1994-95 School Year	31
Table 4-3.	Comparison of the Common Core of Data (CCD) File to the Market Data Retrieval (MDR) File, by Agency Type and State, for the 1994-95 School Year	32
Table 4-4.	Comparison of the Common Core of Data (CCD) File to the Quality Education Data (QED) File, by Agency Type and State, for the 1994-95 School Year	33
Table 5-1.	Comparison of the Quality Education Data (QED) File to the Common Core of Data (CCD) File, by School Type and Outlying Area, for the 1994-95 School Year	36
Table 5-2.	Comparison of the Quality Education Data (QED) File to the Common Core of Data (CCD) File, by File Type and Outlying Area, for the 1994-95 School Year	36
Table 5-3.	Comparison of the Common Core of Data (CCD) File to the Quality Education Data (QED) File, by School Type and Outlying Area, for the 1994-95 School Year	37
Table 5-4.	Comparison of the Common Core of Data (CCD) File to the Quality Education Data (QED) File, by Agency Type and Outlying Area, for the 1994-95 School Year	37
Table A-1.	School and Agency Types for the 1994-95 Common Core of Data File	A-3
Table A-2.	School and File Types for the 1994-95 Market Data Retrieval File	A-4
Table A-3.	School and File Types for the 1994-95 Quality Education Data File	A-4
Table A-4.	Comparison of School Classifications between the 1994-95 Common Core of Data, Market Data Retrieval, and Quality Education Data Files	A-5
Table A-5.	Summary of Matching Schools – Common Core of Data (CCD) File and the Market Data Retrieval (MDR) File: 1994-95 School Year	A-6
Table A-6.	Summary of Matching Schools – Common Core of Data (CCD) File and the Quality Education Data (QED) File: 1994-95 School Year	A-7

Table B-1.	The Common Core of Data File Education Agency Type Codes	B-1
Table C-1.	Special Education Schools on the Market Data Retrieval File (MDR) Classified as Regular, Alternative, or Vocational on the Common Core of Data (CCD) File: 1994-95 School Year	C-1
Table C-2.	Special Education Schools on the Quality Education Data (QED) File Classified as Regular, Alternative, or Vocational on the Common Core of Data (CCD) File: 1994-95 School Year	C-4
Table C-3.	Schools Classified as Special Education that Match Between the Market Data Retrieval (MDR) and the Common Core of Data (CCD) Files on School Identification Number but Differ in Name: 1994-95 School Year	C-7
Table C-4.	Schools Classified as Special Education that Match Between the Quality Education Data (QED) and the Common Core of Data (CCD) Files on School Identification Number but Differ in Name: 1994-95 School Year	C-8
Table C-5.	Vocational Schools on the Market Data Retrieval (MDR) File Classified as Regular, Special, or Alternative on the Common Core of Data (CCD) File: 1994-95 School Year	C-9
Table C-6.	Vocational Schools on the Quality Education Data (QED) File Classified as Regular, Special, or Alternative on the Common Core of Data (CCD) File: 1994-95 School Year	C-10
Table C-7.	Schools Classified as Alternative Education that Match Between the Market Data Retrieval (MDR) and Common Core of Data (CCD) Files on School Identification Number but Differ in Name: 1994-95 School Year	C-12
Table C-8.	Schools Classified as Alternative Education that Match Between the Quality Education Data (QED) and Common Core of Data (CCD) Files on School Identification Number but Differ in Name: 1994-95 School Year	C-13
Table C-9.	Schools Classified as Adult Education that Match Between the Market Data Retrieval (MDR) and the Common Core of Data (CCD) Files on School Identification Number but Differ in Name: 1994-95 School Year	C-14
Table C-10.	State-Operated Schools on the Market Data Retrieval (MDR) File Not Classified as State-Operated on the Common Core of Data (CCD) File: 1994-95 School Year	C-15
Table C-11.	Schools Matching Between the 1997 Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) List of Schools and the 1994-95 Common Core of Data (CCD) File Federal Agency Type Schools	C-16
Table C-12.	Schools Listed on the National Charter School Directory and Found on the Common Core of Data (CCD) File: 1994-95 School Year	C-19
Table C-13.	Schools Listed on the National Charter School Directory but Not on the Common Core of Data (CCD) File: 1994-95 School Year	C-21

## Abbreviations Used In This Report

The following abbreviations are used throughout this report:

<b>BIA</b>	<b>Bureau of Indian Affairs</b>
<b>CCD</b>	<b>Common Core of Data</b>
<b>DOD</b>	<b>Department of Defense</b>
<b>FIPS</b>	<b>Federal Information Processing Standards</b>
<b>GED</b>	<b>General Education Diploma</b>
<b>K</b>	<b>Kindergarten</b>
<b>MDR</b>	<b>Market Data Retrieval</b>
<b>na</b>	<b>not available</b>
<b>NCES</b>	<b>National Center for Education Statistics</b>
<b>PK</b>	<b>Prekindergarten</b>
<b>QED</b>	<b>Quality Education Data</b>

## Chapter 1. Introduction

### Section 1.0 Scope and Purpose of Evaluation

The objective of this evaluation is to determine the accuracy and completeness of the list of schools used for the 1994-95 Common Core of Data's Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe survey (referred to as the CCD file in this report). To this end, the CCD file was primarily compared to those files of two private firms - Market Data Retrieval (MDR) and Quality Education Data (QED).

The CCD collects data on a mail survey for the schools in existence as of October 1 of the survey year. The MDR and QED files represent data collected by a mail and phone survey covering the 1994-95 school year. All three sources counted U.S. elementary and secondary public schools<sup>1</sup>. The classifications and definitions of these schools that will be addressed in the next chapter, however, varied by source.

The CCD also was compared to listings of schools from the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Department of Defense (DOD), and the Center for Education Reform's National Charter School Directory. The sources and types of schools compared in this evaluation are shown in Table 1-1. This table shows the school types and characteristics that make up the agency/file types and how the MDR and QED files compare to the CCD file in terms of file (agency on the CCD) and school type. It reflects, for example, that the CCD alternative school type is one of four school types within the local agency type. Comparatively, a CCD alternative school corresponds to the public file type - as a school type on the QED file and as a characteristic of all school types on the MDR file.

### Section 1.1 Limitations of the Evaluation

In an effort to meet the objective of this evaluation - to assess the overall completeness and accuracy of the CCD school file - CCD data were compared to several other sources. It is necessary to mention the limitations of the evaluation in this regard.

Although every effort was made to ensure that similar categories of data (school and agency types) were compared between the data files (see Appendix A), it is recognized that some inherent definition, categorical, and coverage differences exist between

---

<sup>1</sup> *The CCD and QED surveys provided data for the outlying areas of the U.S. - American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the Department of Defense - while MDR did not provide these data.*

the CCD, MDR, and QED surveys. Distinctions have been noted, where appropriate, throughout this report.

In the case of the charter, BIA, and DOD schools, the respective agencies can be readily accepted as officially identifying their schools. With respect to the comparison of CCD school lists to those of MDR and QED, the appearance of a school on the MDR or QED file, but not on the CCD file, or vice-versa, does not necessarily suggest that either file is incorrect. For example, the QED and MDR surveys collect information on adult schools while such schools are considered out-of-scope on the CCD survey. The discussion of adult schools is included because these schools are covered from the perspective of both the QED and MDR surveys.

It is also recognized that some of the apparent non-matching schools, for a particular school type in a given state for example, may now appear on a file. This would result from a school being reported during one of the survey cycles conducted since the benchmark year, the 1994-95 school year, used for this evaluation. Finally, it is acknowledged that some of the recommendations made herein are, from a financial or legal standpoint, more feasible than others are to be implemented as part of the CCD survey.

### Section 1.2 Principal Findings

The CCD file is a quality data source and listing of public schools when compared to other sources. The CCD appears to have a broader coverage of special education and alternative schools than do the MDR and QED files. Despite the shortcomings outlined in this evaluation, the CCD is an accurate, comprehensive statistical database of this nation's public elementary and secondary schools, particularly so with respect to its coverage of regular schools.

This evaluation effort examined public schools by school type (regular, special, alternative, vocational, and adult), and by agency types - regional, state, federal, and other schools. Federal agencies included BIA and DOD schools. Most of the BIA schools in the CCD file were found (coded) under the federal agency type, while the DOD schools were found throughout the CCD file. In addition, there were charter and adult education (as classified in the MDR and QED files) schools that matched to schools in the CCD file. The CCD file does not specifically code adult schools, while the MDR file does not have a code for alternative schools. However, the MDR school type for regular, special education, and vocational schools includes schools with the characteristic of alternative education. Thus, alternative schools identified within the MDR data file are essentially a subset of the three school types -

regular, special education, and vocational. The findings, as well as the organization, of this evaluation are presented by CCD school or agency type.

In 1994-95, a total of 86,220 public schools were included on the CCD file, in comparison with 83,953 schools on the MDR file and 87,135 on the QED file (see tables in Appendix A). The average number of schools included in only one of two files was about 3,000 (Table 1a). With few exceptions, the discrepancy between the CCD file and the other two files was evenly distributed among all the states. Several states, in fact, had one percent or less of their schools appear on the MDR or QED files but not on the CCD file.

**Table 1a. Summary of Non-matching Schools – The Common Core of Data File Compared to the Market Data Retrieval and Quality Education Data Files: 1994-95 School Year**

Data File	Total no. of schools*	No. of schools NOT found on data file:		
		CCD	QED	MDR
CCD	86,220	-	3,600	3,011
QED	87,135	2,786	-	-
MDR	83,953	2,842	-	-

Notes: \*Does not include the outlying areas or DOD overseas schools. No attempt was made to compare QED and MDR to each other.

Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database, School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT.

Quality Education Data, School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

The coverage percentages presented below (Table 1b) show separate comparisons of the CCD file with the MDR and QED files. For example, 3.6 percent of schools included on the CCD file were not on the MDR file. Conversely, 3.3 percent of MDR's schools were not reported on the CCD file. In general, the CCD coverage of all schools and regular schools matched that of MDR and QED fairly closely. It is notable that regular schools, while accounting for over 90 percent of all the schools on all three files, accounted for between one and two percent of the schools included on only one of two files. Assuming that larger numbers of schools reflect better coverage, the CCD appears to have a broader coverage of special education and alternative schools than do the other two files, while both MDR and QED include considerably more vocational schools than does the CCD file.

**Table 1b. Coverage Gap – Percent of Schools Included on Only One of Two Data Files: 1994-95 School Year**

CCD School/ Agency Type	Percent schools on CCD but not:		Percent schools not on CCD:	
	MDR	QED	MDR	QED
Total	3.6	4.1	3.3	3.2
Regular	1.0	1.6	1.6	1.0
Special Ed.	47.9	57.0	34.8	26.3
Vocational	8.2	6.8	44.8	56.3
Alternative	73.5	79.3	20.1	17.0

Key: Total schools on CCD but not MDR ÷ total schools on MDR = 3.6%

Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database, School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT.

Quality Education Data, School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

Several points concerning the coverage comparisons should be kept in mind. First, not all schools listed on the QED and MDR files have been assigned a NCES (CCD) identification number. When an MDR or QED school did not have a CCD identification number, a subjective assessment was made about whether cases on the two files were actually the same school. This may have led to an underestimate of the number of matches. Second, comparisons were made on school identification, not school type: a school that was listed as "vocational" on the CCD file and "alternative" on the QED file was still considered a match between the two files. Third, there were apparent situations of shared mailing addresses between schools, or of a school district's address being used for multiple schools. This could occur on one file but not on the other. Cases of one-to-many correspondence were considered matches across the files. That is, if the CCD listed a Jefferson Elementary School and a Jefferson Middle School (or Jefferson Alternative School) at a single address, while the MDR listed only a Jefferson School at that same address, both of the CCD schools were considered to have a match on the MDR file. Finally, the comparisons do not take into account some inherent definition, categorization and coverage differences among the three surveys.

This means that some legitimate differences in coverage should be expected. For example, the QED and MDR collect information on adult schools, which are considered out of scope for the CCD. Between 15 and 16 percent of the schools found on the QED and MDR files but not on the CCD file are out-of-scope adult schools. The number and percentage breakdown of the schools found on the other two files but not on CCD file is shown below (Table 1c).

<b>Table 1c. Summary of Missing CCD Schools – The Common Core of Data File Compared to the Market Data Retrieval and Quality Education Data Files: 1994-95 School Year</b>					
Schools:		CCD Schools			Total
		In-scope		Out-of-scope	
		PK only or K only	All other grades	Adult	
on MDR, not CCD	No. %	127 4.5	2,263 79.6	452 15.9	2,842
on QED, not CCD	No. %	238 8.5	2,118 76.0	430 15.4	2,786

Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database, School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT.  
Quality Education Data, School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ.  
U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

Missing information, such as students, is a serious omission when trying to understand the consequences of school undercoverage. Using data from the MDR or QED files, additional information can be learned about cases potentially missing from the CCD file. In this case, the number of potentially missing CCD students (based on the number of schools found on the QED or MDR files, but not on the CCD file) is not substantial. For example, the 941,360 students enrolled in the 2,786 schools found on the QED file, but not the CCD file, represent 2.1 percent of the CCD student population (Table 1d).

<b>Table 1d. Potentially Missing CCD Students – The Common Core of Data File Compared to the Market Data Retrieval and Quality Education Data Files: 1994-95 School Year</b>		
Schools:	Number of Students	Percent of Total Student Population
On QED, not CCD	941,360	2.1
on MDR, not CCD	948,923	2.2
on CCD, not QED	481,533	1.1
on CCD, not MDR	337,024	0.8

Key: The student population of the schools found on the QED file but not the CCD file/the total CCD student population = 2.1 percent. The total student population of the CCD, QED, and MDR files is 44,031,399, 45,834,927, and 44,606,013, respectively.  
Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database, School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT.  
Quality Education Data, School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ.  
U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

Eliminating schools considered out-of-scope on the CCD file (such as adult schools) as well as schools consisting of pre-kindergarten students and/or kindergarten students only lessens the percentage of potentially missing CCD students. Based on the enrollment of schools found only on the QED and MDR files, this percentage is reduced to 0.6 and 1.0 percent, respectively.

School type is an important piece of information for many users of these data files. There are cases in which a school appears on both the CCD and MDR or QED files, but is classified as a different type. These discrepancies are uncommon among the regular school listings. However, of the 1,783 special education schools included on the MDR file and the 1,520 special education schools on the QED file, some 109 and 110, respectively, are listed as a different type of school on the CCD file (Table 1e). This occurs for 43 of the 1,230 vocational schools on the MDR file and 85 of the 1,420 vocational schools on the QED file; and 204 of MDR's 1,768 alternative schools and 230 of the 1,766 alternative schools shown for QED. Overall, the classification differences between CCD and the other files do not appear substantial.

<b>Table 1e. Classification Gap – Number of Schools for which the Common Core of Data and the Market Data Retrieval or Quality Education Data Files Differ in School Type: 1994-95 School Year</b>			
CCD			
Classification differs from:	Special Education	Vocational	Alternative
MDR listed as	109	43	204
QED listed as	110	85	230

Key: 43 vocational schools on the MDR file were listed as some other type on the CCD file.  
Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database, School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT.  
Quality Education Data, School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ.  
U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

Other findings of this evaluation are worth noting. The CCD federal agency type included BIA and DOD schools. Most all of the BIA schools in the CCD file were listed (coded) under the federal agency type. Between 120 and 150 Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) schools were not on the CCD file based on a comparison with other sources. The 1994-95 CCD file does not specifically code (by agency type) for the domestic DOD schools. The DOD schools were found throughout the CCD file. Most of these schools were coded as 'regular' for school type. The CCD file contained 190 overseas DOD schools, a number that was between 5 and 25 fewer than

appeared on other sources. In addition, there were charter and adult education (as classified on the MDR and QED files) schools that matched to schools on the CCD file. According to the National Charter School Directory, the CCD file listed 79 of the 100 charter schools open during the 1994-95 school year.

It is notable that the type of comparison employed in this evaluation, i.e., of one source to another, does not account for shortcomings each source had initially in distinguishing (and classifying) one school type from another. The over- and under-reporting of certain school types is a concern for the sources compared in this evaluation<sup>2</sup>.

Finally, during this evaluation two characteristics of CCD operations were observed that hinder compilation of a complete CCD school universe: NCES managers delegated full responsibility to the state coordinators for accurate reporting and the state coordinators reported in accordance with their own record-keeping systems rather than survey guidelines. A more interactive approach between the federal survey managers and the state coordinators would, over the years, generate a wealth of information and mutual understanding.

### **Section 1.3 Recommendations**

Based on the findings of this evaluation, the following specific recommendations include methods and suggestions that call for adopting an assertive approach for improving the CCD. Such an approach would involve creating a CCD school universe survey form that accommodates the various types of schools and state views and compiling a more complete CCD list. This would enable potential future reconciliation of the CCD school file to the MDR and QED files and, ultimately, improve the CCD as a sampling frame for other surveys.

#### **1. Reconcile state listing of non-matching schools and the CCD file to other sources to compile a more complete list of schools.**

This evaluation produced a comprehensive, state-by-state listing of non-matching schools (schools that appear on QED or MDR, but not on the CCD file/universe, and vice-versa) which will be provided to each state CCD coordinator for review and reconciliation. This should provide valuable information as to why discrepancies exist and allow a judgement to be made to (a)

---

<sup>2</sup>A technical review panel was conducted in March 1999 by NCES to address the difficulty in the CCD survey of distinguishing and categorizing all types of vocational education schools from other types of schools.

either impose the CCD scope and definition or (b) restate the CCD scope and definition if states appear to be excluding schools that should be included on the CCD. The bulk of non-matching schools appear to cluster in a small number of states, implying a systematic problem in state collecting and reporting procedures.

A comprehensive reconciliation of the results of the school matching effort between the CCD file and other source files would likely require a survey cycle for the subject analysts and state CCD coordinators to review lists and incorporate changes into the CCD file. A subject analyst should verify the existence, or not, of schools found on other sources but not on the CCD file by contacting schools or state coordinators for clarification of instances mentioned in this evaluation. This could be accomplished by adding a note field to the CCD file for the state coordinators and/or subject analyst to record clarifications of school situations. It is acknowledged that an annual reconciliation of the CCD to outside sources would change the scope of the CCD from representing a state's official listing of its schools. More consistent with current survey guidelines, such a proposed reconciliation effort could be employed as a one-time correction to the CCD file.

#### **2. Reconcile the varying classifications, definitions and reporting of schools.**

Add identifiers in the CCD file for schools that have an adult education component, much like what has been (or will be) done for charter, BIA and DOD schools. Improved definitions for adult education, vocational, charter, regionally-operated, BIA, and DOD schools would also assist in ensuring proper classification. Examination of the non-matching school lists could further reveal data collection and classification differences between states and may explain differences between the CCD file and the MDR or QED file school counts.

Discrepancies in school type classification between files, e.g., a school coded as special education on the MDR file matched to a regular school on the CCD file, indicate areas that apparently require further investigation and a more complete and properly defined CCD list. These schools must be identifiable in the file before it can, with great certainty, be determined to what

extent a particular type of school is listed in the CCD universe. All schools are reported on the CCD - some are reported to the CCD by states, while others are reported directly by BIA and DOD, for example. A specific indication of who reports which schools could eliminate confusion regarding a state's reporting responsibility.

Query respondents about their ability to report if regular schools have special, alternative, vocational or adult components *in addition to* the main curriculum. This information could be used to clarify future classification issues within the CCD survey. This might also prove valuable for comparison purposes if such future efforts take place between CCD and other sources.

**3. Clarify reporting definitions and instructions with regard to school type assignment.**

Some vocational schools are created to instruct special education and alternative education students. Clear indication should be made that regular, vocational, special and alternative education schools are to be classified on the basis of the curriculum, not the student body - that is, based on **what** they teach rather than on **whom** they teach. (NOTE: NCES has convened review panels of state and federal vocational educators to determine whether a vocational education flag can be added to the school file.)

**4. Perform research to determine if the schools on the CCD file that matched to schools coded as adult education on the MDR or QED files are primarily adult education schools.**

This type of information would indicate whether these schools are mis-categorized as another type of school and perhaps whether such schools should be included on the CCD survey.

**5. Continue to perform research to determine if the CCD schools with high ratios of American Indian/Alaskan Native students to all students but not matched to a school on the BIA listing are indeed BIA schools.**

When compared to the listing of schools provided by BIA, this research effort would help to ensure the proper classification of

schools as well as to prevent the duplication of schools on the CCD file (particularly those with similar, but differing names). This may occur as a result of the schools being reported by state coordinators. (NOTE: BIA now provides the official list of BIA schools.)

**6. Request the state coordinators to report the full legal name of each school.**

This would likely eliminate some confusion that might exist when two schools have similar names but different addresses. This may require a larger field length for school name, but given that an additional field has been added to accommodate both mailing and physical location addresses for every school, this should not be a significant issue. (NOTE: In 1998, the CCD survey increased the total characters in the name field to 50 by adding 30 characters.)

**7. Edit the files for situations where the school grades indicated by the name of the school differ from the grades reported.**

The matching efforts employed for this evaluation revealed several such situations. For example, the Crowley Middle School is listed as covering prekindergarten through fifth grade. The state CCD coordinators' review of this evaluation likely would identify obsolete school names and perhaps uncover missing schools.

**8. Compare the CCD file to the MDR and QED files, the DOD and BIA lists, and the National Charter Schools Directory.**

To do this efficiently, add fields to the CCD file for the MDR and QED school identification numbers (assuming proprietary issues do not prevent this). As a starting point, use the non-matching school listings and files generated by this evaluation to enter the identification numbers. Alternatively, work with the MDR and QED staffs to keep their identification number links up to date. Such an effort could be an annual CCD survey function. More practically (and feasibly), however, periodic evaluative efforts such as the current one could be undertaken to address CCD coverage issues.

Table 1-1. Sources and Types of Schools Compared to the 1994-95 Common Core of Data File					
Outside Source				Common Core of Data File	
Name	File Type	School Type	Characteristic	Agency Type	School Type
Market Data Retrieval File	Public	Regular		Local	Regular
		Vocational			Vocational
		Special			Special
		Adult			All
	County	All		Regional	All
	State	All		State	All
	BIA	Na		Federal	All
	Public	All	Alternative	Local	Alternative
Quality Education Data File	Public	Regular		Local	Regular
		Vocational			Vocational
		Special			Special
		Alternative			Alternative
	Adult		All	All	
	All	County		Regional	All
	State	All		State	All
	BIA	Na		Federal	All
DOD	Na		All	All	
Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA)	BIA	Na		Federal	All
Department of Defense (DOD)	DOD domestic	Na		All	All
	DOD overseas	Na		Schools with an overseas geographic code	All
National Charter School Directory	Charter	Na		All	All

Note: The Market Data Retrieval and Quality Education Data files contained charter school indicators, but these were as of a later school year. Since there were no dates for the schools' conversions to charter, the indicators were not used in this evaluation.

Sources: Bureau of Indian Affairs, Office of Indian Education Programs, Online, September 1997, <http://shaman.unm.edu/oiiep/address.htm>.  
Department of Defense, Online, November 1997, <http://www.tmn.com/dodea/home.htm>.  
Market Data Retrieval Database, School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT.  
National Charter School Directory, Fall 1996, The Center for Education Reform, Washington, DC.  
Quality Education Data, School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ.  
U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

## Chapter 2. Survey Background, Definitions, and Evaluation Methodology

### Section 2.0 Introduction

#### The CCD Surveys

The CCD is the annual census that collects information about U.S. public elementary and secondary schools. The CCD surveys are conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) of the U.S. Department of Education. The Bureau of the Census is the CCD data collection agent for NCES.

The CCD consists of three nonfiscal surveys and one fiscal survey. The nonfiscal surveys are the Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe, the Local Education Agency Universe and the State Nonfiscal Survey. Together, these surveys provide school names and addresses, and demographic information on students and staff in the public schools. The information is collected at the school, local education agency and state level, respectively. The fiscal survey is the National Public Education Financial Survey. The fiscal survey collects school financial data at the state level.

The 1994-95 CCD school universe survey documentation stated that the survey objectives were:

- “To provide a complete listing of all public elementary and secondary schools in the country, and
- to provide basic information and descriptive statistics on all schools, their students and their teachers.”

The CCD public school universe survey was sent to the state official designated as the state CCD coordinator. State coordinators provided information on new public schools and updated operational status codes for public schools existing on October 1. Essentially, the CCD school listing is constructed by the respondents themselves. That is, the CCD lists the schools reported by state coordinators.

#### The MDR Survey

Market Data Retrieval (MDR), a company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation and headquartered in Shelton, CT, has collected education data for 30 years. The MDR education database covers all levels of the education process from preschool through college, including public libraries. MDR annually collects comprehensive data on educational institutions and personnel via mail and phone canvassing of school and district administrators.

MDR provides mailing lists, database marketing services, state-by-state school directories, and statistical reports and analysis about the education market. MDR’s products and services are used to provide highly targeted mailing lists for direct mail marketing, telemarketing campaigns, market research, and product development.

#### The QED Survey

Quality Education Data (QED), a division of Peterson’s and a member of the International Thomson Publishing group, has collected education data since 1981. QED has built a comprehensive database of educational institutions, encompassing “every single K-12 school and school district in the United States.” The QED National Education Database covers all public school districts and both public and nonpublic schools and supports all QED products and services. These include market research, marketing databases, database design, annual research reports tracking critical educational trends, and customized database and mailing lists to the education market. Each year, QED mails surveys to school and district officials to collect information, including name and address, financial, demographic, technology, program, faculty, and facility data. All data received from the mail survey are telephone-verified by QED market researchers.

### Section 2.1 Public School Definitions

#### The CCD Definition

All schools examined in this report were public schools. The CCD school universe survey definition of a public school is:

“Public School

Institution that provides educational services, has one or more grade groups (PK-12) or is ungraded, and

- has one or more teachers to provide instruction;
- is located in one or more buildings;
- has an assigned administrator;
- receives public funds as primary support; and
- is operated by an education agency.”<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>Education Agency: “Government agency administratively responsible for providing public elementary and/or secondary instruction or educational support services.”  
Source: Common Core of Data.

The CCD school universe survey instructions further specified: “All schools providing free, public elementary and secondary education are to be included. State-operated schools such as those operated for the deaf, blind, and the arts and sciences are to be included, as well as schools operated by agencies other than the state education agencies, such as departments of corrections, or health and human services . . . Federally-operated public school information (such as Bureau of Indian Affairs) should be included if known.”

### The MDR Definition

The MDR documentation offered the following definition of public schools:

“Public Schools

. . . An educational organization that provides free instruction to the public. These schools may be designed for: the teaching of elementary and secondary age children; adult education; vocational and technical education; and the education of the mentally or physically handicapped.”

The CCD and MDR definitions had two main elements in common: educational instruction and free instruction - that is, paid for by public funds.

### The QED Definition

The QED dictionary did not contain a definition of public schools.

## Section 2.2 Methodology and Organization

The comparison of data files for this evaluation was undertaken through several steps. First, survey forms and relevant documents containing definitions and classification criteria for the CCD, MDR and QED surveys were obtained. Next, it was verified that these files were for approximately the same time period. The CCD survey definitions were then compared with those found in the MDR and QED survey materials. Fourth, differences in definitions and classification criteria that might affect coverage were identified. Fifth, common data fields were identified and the most efficient approaches to linking the files were determined. Finally, the CCD file was compared to each outside source (QED and MDR files, school directories, etc.) separately. The entire universe of schools was compared for all three files. No samples were drawn for this evaluation.

The record linkage, or school matching, process involved three phases. Initially, schools were matched electronically on CCD school identification number between the entire CCD file and the entire

MDR and QED files. This was accomplished for each state of the United States and the District of Columbia<sup>4</sup>. Next, for each state, all non-matching schools were compared by school type, such as regular or vocational, and by agency or file type, such as regional, state, DOD, or BIA and agency/file type. For example, schools coded as special education on both the CCD and MDR files were compared. Lastly, using this same example, the remaining non-matching schools on the CCD file were compared to the entire MDR file, and non-matching schools in the MDR file were compared to the entire CCD file.

**Table 2. Summary of Matching Schools – The Common Core of Data File Compared to the Market Data Retrieval and Quality Education Data Files: 1994-95 School Year**

Data File*		Files Compared:			
		CCD and MDR		CCD and QED	
		Electronic matches	Hand matches	Electronic matches	Hand matches
CCD	No. %	76,923 89.2	6,601 7.7	72,719 84.3	10,437 12.1
MDR	No. %	76,923 91.6	4,208 5.0	--	--
QED	No. %	--	--	72,719 83.5	9,170 10.5

Key: The 76,923 electronic matches found between the CCD and MDR files/the total number of CCD schools (86,220) = 89.2 percent.

\*Does not include the outlying areas or DOD overseas schools. No attempt was made to compare QED and MDR files to each other.

Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database, School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT.

Quality Education Data, School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, “Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95” and “Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95”.

Not all schools listed on the QED and MDR files are assigned a CCD identification number. In a few instances, the school identification number field has not been consistently updated by QED. For example, the FIPS state code for Puerto Rico, which changed several years ago, is still present with the old code for many records. It was also determined that the QED file contained many records (schools) with zero-filled NCES school identification number fields. Similarly, the MDR files had numerous records with a blank field for the NCES identification number. In such cases, efforts were made to “hand match” the schools without CCD identification numbers by school name, address, and grade range. Although a majority of

<sup>4</sup>The CCD and QED surveys provided data for the outlying areas of the U.S. - American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the Department of Defense - while MDR did not provide these data. These data are examined in Chapter 5.

schools were matched electronically on identification number, many matches were found in this manner. The table above (Table 2) highlights the national counts and percentages of both electronic and hand matches found between the CCD file and the MDR and QED files. See Tables A-5 and A-6 in Appendix A for state-by-state counts and percentages.

Although most school matches were straightforward, there were some situations that required subjective judgement. Matching schools between files by school name only required caution. A common problem that existed was the listing of schools in the databases by generic references such as “vocational center” or “learning center.” For example, suppose one database listed a “Northern High School” and the other had a “Northern High School - Vocational.” It was not clear if there were one or two schools. In such situations, school address and grade range would be used to determine if candidate schools were to be deemed matches or non-matches.

Other hindrances to school matching included apparent sharing of mailing addresses between schools or addresses given for the education agency rather than for the individual school. For example, a “Clare Alternative Education” on the CCD file was compared to the MDR file. A “Pioneer Alternative Secondary School” at the same address in the town of Clare was found on the MDR. It was hypothesized that “Pioneer Alternative Secondary School” was the formal name of the school and “Clare Alternative Education” meant “the alternative education school in Clare.” The schools were counted as a “match”.

Similar situations were also considered to be matches. In some cases one school on a file matched to two or three schools on the other file. For example, the Tolleson School on the MDR file matched to the Tolleson Elementary School and the Tolleson Junior High School on the CCD file. There were several one-to-many and many-to-one school occurrences between the data files. This fact, at least partly, helps to explain the differences in counts of both non-matches and matches between the data files that are detailed later in this report. For example, suppose the CCD listed a Kennedy Elementary School, a Kennedy Jr. High School, and a Kennedy High School at a single address, while the QED file listed only a Kennedy School. If there was not sufficient evidence to consider these schools as a three-to-one match, the resulting count of schools found on the CCD file but not on the QED file (i.e., schools on CCD only) in this instance would be three. The count of schools found on the QED file but not on the CCD file (i.e., schools on QED only) would only be one. Conversely, if these schools were identified as a match then the number of matching schools (i.e., schools on both files) would be different for each file.

The CCD file would reflect a matching school count of three while the QED file would only show one school as being on both files.

The objective of the matching was to generate accurate counts and estimates of matched and, particularly, non-matched schools. There may actually be more matches in the lists of non-matches, but the name and address information was insufficient to make such a determination. There may be “matches” that were, in fact, not matches but schools with similar names sharing a mailing address. Schools counted as non-matching were those found in one database file but which did not appear anywhere in the other databases. The counts of these non-matches are outlined in the following two chapters.

Chapters 3 and 4 present the results of matching schools between the CCD file and data files of MDR and QED and other selected sources for the fifty states and the District of Columbia. The various sections in these chapters are arranged by school or agency/file type. Each section identifies sources compared, describes relevant definitions, and details findings of the matching efforts. Tables showing specific counts and other findings are found at the end of each chapter. Chapter 5 addresses results of similar matching efforts for the five outlying areas of the United States - American Samoa, Guam, the Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico - and the Department of Defense.

Due to resource limitations, the amount of detail provided in each section is inversely related to the number of schools for that school or agency type. For example, the approximately 80,000 regular schools were not examined beyond matching efforts. On the other end, the other school types - special education, vocational and alternative - and agency types were examined and discussed in more detail (state-by-state listings of certain matching and non-matching schools are provided in Appendix C).

Appendix A provides a detailed description of the identifiers used to distinguish school and agency types and the total counts for the CCD, MDR and QED file types. Appendix B describes the CCD agency types. A complete bibliography of consulted sources appears in Appendix D.

## Chapter 3. Comparison of Data Files By School Type

### Section 3.0 Introduction

The CCD file was compared to the MDR and QED files separately. The comparison of data files presented in this chapter is based on school type. The CCD, QED, and MDR files identify school types as regular, vocational, special education, alternative, and adult. The CCD file does not specifically code adult schools, while the MDR file does not have a code for alternative schools. However, the MDR school type for regular, special education, and vocational schools includes schools with the *characteristic* of alternative education. Thus, alternative schools identified within the MDR data file were essentially a subset of the three school types - regular, special education, and vocational.

Definitions of each of these types of schools, as provided in the source documentation and the findings of the matching efforts, are given in the sections that follow. Table 1-1 and Appendix A help to further clarify these relationships as well as to identify the number of schools associated with each type.

### General Findings

#### *How Many Schools?*

There were 86,220 schools on the 1994-95 CCD file. The total number of schools on the MDR file was 83,953, while the QED file totaled 87,135 schools. Descriptions and results of the matching efforts for each of the five school types, preceded by a summary of overall findings, follow below.<sup>5</sup> Tables 3-1 through 3-7 at the end of this chapter highlight the state-by-state counts for each school type.

#### *Non-matching Schools*

##### *Schools Not on the CCD File*

A comparison of the CCD file of 86,220 schools to the MDR file resulted in a total of 2,842 schools found on the MDR file but not found on the CCD file. This number of non-matching schools between these files represented about 3.4 percent of MDR schools. There were nine states where one percent or less of their schools appeared on the MDR file but

not on the CCD file. Two states, California with 584 and Ohio with 241, accounted for about 30 percent of all the non-matching schools. Only three states – Alabama, Delaware, and Kentucky – had a percentage of non-matching schools as high as eight percent. See Table 3-1 for counts by state.

Based on comparison of the QED and CCD files, there was a total of 2,786 schools found on the QED file, but not the CCD file – a 3.2 percentage of the QED schools. California’s 736 non-matching schools accounted for slightly more than 25 percent of the 2,786 schools that appeared on the QED file but not on the CCD file. Six states had a percentage of non-matching schools of one percent or less, with a range from a high of almost nine percent for California to a low of one-half percent for Idaho and Illinois. Of note, four states – Illinois, Mississippi, Missouri, and Nebraska – each had less than one percent of their schools appear on both the MDR and QED file but not on the CCD file (see Table 3-2).

##### *Schools Not on the MDR File*

A total of 3,011 schools (3.5 percent of all CCD schools) were found on the CCD file, but not the MDR file. Only 5 states accounted for half of the non-matching total. Fifteen states had one percent or less of their schools appear on the CCD file but not the MDR file. Of the 3 states that had such non-matching school percentages greater than 10 percent, Minnesota is most notable with almost one-quarter (510 of 2,099) of its schools appearing on the CCD file but not on the MDR file. For complete state-by-state counts, see Table 3-3.

##### *Schools Not on the QED File*

There were 3,600 schools listed on the CCD file not found on the QED file. These schools amounted to 4.2 percent of the CCD file schools. Eight states had more than 100 schools found on the CCD file but not on the QED file. Similar to the comparison of the CCD file to the MDR file, there were three states – Minnesota, Vermont and Washington – that had more than 10 percent of their schools appear on the CCD file but not the QED file. Eight states had one percent or less of such non-matching schools. See Table 3-4 at the end of this chapter for counts by state.

### Section 3.1 Regular Schools

#### Definitions

##### CCD

“Regular School

A public elementary/secondary school that does not

---

<sup>5</sup>The outlying areas - American Samoa, Guam, the Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands - and the Department of Defense are not included in Chapter 3. They will be addressed in Chapter 5.

focus primarily on vocational, special or alternative education.”

### **MDR**

There was no definition in the documentation.

### **QED**

“Regular Public School District

Traditional fiscal units with school boards, budgets and purchasing responsibilities.”

### **Findings**

The following discussion concerns only open regular schools in the fifty U.S. states and the District of Columbia.

#### ***How Many Regular Schools?***

There were 80,373 schools coded as regular on the CCD file. The MDR file listed 80,214 regular schools, while the QED file listed 79,024 such schools (see Tables in Appendix A). In each instance, the total of regular schools accounted for over 90 percent of all the schools found on that file.

#### ***Non-matching Schools***

##### *Schools Not on the CCD File*

There were 1,288 schools classified as regular on the MDR file that were not found on the CCD file. These 1,288 schools were distributed rather evenly throughout the states - 19 states had 20 or more regular schools not found on the CCD file. For two of these 19 states, New Mexico and Washington, the regular schools found on the MDR file and not on the CCD file accounted for over 95 percent of all non-matching schools found in those particular states. California, with 285 of these schools, by far had the highest total of any state. See Table 3-1 for counts by state.

The 824 schools classified as regular on the QED file that were not found on the CCD file represented one-third of all schools not matching between files. California with 184 non-matching schools accounted for about 22 percent of these schools. Only two states - Hawaii and Rhode Island - did not report at least one non-matching regular school. See Table 3-2 for counts by state.

##### *Schools Not on the MDR File*

There were 756 regular schools listed on the CCD file that did not appear on the MDR file. This number

represented about one-quarter of the 3,011 schools found on the CCD file but not the MDR file. Washington, with 131 non-matching regular schools, was the only state to account for as much as 10 percent of the non-matching regular schools. Table 3-3 at the end of this chapter highlights the counts by state.

##### *Schools Not on the QED File*

There were 1,237 regular schools listed on the CCD file that did not appear on the QED file. Twenty-three states had fewer than 10 such schools. New York, Texas and Washington accounted for 100, 113, and 142, respectively, of these non-matching regular schools. As a percentage of the total schools found on the CCD file, but not on the QED file for these three states, New York at just under 75 percent (100 of 138 schools) was most notable. See Table 3-4 for counts by state.

### ***Matching Schools***

#### *School Types Did Not Match*

There were a few schools coded as regular on the MDR or QED files that matched (on identification number or name and address) between these files and the CCD file, but the school type in the CCD file was not regular. These schools are discussed in the following sections of this chapter. Appendix C provides state-by-state listings of the specific schools.

## **Section 3.2 Special Education Schools**

### **Definitions**

#### **CCD**

“Special Education School

A public elementary/secondary school that:

- focuses primarily on special education, including instruction for any of the following: hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, health impaired, orthopedically impaired, mentally retarded, seriously emotionally disturbed, multi-handicapped, visually handicapped, deaf and blind; and
- adapts curriculum, materials or instruction for students served.”

#### **MDR**

“Special Education School

A school that offers instructional activities designed

for physically handicapped, emotionally disturbed or mentally handicapped students only. All age levels, from preprimary through adult, are included.”

### ***QED***

“SpEd:

Special education school for the mentally, physically or emotionally disabled.”

### **Findings**

The following discussion concerns only open special education schools in the fifty U.S. states and the District of Columbia.

#### ***How Many Special Education Schools?***

There were 2,014 special education schools on the CCD file. The MDR file listed 1,783 special education schools, while the QED file had 1,520 such schools (see Tables in Appendix A for details). For each file, the special education schools represented only about 2 percent of all the schools listed.

#### ***Non-matching Schools***

##### *Schools Not on the CCD File*

There were 701 schools classified as special education on the MDR file that were not on the CCD file. Ohio and California, with 209 and 127 schools respectively, accounted for close to half of this total. Ohio’s 209 special education schools made up about 87 percent of that state’s non-matching school total of 241. For only two other states – Delaware and Iowa, with 9 and 13 respectively – did the special education schools account for more than 50 percent of the non-matching schools between files. Thirty states had 5 or fewer special education schools on the MDR file but not the CCD file (see Table 3-1 for all state counts).

There were 530 schools classified as special education on the QED file that were not on the CCD file. California and Ohio had 148 and 103, respectively, of these special education schools. Again, Ohio was more notable in that the special education schools accounted for almost three-fourths of all its non-matching schools, while in California they represented 20 percent of such schools. Fourteen states did not have any non-matching special education schools while another nine states had only one such school. Table 3-2 provides total counts by state.

##### *Schools Not on the MDR File*

There were 854 special education schools listed on the CCD file that did not appear on the MDR file. Special education schools trailed only alternative schools as the most frequently occurring school type that appeared on the CCD file, but not the MDR file. Six states - California with 57 schools, Florida and Vermont with 59 schools each, Illinois with 61 schools, Minnesota with 103 schools, and Texas with 116 schools - accounted for about half of this total. Vermont’s total of 59 special education schools was remarkable because it represented over 90 percent of the total non-matching schools for that state. This was also true of Delaware and the District of Columbia although reporting smaller numbers of non-matching schools (see Table 3-3 for counts by state).

##### *Schools Not on the QED File*

There were 866 special education schools listed on the CCD file that did not appear on the QED file. Texas accounted for 116 (slightly less than 30 percent of that state’s total of 390) of these schools. For three states, Delaware, North Dakota, and Vermont, and the District of Columbia, the number of special education schools represented more than 70 percent of all schools found on the CCD file, but not the QED file for that state. See Table 3-4 for counts by state.

#### ***Matching Schools***

##### *School Types Did Not Match*

###### *Between the CCD and MDR Files*

For the schools coded as special education on the MDR file, 109 matched on identification number or name and address between the MDR and CCD files, but the school type on the CCD file was not special education. Of the 109 schools on Table 3-5, 72 were listed on the CCD file as regular schools, 8 were listed as vocational, and 29 were listed as alternative. Twelve schools in Missouri and ten schools in Alabama were listed as regular schools on the CCD file but reported as special education schools on the MDR file. For a complete state-by-state listing of these schools, refer to the tables in Appendix C.

###### *Between the CCD and QED Files*

For the schools coded as special education on the QED file, 110 matched on identification number or name and address between the QED and CCD files, but the school type on the CCD file was not special education. Of the 110 schools on Table 3-5, 78 were listed on the CCD file as regular schools, 2 were

listed as vocational, and 30 were listed as alternative. Ten schools in Alabama were listed as regular schools on the CCD file but reported as special education schools on the QED file (see Appendix C for state school listings).

### *School Names Did Not Match*

Nine schools matched on school identification number between the MDR and CCD files but differed on the school name. Twenty-six schools matched on school identification number between the QED and CCD files but differed on the school name. For a listing of these schools, see tables in Appendix C. Apparently, in some cases, these are the same schools (they have the same address) and in others, they are not indeed the same school.

## **Section 3.3 Vocational Schools**

### **Definitions**

#### **CCD**

“Vocational Education School

A public elementary/secondary school that focuses primarily on vocational education, and provides education and training in one or more semi-skilled or technical operations.”

#### **MDR**

“Vocational and/or Technical School

A school which is separately organized under the direction and management of an administrator (such as a principal) for the primary purpose of offering education and training in one or more semi-skilled, skilled or technical occupations. . . . There are two classifications for vocational schools. One is a vocational school in a regular district with other regular academics. The other is a vocational school in a vocational district. Vocational school districts generally provide services to more than one academic school district.”

#### **QED**

“Voc:

Vocational technical school for vocational education, specifically schools with facilities and equipment for career training.”

### **Comments on Definitions**

The CCD survey apparently classifies schools into

types based on the curriculum content that the school predominantly offers. The instructions for the CCD survey indicated that regular, special education, vocational and alternative schools were mutually exclusive types of schools. Some vocational schools, however, were created to instruct special and alternative education students. It was not clear whether to classify schools based on **what** they were teaching or **whom** they were teaching. Therefore, for example, a school may be classified as a regular school even though it has a large vocational education program.

### **Findings**

The following discussion concerns only open vocational schools in the fifty U.S. states and the District of Columbia.

#### **How Many Vocational Schools?**

There were 895, or about 1 percent, vocational education schools on the CCD file. The MDR file listed 1,230 vocational schools, while the QED file had 1,420 vocational schools (see Tables in Appendix A).

#### **Non-matching Schools**

##### *Schools Not on the CCD File*

Of the 2,842 schools found on the MDR file that were not found on the CCD file, 401 schools were classified as vocational. Kentucky and Alabama, with 71 and 68 respectively, accounted for the highest state totals for these schools. In addition to these two states, for only three other states – Oklahoma, Rhode Island and Vermont - did the number of vocational schools represent at least half of the non-matching schools for that state. For Rhode Island, 7 of its 10 non-matching schools were vocational. Seventeen states did not have a single vocational school that appeared on the MDR file and not on the CCD file. Table 3-1 at the end of this chapter provides state-by-state totals.

There were 504 schools classified as vocational on the QED file that were not on the CCD file. Again, Alabama and Kentucky were notable with each accounting for 72, about 30 percent of the total non-matching vocational schools and 73 percent and 65 percent respectively of their state’s non-matching schools. Maine’s and New Hampshire’s non-matching vocational schools accounted for at least half of their state’s non-matching schools, while Rhode Island’s 7 accounted for all their non-matching schools. Twenty states had one or fewer schools on the QED file but not on the CCD file. See Table 3-2 for counts by state.

### *Schools Not on the MDR File*

There were 101 vocational schools (less than four percent of the 3,011 non-matching schools) listed on the CCD file that did not appear on the MDR file. No states had a remarkably high number of these schools. As a percentage of their state's non-matching schools, only Maine, with 8 non-matching vocational schools (out of 14 total), was notable. Only four states had as many as ten, while 28 did not have any (see Table 3-3).

### *Schools Not on the QED File*

There were 96 vocational schools listed on the CCD file that did not appear on the QED file. Again, these non-matching schools represented, by far, the least number for any of the school types. Only two states, Mississippi with 14 and Texas with 16, had notable totals. Perhaps more relevant, while Texas' total accounted for less than five percent of all Texas schools found on the CCD file but not on the QED file, Mississippi's vocational schools accounted for almost 30 percent of that state's total. Table 3-4 at the end of this chapter presents state-by-state counts.

### **Matching Schools**

#### *School Types Did Not Match*

##### *Between the CCD and MDR Files*

Of the schools coded as vocational on the MDR file, 43 matched on identification number or name and address between the MDR and CCD files, but the school type in the CCD file was not vocational. Of the 43 schools on Table 3-6, 21 were listed on the CCD file as regular schools, 8 were listed as special education, and 14 were listed as alternative. Illinois accounted for 9 of the 21 schools listed as regular on the CCD file but vocational on the MDR file. Of the eight schools on this table listed as special education on the CCD file, five reported a special education program in addition to being a vocational school on the MDR file. For a complete state-by-state listing of these schools, refer to the tables in Appendix C.

##### *Between the CCD and QED Files*

For the schools coded as vocational on the QED file, 85 matched on identification number or name and address between the QED and CCD files, but the school type in the CCD file was not vocational. Of the 85 schools in Table 3-6, 35 were listed on the CCD file as regular schools, 20 were listed as special education, and 30 were listed as alternative. Again, Illinois had a notable number, 16, of these schools. Of the 20 QED vocational education schools listed as special education on the CCD file, 15 reported a

special education program in addition to being a vocational school on the QED file (see tables in Appendix C for state-by-state listing of schools).

#### *School Names Did Not Match*

There were no vocational schools that matched on school identification number between the CCD file and MDR or QED files that differed on the school name.

## **Section 3.4 Alternative Schools**

### **Definitions**

#### **CCD**

“Alternative Education School

A public elementary/secondary school that:

- addresses needs of students that typically can not be met in a regular school,
- provides nontraditional education,
- serves as an adjunct to a regular school, or
- falls outside the categories of regular, special education or vocational education.”

#### **MDR**

“Alternative Schools/Programs

... Alternative education offers a specialized curriculum designed to meet the needs of a particular group of students. Students may be levels or grades behind, have behavioral problems, need small classroom settings and are often at risk of dropping out of school.”

#### **QED**

“Alt:

Alternative schools are for children who do not function well in the traditional school setting. Includes continuation high schools.”

### **Findings**

The following discussion concerns only open alternative schools in the fifty U.S. states and the District of Columbia.

#### **How Many Alternative Education Schools?**

There were 2,938 alternative education schools on

the CCD file - between 3 and 4 percent of the total. The MDR file listed 1,768 schools with an alternative program. The QED file had 1,766 alternative schools (see Tables in Appendix A).

### *Non-matching Schools*

#### *Schools Not on the CCD File*

There were 592 schools with an alternative education program on the MDR file that did not appear on the CCD file. The MDR survey considered alternative education to be a characteristic, while the CCD and QED files treated it as a school type. A school could be regular, special, vocational or adult and also report that it had an alternative program. Thus, the 592 schools identified as having an alternative program are reflected in the count (2,842) of schools found on the MDR file but not on the CCD file listed in the Table 3.1 at the end of this chapter.

Of the 2,786 schools on the QED file that were not on the CCD file, there were 498 classified as alternative education. California had 189 (close to 40 percent) of these schools. Of all the states that had at least 10 alternative schools found on the QED file but not on the CCD file, only the state of Maryland, with 15 non-matching alternative schools, reported a number that represented at least half of their total number of non-matching schools. See Table 3-2 for counts by state.

#### *Schools Not on the MDR File*

There were 1,300 alternative education schools listed on the CCD file that did not appear on the MDR file. This figure represented about 43 percent of the total (3,011). Two states, Minnesota and California, with 372 and 181 respectively, combined to represent nearly half of all the alternative schools found on the CCD file but not on MDR file. In both instances, these totals represent more than 70 percent of that state's non-matching schools. Three other states, Colorado, Nevada and South Carolina, although having smaller numbers (at least ten) of non-matching alternative schools, had such totals that accounted for at least 70 percent of their non-matching schools. All of Maryland's non-matching schools were alternative schools (see Table 3-3).

#### *Schools Not on the QED File*

There were 1,401 alternative education schools listed on the CCD file that did not appear on the QED file. Three states (California, Minnesota and Texas) accounted for over half of these schools. Minnesota, with 387 non-matching alternative schools (75 percent of all the schools listed for the state), is notable. The 9 non-matching alternative schools in

Maryland accounted for 80 percent of that state's total non-matching schools. Seventeen states had 2 or fewer alternative schools that were found on the CCD file but not on the QED file. For counts by state, see Table 3-4.

### *Matching Schools*

#### *School Types Did Not Match*

##### *Between the CCD and MDR Files*

For the schools coded as alternative education (i.e., schools with an alternative education program) on the MDR file, 204 matched on identification number or name and address between the MDR and CCD files, but the school type on the CCD file was not alternative education. Of the 204 schools on Table 3-7, 141 schools were listed on the CCD file as regular schools, 55 were listed as special education, and 8 were listed as vocational. Illinois accounted for the most mis-matched schools with 21. All 21 schools were listed as special education on the CCD file but alternative education on the MDR file. Of the 63 schools listed as special education or vocational on the CCD file, 47 reported a special education or vocational program in addition to being an alternative education school on the MDR file. For a complete state-by-state listing of these schools refer to tables in Appendix C.

##### *Between the CCD and QED Files*

For the schools coded as alternative education on the QED file, 230 matched on identification number or name and address between the QED and CCD files, but the school type on the CCD file was not alternative education. Of the 230 schools on Table 3-7, 155 were listed on the CCD file as regular schools, 66 were listed as special education, and 9 were listed as vocational. Ohio, with 44 schools listed as alternative education on the QED file but another school type on the CCD file, accounted for the greatest number of these schools. Of the 66 schools on Table 3-7 listed as special education on the CCD file, 40 reported a special education program in addition to being an alternative education school on the QED file (see tables in Appendix C for state listings of schools).

#### *School Names Did Not Match*

Eighteen schools matched on school identification number between the MDR and CCD files but differed on the school name. Seventeen schools matched on school identification number between the QED and CCD files but differed on the school name. See tables in Appendix C for a complete listing. Further investigation might reveal if these schools are

actually the same schools or different schools with duplicate identification numbers.

### Section 3.5 Adult Schools

#### Definitions

##### CCD

There was none in the documentation. Adult schools should not appear on the CCD file unless they meet the definition of a public school as provided in Chapter 2. Adult schools were not considered a unique school type and were out-of-scope for this evaluation.

##### MDR

“Adult School

A separately organized school providing instruction for adults and youth beyond the age of compulsory school attendance. Sometimes called a Community School. Must be academically oriented with some type of certificate or diploma, such as a GED [General Education Diploma] program, to add to MDR’s file.”

##### QED

“AdEd:

Adult education schools for those receiving basic education and/or courses leading up to GED or similar certificates; usually older than school-age children.”

#### Findings

##### How Many Adult Education Schools?

Based on the MDR and QED files, there were 557 and 602 adult education schools, respectively, in the United States during the 1994-95 school year. Both of these files contained schools classified as adult that matched to other school types on the CCD file. These matching schools are discussed below.

##### Matching Schools

###### School Types Did Not Match

###### Between the CCD and MDR Files

There were 75 schools coded as adult education on the MDR file that matched to the CCD file. Florida had 37 of these schools. The following table lists the 75 schools by CCD school type:

CCD School Type	Count
Regular	10
Special Education	6
Vocational	14
Alternative	45
Total	75

Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database, School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT.  
U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, “Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95” and “Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95”.

###### Between the CCD and QED Files

There were 53 schools coded as adult education on the QED file that matched to the CCD file. Again, Florida had the majority of these schools. The table below list shows the 53 schools by CCD school type:

CCD School Type	Count
Regular	4
Special	1
Vocational	6
Alternative	42
Total	53

Sources: Quality Education Data, School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson’s, Princeton, NJ.  
U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, “Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95” and “Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95”.

###### Names Did Not Match

The five schools that matched on school identification number between the MDR and CCD files but differed on the school name are listed in Appendix C. Again, it was possible that these schools are indeed the same school, but further investigation is warranted.

**Table 3-1. Comparison of the Market Data Retrieval (MDR) File to the Common Core of Data (CCD) File, by School Type and State, for the 1994-95 School Year**

*This table shows the counts, by state and school type, of schools found on the Market Data Retrieval File but NOT found on the Common Core of Data File for the 1994-95 school year.*

State	Total no. of schools on MDR File	Total no. of schools found on MDR but NOT on CCD	Percentage of schools found on MDR but NOT on CCD	No. of schools found on MDR but NOT on CCD, by school type:			
				Regular	Special Ed.	Vocational	Adult*
Total, All States	83,953	2,842	3.4	1,288	701	401	452
Alabama	1,400	114	8.1	32	11	68	3
Alaska	458	4	0.9	2	1	0	1
Arizona	1,146	81	7.1	76	3	0	2
Arkansas	1,086	70	6.4	34	3	7	26
California	8,162	584	7.2	285	127	10	162
Colorado	1,334	23	1.7	14	6	3	0
Connecticut	994	10	1.0	2	2	3	3
Delaware	184	15	8.2	5	9	0	1
Dis. of Columbia	173	5	2.9	0	2	0	3
Florida	2,498	26	1.0	16	2	1	7
Georgia	1,903	123	6.5	74	16	8	25
Hawaii	248	7	2.8	0	1	0	6
Idaho	577	8	1.4	7	1	0	0
Illinois	3,945	24	0.6	10	8	1	5
Indiana	1,885	25	1.3	11	6	1	7
Iowa	1,423	23	1.6	10	13	0	0
Kansas	1,479	46	3.1	16	13	12	5
Kentucky	1,426	121	8.5	29	4	71	17
Louisiana	1,524	79	5.2	11	6	2	60
Maine	724	7	1.0	3	3	1	0
Maryland	1,288	16	1.2	8	7	0	1
Massachusetts	1,813	31	1.7	19	5	2	5
Michigan	3,466	171	4.9	65	43	33	30
Minnesota	1,516	33	2.2	18	4	2	9
Mississippi	983	5	0.5	3	1	1	0
Missouri	2,050	12	0.6	9	2	0	1
Montana	690	15	2.2	8	2	1	4
Nebraska	1,195	9	0.8	5	3	0	1
Nevada	393	6	1.5	5	0	1	0
New Hampshire	440	11	2.5	6	3	1	1
New Jersey	2,332	60	2.6	10	22	8	20
New Mexico	722	51	7.1	48	3	0	0
New York	4,175	152	3.6	51	45	49	7
North Carolina	2,002	37	1.8	33	4	0	0
North Dakota	456	3	0.7	3	0	0	0
Ohio	3,928	241	6.1	21	209	6	5
Oklahoma	1,739	78	4.5	16	5	49	8
Oregon	1,230	24	2.0	20	2	2	0
Pennsylvania	3,204	57	1.8	25	26	1	5
Rhode Island	317	10	3.2	3	0	7	0
South Carolina	1,134	50	4.4	37	9	0	4
South Dakota	594	23	3.9	15	2	4	2
Tennessee	1,579	46	2.9	21	16	7	2
Texas	6,203	146	2.4	104	16	17	9
Utah	724	18	2.5	11	1	5	1
Vermont	356	22	6.2	7	2	13	0
Virginia	1,868	45	2.4	23	17	3	2
Washington	1,837	25	1.4	24	1	0	0
West Virginia	885	11	1.2	6	3	0	2
Wisconsin	1,911	34	1.8	25	9	0	0
Wyoming	354	5	1.4	2	2	1	0

\*The adult school category is out-of-scope for the CCD surveys. It is included in the MDR survey and provided here for completeness of coverage purposes.

Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database. School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT.  
U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

**Table 3-2. Comparison of the Quality Education Data (QED) File to the Common Core of Data (CCD) File, by School Type and State, for the 1994-95 School Year**

*This table shows the counts, by state and school type, of schools found on the Quality Education Data File but NOT found on the Common Core of Data File for the 1994-95 school year.*

State	Total no. of schools on QED File	Total no. of schools found on QED but NOT on CCD	Percentage of schools found on QED but NOT on CCD	No. of schools found on QED but NOT on CCD, by school type*:				
				Regular	Special Ed.	Vocational	Alternative	Adult
Total, All States	87,135	2,786	3.2	824	530	504	498	430
Alabama	1,436	98	6.8	9	9	72	7	1
Alaska	481	12	2.5	6	1	1	3	1
Arizona	1,175	78	6.6	67	2	0	5	4
Arkansas	1,137	33	2.9	18	0	7	3	5
California	8,357	736	8.8	184	148	39	189	176
Colorado	1,393	14	1.0	4	1	4	5	0
Connecticut	1,028	26	2.5	2	12	3	6	3
Delaware	194	5	2.6	2	0	2	0	1
Dis. of Columbia	200	8	4.0	3	1	0	1	3
Florida	2,823	69	2.4	15	4	1	8	41
Georgia	1,991	110	5.5	36	18	18	25	13
Hawaii	265	13	4.9	0	0	0	2	11
Idaho	579	3	0.5	2	0	1	0	0
Illinois	4,119	19	0.5	5	8	0	3	3
Indiana	1,925	22	1.1	5	3	9	1	4
Iowa	1,522	17	1.1	4	9	1	3	0
Kansas	1,520	34	2.2	9	3	17	3	2
Kentucky	1,517	110	7.3	22	2	72	8	6
Louisiana	1,501	31	2.1	4	6	2	3	16
Maine	733	8	1.1	4	0	4	0	0
Maryland	1,354	27	2.0	5	4	0	15	3
Massachusetts	1,909	23	1.2	7	5	3	3	5
Michigan	3,550	189	5.3	37	57	30	22	43
Minnesota	1,585	32	2.0	18	0	7	5	2
Mississippi	1,025	8	0.8	2	0	1	4	1
Missouri	2,181	18	0.8	14	1	0	1	2
Montana	725	13	1.8	6	1	1	3	2
Nebraska	1,332	8	0.6	5	1	0	1	1
Nevada	432	5	1.2	2	0	0	1	2
New Hampshire	444	5	1.1	1	0	3	1	0
New Jersey	2,391	78	3.3	13	10	16	11	28
New Mexico	786	59	7.5	54	1	2	0	2
New York	4,305	126	2.9	26	31	44	16	9
North Carolina	2,095	30	1.4	22	0	0	8	0
North Dakota	468	6	1.3	6	0	0	0	0
Ohio	3,905	139	3.6	15	103	6	6	9
Oklahoma	1,892	72	3.8	15	6	43	7	1
Oregon	1,235	16	1.3	7	1	1	7	0
Pennsylvania	3,260	64	2.0	20	29	4	8	3
Rhode Island	324	7	2.2	0	0	7	0	0
South Carolina	1,162	39	3.4	15	4	2	11	7
South Dakota	740	24	3.2	15	0	4	5	0
Tennessee	1,652	44	2.7	5	7	21	9	2
Texas	6,263	135	2.2	42	24	16	43	10
Utah	739	19	2.6	7	0	7	4	1
Vermont	376	32	8.5	13	2	15	2	0
Virginia	1,914	35	1.8	22	3	2	5	3
Washington	1,892	33	1.7	19	3	1	9	1
West Virginia	899	10	1.1	2	1	1	3	3
Wisconsin	2,032	35	1.7	7	5	13	10	0
Wyoming	372	9	2.4	1	4	1	3	0

\*The adult school category is out-of-scope for the CCD surveys. It is included in the QED survey and provided here for completeness of coverage purposes. The prison schools listed on QED are excluded from these totals.

Sources: Quality Education Data. School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

**Table 3-3. Comparison of the Common Core of Data (CCD) File to the Market Data Retrieval (MDR) File, by School Type and State, for the 1994-95 School Year**

*This table shows the counts, by state and school type, of schools found on the Common Core of Data File but NOT found on the Market Data Retrieval File for the 1994-95 school year.*

State	Total no. of schools on CCD File	Total no. of schools found on CCD but NOT on MDR	Percentage of schools found on CCD but NOT on MDR	No. of schools found on CCD but NOT on MDR, by school type:			
				Regular	Special Ed.	Vocational	Alternative
Total, All States	86,220	3,011	3.5	756	854	101	1,300
Alabama	1,309	18	1.4	4	6	0	8
Alaska	496	34	6.9	12	1	2	19
Arizona	1,136	58	5.1	28	8	3	19
Arkansas	1,061	4	0.4	3	0	1	0
California	7,821	253	3.2	15	57	0	181
Colorado	1,460	66	4.5	9	5	1	51
Connecticut	1,045	57	5.5	17	8	1	31
Delaware	182	13	7.1	0	12	0	1
Dis. of Columbia	175	7	4.0	0	6	0	1
Florida	2,733	255	9.3	57	59	8	131
Georgia	1,766	9	0.5	5	2	0	2
Hawaii	242	1	0.4	0	1	0	0
Idaho	607	27	4.4	3	11	0	13
Illinois	4,195	107	2.6	17	61	1	28
Indiana	1,911	42	2.2	1	34	2	5
Iowa	1,555	13	0.8	5	4	0	4
Kansas	1,491	11	0.7	9	0	0	2
Kentucky	1,374	38	2.8	20	3	1	14
Louisiana	1,459	20	1.4	1	7	1	11
Maine	733	14	1.9	2	4	8	0
Maryland	1,263	7	0.6	0	0	0	7
Massachusetts	1,831	52	2.8	34	4	6	8
Michigan	3,432	130	3.8	33	37	4	56
Minnesota	2,099	510	24.3	25	103	10	372
Mississippi	1,018	37	3.6	1	4	10	22
Missouri	2,234	86	3.9	19	18	5	44
Montana	903	5	0.6	5	0	0	0
Nebraska	1,422	77	5.4	33	44	0	0
Nevada	421	24	5.7	1	5	1	17
New Hampshire	458	2	0.4	2	0	0	0
New Jersey	2,295	27	1.2	5	22	0	0
New Mexico	715	24	3.4	4	13	0	7
New York	4,130	42	1.0	39	1	0	2
North Carolina	1,968	6	0.3	1	2	0	3
North Dakota	619	34	5.5	4	30	0	0
Ohio	3,813	88	2.3	66	11	11	0
Oklahoma	1,824	7	0.4	5	2	0	0
Oregon	1,214	18	1.5	2	7	0	9
Pennsylvania	3,190	19	0.6	12	2	4	1
Rhode Island	308	3	1.0	2	1	0	0
South Carolina	1,094	18	1.6	2	0	1	15
South Dakota	825	30	3.6	20	5	1	4
Tennessee	1,555	23	1.5	17	3	0	3
Texas	6,477	325	5.0	71	116	15	123
Utah	727	18	2.5	0	5	0	13
Vermont	394	65	16.5	6	59	0	0
Virginia	1,851	28	1.5	0	9	4	15
Washington	2,066	229	11.1	131	53	0	45
West Virginia	883	12	1.4	2	2	0	8
Wisconsin	2,030	14	0.7	4	5	0	5
Wyoming	410	4	1.0	2	2	0	0

Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database. School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

**Table 3-4. Comparison of the Common Core of Data (CCD) File to the Quality Education Data (QED) File, by School Type and State, for the 1994-95 School Year**

*This table shows the counts, by state and school type, of schools found on the Common Core of Data File but NOT found on the Quality Education Data File for the 1994-95 school year.*

State	Total no. of schools on CCD File	Total no. of schools found on CCD but NOT on QED	Percentage of schools found on CCD but NOT on QED	No. of schools found on CCD but NOT on QED, by school type:			
				Regular	Special Ed.	Vocational	Alternative
Total, All States	86,220	3,600	4.2	1,237	866	96	1,401
Alabama	1,309	24	1.8	6	8	0	10
Alaska	496	45	9.1	19	1	2	23
Arizona	1,136	47	4.1	21	8	2	16
Arkansas	1,061	4	0.4	4	0	0	0
California	7,821	343	4.4	63	54	0	226
Colorado	1,460	111	7.6	43	6	1	61
Connecticut	1,045	51	4.9	26	8	1	16
Delaware	182	15	8.2	1	13	0	1
Dis. of Columbia	175	10	5.7	0	8	0	2
Florida	2,733	204	7.5	63	54	5	82
Georgia	1,766	27	1.5	20	0	0	7
Hawaii	242	1	0.4	0	1	0	0
Idaho	607	47	7.7	9	10	0	28
Illinois	4,195	96	2.3	23	68	2	3
Indiana	1,911	51	2.7	1	32	2	16
Iowa	1,555	27	1.7	18	4	0	5
Kansas	1,491	19	1.3	12	0	0	7
Kentucky	1,374	47	3.4	33	1	2	11
Louisiana	1,459	20	1.4	4	7	0	9
Maine	733	19	2.6	6	4	9	0
Maryland	1,263	11	0.9	2	0	0	9
Massachusetts	1,831	64	3.5	49	3	3	9
Michigan	3,432	170	5.0	68	35	3	64
Minnesota	2,099	515	24.5	33	88	7	387
Mississippi	1,018	48	4.7	6	5	14	23
Missouri	2,234	95	4.3	41	18	6	30
Montana	903	30	3.3	28	2	0	0
Nebraska	1,422	98	6.9	59	39	0	0
Nevada	421	22	5.2	4	5	0	13
New Hampshire	458	2	0.4	2	0	0	0
New Jersey	2,295	41	1.8	11	27	3	0
New Mexico	715	32	4.5	8	12	0	12
New York	4,130	138	3.3	100	7	0	31
North Carolina	1,968	20	1.0	8	5	0	7
North Dakota	619	40	6.5	11	29	0	0
Ohio	3,813	76	2.0	61	12	3	0
Oklahoma	1,824	12	0.7	10	2	0	0
Oregon	1,214	32	2.6	3	12	0	17
Pennsylvania	3,190	26	0.8	16	3	6	1
Rhode Island	308	9	2.9	4	1	2	2
South Carolina	1,094	13	1.2	6	1	4	2
South Dakota	825	46	5.6	27	11	0	8
Tennessee	1,555	26	1.7	15	3	1	7
Texas	6,477	390	6.0	113	116	16	145
Utah	727	26	3.6	9	2	0	15
Vermont	394	64	16.2	4	59	0	1
Virginia	1,851	53	2.9	10	13	2	28
Washington	2,066	250	12.1	142	55	0	53
West Virginia	883	13	1.5	4	4	0	5
Wisconsin	2,030	19	0.9	5	7	0	7
Wyoming	410	11	2.7	6	3	0	2

Sources: Quality Education Data. School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

**Table 3-5. Special Education Schools on the Market Data Retrieval (MDR) and Quality Education Data (QED) Files Classified as Regular, Vocational, or Alternative on the Common Core of Data File: 1994-95 School Year**

*This table shows the number of schools classified as special education on the MDR and QED files that matched to schools on the CCD file with a school type of regular, vocational, or alternative.*

State	Market Data Retrieval (MDR)				Quality Education Data (QED)			
	CCD School Type:				CCD School Type:			
	Total	Regular	Vocational	Alternative	Total	Regular	Vocational	Alternative
Total, All States	109	72	8	29	110	78	2	30
Alabama	10	10	0	0	10	10	0	0
Alaska	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Arizona	5	4	0	1	4	3	0	1
Arkansas	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
California	1	1	0	0	8	8	0	0
Colorado	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Connecticut	2	1	0	1	3	1	0	2
Delaware	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dis. of Columbia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Florida	5	2	0	3	4	3	0	1
Georgia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hawaii	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Idaho	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Illinois	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0
Indiana	1	1	0	0	2	1	0	1
Iowa	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Kansas	6	0	0	6	2	0	0	2
Kentucky	8	0	0	8	5	2	0	3
Louisiana	2	0	2	0	3	1	0	2
Maine	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maryland	2	0	0	2	4	2	0	2
Massachusetts	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Michigan	5	2	2	1	1	1	0	0
Minnesota	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2
Mississippi	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Missouri	12	12	0	0	8	6	0	2
Montana	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nebraska	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nevada	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Hampshire	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Jersey	3	3	0	0	5	5	0	0
New Mexico	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
New York	7	7	0	0	7	7	0	0
North Carolina	1	1	0	0	3	1	0	2
North Dakota	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Ohio	8	6	2	0	7	5	2	0
Oklahoma	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Oregon	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Pennsylvania	2	2	0	0	3	3	0	0
Rhode Island	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
South Dakota	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Tennessee	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1
Texas	8	4	0	4	5	2	0	3
Utah	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vermont	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Virginia	1	1	0	0	2	1	0	1
Washington	1	1	0	0	5	1	0	4
West Virginia	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Wisconsin	5	5	0	0	4	4	0	0
Wyoming	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Notes: A state-by-state listing of the specific schools (name and CCD identification number) is found in Appendix C.  
Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database. School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT.  
Quality Education Data. School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ.  
U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

**Table 3-6. Vocational Schools on the Market Data Retrieval (MDR) and Quality Education Data (QED) Files Classified as Regular, Special Education, or Alternative on the Common Core of Data File: 1994-95 School Year**

*This table shows the number of schools classified as vocational on the MDR and QED files that matched to schools on the CCD file with a school type of regular, vocational, or alternative.*

State	Market Data Retrieval (MDR)				Quality Education Data (QED)			
	CCD School Type:				CCD School Type:			
	Total	Regular	Special Ed.	Alternative	Total	Regular	Special Ed.	Alternative
Total, All States	43	21	8	14	85	35	20	30
Alabama	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alaska	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arizona	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arkansas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
California	2	1	1	0	8	3	0	5
Colorado	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Connecticut	1	0	0	1	2	0	1	1
Delaware	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dis. of Columbia	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Florida	2	0	0	2	7	0	3	4
Georgia	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Hawaii	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Idaho	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Illinois	10	9	1	0	16	12	4	0
Indiana	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Iowa	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Kansas	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	1
Kentucky	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Louisiana	4	0	3	1	4	0	2	2
Maine	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maryland	1	0	0	1	2	0	1	1
Massachusetts	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	2
Michigan	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
Minnesota	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	2
Mississippi	2	1	0	1	5	4	0	1
Missouri	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montana	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nebraska	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Nevada	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Jersey	1	0	1	0	2	0	2	0
New Mexico	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New York	0	0	0	0	5	3	2	0
North Carolina	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	2
North Dakota	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ohio	2	1	0	1	2	2	0	0
Oklahoma	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oregon	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2
Pennsylvania	3	3	0	0	1	1	0	0
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Dakota	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tennessee	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Texas	3	2	0	1	7	3	1	3
Utah	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vermont	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Virginia	2	0	1	1	7	1	3	3
Washington	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
West Virginia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wisconsin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wyoming	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Notes: A state-by-state listing of the specific schools (name and CCD identification number) is found in Appendix C.  
Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database. School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT.  
Quality Education Data. School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ.  
U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

**Table 3-7. Alternative Schools on the Market Data Retrieval (MDR) and Quality Education Data (QED) Files Classified as Regular, Special Education, or Vocational on the Common Core of Data File: 1994-95 School Year**

*This table shows the number of schools classified as alternative on the MDR and QED files that matched to schools on the CCD file with a school type of regular, special education, or vocational.*

State	Market Data Retrieval (MDR)				Quality Education Data (QED)			
	CCD School Type:				CCD School Type:			
	Total	Regular	Special Ed.	Vocational	Total	Regular	Special Ed.	Vocational
Total, All States	204	141	55	8	230	155	66	9
Alabama	2	1	1	0	2	2	0	0
Alaska	2	1	0	1	3	2	1	0
Arizona	1	1	0	0	2	1	0	1
Arkansas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
California	6	5	1	0	12	9	3	0
Colorado	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
Connecticut	2	2	0	0	3	3	0	0
Delaware	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dis. of Columbia	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0
Florida	16	14	2	0	19	10	8	1
Georgia	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hawaii	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Idaho	1	0	1	0	2	1	1	0
Illinois	21	0	21	0	17	2	15	0
Indiana	5	4	0	1	2	2	0	0
Iowa	3	0	3	0	3	1	2	0
Kansas	3	3	0	0	2	2	0	0
Kentucky	12	11	1	0	8	7	1	0
Louisiana	1	0	1	0	5	2	1	2
Maine	4	4	0	0	2	2	0	0
Maryland	2	0	2	0	4	1	3	0
Massachusetts	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Michigan	13	12	1	0	8	7	1	0
Minnesota	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mississippi	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0
Missouri	4	4	0	0	4	4	0	0
Montana	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nebraska	8	6	2	0	6	5	1	0
Nevada	2	0	2	0	2	1	1	0
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Jersey	5	2	2	1	6	2	3	1
New Mexico	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0
New York	14	12	2	0	10	9	1	0
North Carolina	7	7	0	0	3	3	0	0
North Dakota	4	4	0	0	2	2	0	0
Ohio	9	6	2	1	44	34	9	1
Oklahoma	6	6	0	0	2	2	0	0
Oregon	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Pennsylvania	7	6	1	0	6	5	0	1
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0
South Dakota	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tennessee	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Texas	13	7	4	2	16	11	4	1
Utah	1	0	0	1	2	0	2	0
Vermont	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Virginia	3	0	2	1	4	2	2	0
Washington	18	15	3	0	12	9	3	0
West Virginia	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
Wisconsin	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	0
Wyoming	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0

Notes: A state-by-state listing of the specific schools (name and CCD identification number) is found in Appendix C.  
Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database, School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT.  
Quality Education Data, School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ.  
U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

## Chapter 4. Comparison of Data Files By Agency and File Type

### Section 4.0 Introduction

This chapter examines school coverage of the CCD survey by agency and file type. On the CCD survey, the agency types include local, regional, state, federal, and other groupings. (Appendix B provides a detailed description of these agency type codes.) The agency type categories for the MDR survey included public, state, regional, and BIA. The agency types for the QED survey were public, state, DOD, and BIA. Definitions of these terms are provided in the sections that follow. Table 1-1 and Appendix A help to further clarify these relationships as well as to identify the number of schools associated with each type.

The CCD file was compared to several sources. For regionally- and state-operated schools, the CCD file was compared to the MDR and QED files. The regionally-operated schools on the CCD file were identified by their agency type. The MDR staff provided a separate file of both regionally (county)- and state-operated schools. The state-operated schools in the QED file were identified by file type.

The BIA schools in the CCD file were compared to a list from the BIA and to the MDR and QED files. The CCD BIA schools were primarily found under the federal agency type code. A September 1997 list of BIA schools was found on the Bureau of Indian Affairs Office of Indian Education Programs web site. The CCD file and the Fall 1996 National Charter School Directory were compared. The CCD file does not identify charter schools<sup>6</sup>. The National Charter School Directory stated the year each school opened. Only the schools listed as opened for or during the 1994-95 school year were compared to the CCD file.

Based on the MDR file, the total number of schools, not including the outlying areas, was 83,953. A comparison to the CCD file of 86,220 schools resulted in a total of 2,842 schools found on the MDR file, but not on the CCD file and a total of 3,011 schools found on the CCD file, but not on the MDR file. Tables 4-1 and 4-3 at the end of this chapter highlight these totals and the state-by-state numbers.

The number of schools found on the QED file totaled 87,135. Based on comparison of the QED and CCD files, there were a total of 2,786 schools found on the QED file, but not on the CCD file and some 3,600 schools listed on the CCD file, but not on the QED

file. The lack of agreement of non-matching counts is partially due to situations where one school matched to many schools and vice-versa. See Tables 4-2 and 4-4 at the end of this chapter for state-by-state figures.

### Section 4.1 Regionally-Operated Schools

#### Definitions

##### CCD

There was no specific reference in the documentation. For the purposes of this evaluation, education agency type codes “3” or “4” were considered to be “regionally-operated.” The education agency type code is a classification of education agencies within the geographic boundaries of a state according to the level of administrative and operational control (see Appendix B).

##### MDR

“County-Operated Schools

. . . An educational organization, operated by the county, that provides instruction to the public. These schools usually provide special services such as special and adult education and vocational education. Some county schools are administered by county superintendents’ offices; others are independent.”

For this evaluation, these MDR schools were compared to the regionally-operated schools on the CCD file and are identified as such.

##### QED

There was none in the documentation.

#### Findings

##### *How Many Regionally-Operated Schools?*

There were 994 schools coded as regionally-operated on the CCD file and 1,335 regionally-operated schools on the MDR file. Schools in the QED file identified as public schools that were either a supervisory union or a district in a supervisory union were thought to be regionally-operated. However, based on the QED file, electronic comparisons between the CCD and the QED regionally-operated schools produced 24 matches. Hand matches produced no additional matches. The conclusion was that the two files did not represent the same type of schools.

---

<sup>6</sup>The reporting of charter schools was included for the expanded 1998-99 CCD Survey cycle.

**Non-matching Schools**

*Schools Not on the CCD File*

There were 755 schools coded as regionally-operated schools on the MDR file that were not on the CCD file. Interestingly, only 17 states had more than one county-operated school that did not match between files. California and Ohio accounted for 318 and 206, respectively, of these schools (about 70 percent). For California, this number represented almost 50 percent of all schools that did not match in that state, while in Ohio the 206 regionally-operated schools not matching to the CCD file accounted for over 85 percent of their non-matching schools. See Table 4-1 for counts by state. The following table shows the MDR school types for the 755 schools:

<b>Table 4a. Regionally-Operated Schools on the Market Data Retrieval File but Not on the Common Core of Data File, Counts By School Type: 1994-95 School Year</b>	
MDR School Type	Count
Adult	6
Regular	244
Special	437
Vocational	68
<b>Total</b>	<b>755</b>
Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database, School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".	

*Schools Not on the MDR File*

There were 491 regionally-operated schools listed on the CCD file that did not appear on the MDR file. Two states, California and Minnesota, with 113 and 97 schools respectively, accounted for almost half of this total. As a percentage of all non-matching schools for a particular state, Vermont had the highest representation (91 percent) of regionally-operated schools. Thirty-one states did not have any regionally-operated schools found on the CCD file, but not on the MDR file. Table 4-3 at the end of this chapter presents state by state counts. The table below lists the CCD school types for the 491 schools:

<b>Table 4b. Regionally-Operated Schools on the Common Core of Data File but Not on the Market Data Retrieval File, Counts By School Type: 1994-95 School Year</b>	
CCD School Type	Count
Regular	38
Special	297
Vocational	17
Alternative	139
<b>Total</b>	<b>491</b>
Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database, School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".	

**Matching Schools**

*Agency Types Did Not Match*

Two schools coded as regionally-operated on the MDR file matched on identification number or name and address between the MDR and CCD files, but the agency type on the CCD file was the local school district. The schools were the Oshkosh Elementary School in Nebraska and the Dorechester County Career School in South Carolina.

**Section 4.2 State-Operated Schools**

**Definitions**

**CCD**

“State-Operated Agency

An education agency or program operated by a state/territorial government. Examples include elementary/secondary programs operated by the state for the deaf or blind and programs operated by state correctional facilities.”

**MDR**

“State-Operated Schools

... An educational organization operated by the state that provides instruction to the public. These schools primarily provide special services in special education or vocational education. Examples are state-run schools for the blind and state vocational-technical schools.”

## QED

There was none in the documentation.

### Findings

#### *How Many State-Operated Schools?*

Of the 86,220 schools on the 1994-95 CCD file, 304 were coded as state-operated. The CCD definition included territorial schools but there were no territorial schools listed on the CCD file. The MDR file had 618 state-operated schools, while the QED file identified 178 such schools. Tables A-1, A-2, and A-3 in Appendix A provide additional description.

#### *Non-matching Schools*

##### *Schools Not on the CCD File*

There were 379 schools coded as state-operated on the MDR file that were not on the CCD file. There was a fairly even distribution among the states of these schools. Louisiana, with 55, accounted for the greatest number of these schools, while only 2 other states - Colorado and Delaware - had state-operated schools that accounted for more than half of that state's non-matching schools. Four states - Hawaii, Minnesota, Nevada, and North Dakota did not have any state-operated schools that were found on the MDR file, but not on the CCD file. See Table 4-1 for counts by state. The following table shows the MDR school types for the 379 schools:

<b>Table 4c. State-Operated Schools on the Market Data Retrieval File but Not on the Common Core of Data File, Counts By School Type: 1994-95 School Year</b>	
MDR School Type	Count
Regular	95
Special	173
Vocational	14
Adult	97
Total	379
Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database, School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".	

There were 61 schools coded as state-operated on the QED file not found on the CCD file. Of the 32 total non-matching schools in Vermont found on the QED file, but not on the CCD file, 18 were coded as state-operated. No other state had more than five non-matching state-operated schools. Table 4-2 provides

counts by state. The following list shows the QED school types for the 61 schools:

<b>Table 4d. State-Operated Schools on the Quality Education Data File but Not on the Common Core of Data File, Counts By School Type: 1994-95 School Year</b>	
QED School Type	Count
Regular	9
Special	32
Vocational	15
Alternative	4
Adult	1
Total	61
Sources: Quality Education Data File, School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".	

##### *Schools Not on the MDR File*

There were 113 state-operated schools listed on the CCD file that did not appear on the MDR file. The majority of these schools were found in Missouri, Illinois and Connecticut. As a percentage of all non-matching schools for these three states, Connecticut's 23 (out of 57) non-matching state-operated schools represented the greatest percent. Thirty-five states did not have any state-operated schools that were found on the CCD file, but not on the MDR file. See Table 4-3 at the end of this chapter for counts by state. The following table lists the CCD school types for the 113 schools:

<b>Table 4e. State-Operated Schools on the Common Core of Data File but Not on the Market Data Retrieval File, Counts By School Type: 1994-95 School Year</b>	
CCD School Type	Count
Regular	9
Special	19
Vocational	1
Alternative	84
Total	113
Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database, School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".	

### *Schools Not on the QED File*

There were 71 state-operated schools listed on the CCD file that did not appear on the QED file. Only 20 of the states reported non-matching state-operated schools. Missouri and Nebraska accounted for the highest state totals with 10 and 7, respectively, of these schools (see Table 4-4 for counts by state). The table below shows the CCD school types for the 71 schools:

CCD School Type	Count
Regular	14
Special	26
Vocational	1
Alternative	30
Total	71

Sources: Quality Education Data File, School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

### **Matching Schools**

#### *School Types Did Not Match*

For state-operated schools on the MDR file, 21 matched on name and address between the MDR and CCD files, but the agency type in the CCD file was not state-operated. The 19 schools are listed in Appendix C.

For state-operated schools on the QED file, three matched on identification number or name and address between the QED and CCD files, but the agency type in the CCD file was the local school district. The schools were the Alabama School of Fine Arts High School, the Mount Edgecumbe High School in Alaska, and the Farm Home Junior/Senior High School in Oregon.

### **Section 4.3 Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools**

#### **Definitions**

##### **CCD**

"American Indian/Alaskan Native

A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North America, and who maintains cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community

recognition."

#### **BIA**

The BIA December 1997 web site indicated that the BIA schools include:

- "elementary and secondary schools operated by the BIA"
- "peripheral dormitories<sup>7</sup> on reservations" operated by the BIA
- "peripheral dormitories which are Bureau funded [by the BIA] and tribally operated under contracts or grants"
- "off-reservation boarding schools" funded by the BIA".

#### **MDR**

"Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) Schools

. . . A federally funded school run by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Geographically remote, BIA schools can be either day or boarding schools."

#### **QED**

There was none in the documentation.

#### **Findings**

##### **How Many BIA Schools?**

The CCD file does not have a code to specifically identify BIA schools, although most BIA schools were classified under the federal agency type. The MDR and QED files identified 169 and 219 BIA schools, respectively.

##### **Non-matching Schools**

###### *Schools Not on the CCD File*

There were 122 schools classified as BIA schools on the MDR file that were not on the CCD file. Two states, Arizona with 48 and New Mexico with 42, accounted for almost three-fourths of all non-matching BIA schools. Thirty-four states reported no non-matching BIA schools. Table 4-1 at the end of the chapter provides counts by state.

<sup>7</sup>"Peripheral dormitories are established on reservations for Indian students who attend nearby public schools." Source: The BIA Office of Indian Education Programs Internet site.

There were 158 schools with a BIA code on the QED file not found on the CCD file. Not surprisingly, the states of Arizona and New Mexico accounted for the majority of these schools. For Arizona, its 51 non-matching BIA school accounted for 65 percent of all schools found on the QED file but not the CCD file, while the 50 such schools in New Mexico accounted for almost 85 percent. Table 4-2 at the end of this chapter provides state-by-state counts.

*CCD Schools with High Percentages of Native Americans*

Several CCD file schools, excluding Alaskan schools, had high percentages of Native American students that did not match to a BIA school. There were 53 schools in which all of the students were American Indians on the CCD file that did not match to a BIA school. There were 159 schools where between 90 and 99 percent of the students were American Indians that did not match to a BIA school. These schools were classified under local or regional agency types.

No comparison was done for Alaska because the BIA Internet site does not list schools for Alaska. According to the CCD file, there were 58 schools in Alaska with an all American Indian/Alaskan Native student population. The CCD file listed 91 schools in Alaska where between 90 and 99 percent of the student population was American Indian/Alaskan Native. These schools were classified under the local agency type.

**Matching Schools**

Most of the BIA schools on the CCD file were found under the federal agency type. These schools were compared to the BIA list. See tables in Appendix C for a list of matching schools.

**Section 4.4 Charter Schools**

**Definitions**

**CCD**

There was no definition in the documentation.

**National Charter School Directory**

There was no definition in the documentation.

**Findings**

**How Many Charter Schools?**

According to the 1996 National Charter School Directory, there were approximately 100 charter schools, located in just 7 states, in the United States during the 1994-95 school year. The 1994-95 CCD file contained 79 of the charter schools in the United States.

**Non-matching Schools**

**Schools Not on the CCD File**

There were 21 charter schools listed in the directory as open during all or part of the 1994-95 school year that were not on the CCD file. The table below provides counts by state. See the tables in Appendix C for a list of the schools not found on the CCD file.

State	Counts of Schools Not on the CCD	Counts of Schools Found on the CCD	Total Counts of Schools by State
California	13	49	62
Colorado	0	14	14
Minnesota	2	12	14
New Mexico	1	3	4
Michigan	3	0	3
Wisconsin	1	1	2
Arizona	1	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>100</b>

Sources: National Charter School Directory, Fall 1996, The Center for Education Reform, Washington, D.C. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

**Matching Schools**

Of the 100 charter schools listed in the directory, 79 schools (in just 5 states) were found on the CCD file. Of the five states reporting charter schools, California with 49 schools accounted for more than half of the total. Tables in Appendix C provide a listing of the schools.

*School Names Did Not Match*

The school listed as The Charter School of San Diego on the directory appeared as the Student Success Program, school identification number 063432003939, on the CCD file.

**Table 4-1. Comparison of the Market Data Retrieval (MDR) File to the Common Core of Data (CCD) File, by File Type and State, for the 1994-95 School Year**

*This table shows the counts, by state and file type, of schools found on the Market Data Retrieval File but NOT found on the Common Core of Data File for the 1994-95 school year.*

State	Total no. of schools on MDR File	Total no. of schools found on MDR but NOT on CCD	No. of schools found on MDR but NOT on CCD, by file type:			
			Public	State	Regional	BIA
Total, All States	83,953	2,842	1,586	379	755	122
Alabama	1,400	114	105	9	0	0
Alaska	458	4	2	2	0	0
Arizona	1,146	81	26	3	4	48
Arkansas	1,086	70	46	23	1	0
California	8,162	584	251	13	318	2
Colorado	1,334	23	7	13	3	0
Connecticut	994	10	5	4	1	0
Delaware	184	15	7	8	0	0
Dis. of Columbia	173	5	3	2	0	0
Florida	2,498	26	21	3	0	2
Georgia	1,903	123	91	31	1	0
Hawaii	248	7	7	0	0	0
Idaho	577	8	2	4	0	2
Illinois	3,945	24	14	2	8	0
Indiana	1,885	25	16	7	2	0
Iowa	1,423	23	10	8	4	1
Kansas	1,479	46	31	13	1	1
Kentucky	1,426	121	116	4	1	0
Louisiana	1,524	79	23	55	0	1
Maine	724	7	3	3	1	0
Maryland	1,288	16	10	6	0	0
Massachusetts	1,813	31	30	1	0	0
Michigan	3,466	171	102	6	62	1
Minnesota	1,516	33	28	0	1	4
Mississippi	983	5	4	1	0	0
Missouri	2,050	12	10	2	0	0
Montana	690	15	10	3	0	2
Nebraska	1,195	9	6	2	1	0
Nevada	393	6	4	0	0	2
New Hampshire	440	11	8	3	0	0
New Jersey	2,332	60	46	10	4	0
New Mexico	722	51	7	2	0	42
New York	4,175	152	49	13	90	0
North Carolina	2,002	37	30	7	0	0
North Dakota	456	3	2	0	0	1
Ohio	3,928	241	26	9	206	0
Oklahoma	1,739	78	69	5	2	2
Oregon	1,230	24	19	3	2	0
Pennsylvania	3,204	57	23	10	24	0
Rhode Island	317	10	7	2	1	0
South Carolina	1,134	50	39	11	0	0
South Dakota	594	23	18	4	1	0
Tennessee	1,579	46	23	23	0	0
Texas	6,203	146	127	14	5	0
Utah	724	18	10	7	0	1
Vermont	356	22	21	1	0	0
Virginia	1,868	45	26	16	3	0
Washington	1,837	25	15	3	0	7
West Virginia	885	11	8	2	1	0
Wisconsin	1,911	34	21	5	5	3
Wyoming	354	5	2	1	2	0

Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database. School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

**Table 4-2. Comparison of the Quality Education Data (QED) File to the Common Core of Data (CCD) File, by File Type and State, for the 1994-95 School Year**

*This table shows the counts, by state and file type, of schools found on the Quality Education Data File but NOT found on the Common Core of Data File for the 1994-95 school year.*

State	Total no. of schools on QED File	Total no. of schools found on QED but NOT on CCD	No. of schools found on QED but NOT on CCD, by file type*:			
			Public	State	DOD	BIA
Total, All States	87,135	2,786	2,497	61	70	158
Alabama	1,436	98	93	0	5	0
Alaska	481	12	10	0	0	2
Arizona	1,175	78	25	2	0	51
Arkansas	1,137	33	33	0	0	0
California	8,357	736	731	3	0	2
Colorado	1,393	14	13	1	0	0
Connecticut	1,028	26	26	0	0	0
Delaware	194	5	5	0	0	0
Dis. of Columbia	200	8	7	0	0	1
Florida	2,823	69	67	0	0	2
Georgia	1,991	110	92	3	15	0
Hawaii	265	13	13	0	0	0
Idaho	579	3	1	0	0	2
Illinois	4,119	19	19	0	0	0
Indiana	1,925	22	22	0	0	0
Iowa	1,522	17	14	2	0	1
Kansas	1,520	34	30	2	0	2
Kentucky	1,517	110	90	2	18	0
Louisiana	1,501	31	29	1	0	1
Maine	733	8	7	1	0	0
Maryland	1,354	27	24	3	0	0
Massachusetts	1,909	23	22	1	0	0
Michigan	3,550	189	186	2	0	1
Minnesota	1,585	32	27	0	0	5
Mississippi	1,025	8	7	0	0	1
Missouri	2,181	18	17	1	0	0
Montana	725	13	9	0	0	4
Nebraska	1,332	8	8	0	0	0
Nevada	432	5	4	0	0	1
New Hampshire	444	5	5	0	0	0
New Jersey	2,391	78	76	2	0	0
New Mexico	786	59	7	2	0	50
New York	4,305	126	123	2	1	0
North Carolina	2,095	30	11	1	18	0
North Dakota	468	6	2	0	0	4
Ohio	3,905	139	139	0	0	0
Oklahoma	1,892	72	62	2	0	8
Oregon	1,235	16	15	0	0	1
Pennsylvania	3,260	64	63	1	0	0
Rhode Island	324	7	7	0	0	0
South Carolina	1,162	39	32	0	7	0
South Dakota	740	24	18	0	0	6
Tennessee	1,652	44	39	5	0	0
Texas	6,263	135	135	0	0	0
Utah	739	19	15	2	0	2
Vermont	376	32	14	18	0	0
Virginia	1,914	35	26	2	6	1
Washington	1,892	33	25	0	0	8
West Virginia	899	10	10	0	0	0
Wisconsin	2,032	35	33	0	0	2
Wyoming	372	9	9	0	0	0

\* The prison school file type is excluded from these counts.

Sources: Quality Education Data. School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

**Table 4-3. Comparison of the Common Core of Data (CCD) File to the Market Data Retrieval (MDR) File, by Agency Type and State, for the 1994-95 School Year**

*This table shows the counts, by state and agency type, of schools found on the Common Core of Data File but NOT found on the Market Data Retrieval File for the 1994-95 school year.*

State	Total no. of schools on CCD File	Total no. of schools found on CCD but NOT on MDR	No. of schools found on CCD but NOT on MDR, by agency type:				
			Local	Regional	State	Federal	Other
Total, All States	86,220	3,011	2,359	491	113	7	41
Alabama	1,309	18	17	0	1	0	0
Alaska	496	34	34	0	0	0	0
Arizona	1,136	58	46	3	1	5	3
Arkansas	1,061	4	2	0	2	0	0
California	7,821	253	140	113	0	0	0
Colorado	1,460	66	49	17	0	0	0
Connecticut	1,045	57	25	6	23	0	3
Delaware	182	13	13	0	0	0	0
Dis. of Columbia	175	7	7	0	0	0	0
Florida	2,733	255	250	0	3	0	2
Georgia	1,766	9	9	0	0	0	0
Hawaii	242	1	1	0	0	0	0
Idaho	607	27	27	0	0	0	0
Illinois	4,195	107	47	31	28	0	1
Indiana	1,911	42	35	7	0	0	0
Iowa	1,555	13	13	0	0	0	0
Kansas	1,491	11	11	0	0	0	0
Kentucky	1,374	38	38	0	0	0	0
Louisiana	1,459	20	10	0	5	0	5
Maine	733	14	13	1	0	0	0
Maryland	1,263	7	7	0	0	0	0
Massachusetts	1,831	52	20	6	4	0	22
Michigan	3,432	130	113	16	0	0	1
Minnesota	2,099	510	412	97	1	0	0
Mississippi	1,018	37	33	0	4	0	0
Missouri	2,234	86	56	0	26	0	4
Montana	903	5	5	0	0	0	0
Nebraska	1,422	77	36	39	2	0	0
Nevada	421	24	23	0	1	0	0
New Hampshire	458	2	2	0	0	0	0
New Jersey	2,295	27	16	11	0	0	0
New Mexico	715	24	24	0	0	0	0
New York	4,130	42	15	27	0	0	0
North Carolina	1,968	6	6	0	0	0	0
North Dakota	619	34	4	30	0	0	0
Ohio	3,813	88	84	0	4	0	0
Oklahoma	1,824	7	7	0	0	0	0
Oregon	1,214	18	12	6	0	0	0
Pennsylvania	3,190	19	11	5	3	0	0
Rhode Island	308	3	3	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	1,094	18	18	0	0	0	0
South Dakota	825	30	22	6	0	2	0
Tennessee	1,555	23	23	0	0	0	0
Texas	6,477	325	325	0	0	0	0
Utah	727	18	18	0	0	0	0
Vermont	394	65	6	59	0	0	0
Virginia	1,851	28	20	8	0	0	0
Washington	2,066	229	229	0	0	0	0
West Virginia	883	12	7	0	5	0	0
Wisconsin	2,030	14	14	0	0	0	0
Wyoming	410	4	1	3	0	0	0

Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database. School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

**Table 4-4. Comparison of the Common Core of Data (CCD) File to the Quality Education Data (QED) File, by Agency Type and State, for the 1994-95 School Year**

*This table shows the counts, by state and agency type, of schools found on the Common Core of Data File but NOT found on the Quality Education Data File for the 1994-95 school year.*

State	Total no. of schools on CCD File	Total no. of schools found on CCD but NOT on QED	No. of schools found on CCD but NOT on QED, by agency type:				
			Local	Regional	State	Federal	Other
Total, All States	86,220	3,600	3,033	458	71	0	38
Alabama	1,309	24	24	0	0	0	0
Alaska	496	45	45	0	0	0	0
Arizona	1,136	47	41	4	0	0	2
Arkansas	1,061	4	4	0	0	0	0
California	7,821	343	252	91	0	0	0
Colorado	1,460	111	92	19	0	0	0
Connecticut	1,045	51	35	7	6	0	3
Delaware	182	15	15	0	0	0	0
Dis. of Columbia	175	10	10	0	0	0	0
Florida	2,733	204	197	0	3	0	4
Georgia	1,766	27	27	0	0	0	0
Hawaii	242	1	1	0	0	0	0
Idaho	607	47	47	0	0	0	0
Illinois	4,195	96	66	26	2	0	2
Indiana	1,911	51	38	6	6	0	1
Iowa	1,555	27	27	0	0	0	0
Kansas	1,491	19	19	0	0	0	0
Kentucky	1,374	47	47	0	0	0	0
Louisiana	1,459	20	17	0	3	0	0
Maine	733	19	17	1	1	0	0
Maryland	1,263	11	11	0	0	0	0
Massachusetts	1,831	64	34	6	3	0	21
Michigan	3,432	170	157	12	0	0	1
Minnesota	2,099	515	427	87	1	0	0
Mississippi	1,018	48	43	0	5	0	0
Missouri	2,234	95	81	0	10	0	4
Montana	903	30	28	0	2	0	0
Nebraska	1,422	98	59	32	7	0	0
Nevada	421	22	22	0	0	0	0
New Hampshire	458	2	2	0	0	0	0
New Jersey	2,295	41	28	13	0	0	0
New Mexico	715	32	32	0	0	0	0
New York	4,130	138	106	32	0	0	0
North Carolina	1,968	20	17	0	3	0	0
North Dakota	619	40	10	29	1	0	0
Ohio	3,813	76	72	0	4	0	0
Oklahoma	1,824	12	12	0	0	0	0
Oregon	1,214	32	25	7	0	0	0
Pennsylvania	3,190	26	16	7	3	0	0
Rhode Island	308	9	8	0	1	0	0
South Carolina	1,094	13	13	0	0	0	0
South Dakota	825	46	32	8	6	0	0
Tennessee	1,555	26	26	0	0	0	0
Texas	6,477	390	390	0	0	0	0
Utah	727	26	26	0	0	0	0
Vermont	394	64	5	59	0	0	0
Virginia	1,851	53	45	8	0	0	0
Washington	2,066	250	250	0	0	0	0
West Virginia	883	13	10	0	3	0	0
Wisconsin	2,030	19	19	0	0	0	0
Wyoming	410	11	6	4	1	0	0

Sources: Quality Education Data. School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ.  
 U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

## **Chapter 5. Comparison of Data Files By School and Agency Type for the Outlying Areas**

### **Section 5.0 Introduction**

This chapter examines school coverage of the CCD survey for the five outlying areas of the U.S. - American Samoa, Guam, the Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands - and the Department of Defense. The comparison of data files described in this chapter, organized by school and agency type, is similar to the process explained in the previous two chapters.

For the outlying areas, the CCD file was compared only to the QED file. For this evaluation, MDR did not provide data files for the outlying area schools or the DOD schools. Table 1-1 and Appendix A provide a description of the school and agency type relationships as well as a count of the number of schools associated with each type.

The DOD overseas schools in the CCD file were compared to both the QED file and to listings from the DOD. The DOD overseas schools in the CCD file were identified by their overseas federal information processing standards (FIPS) geographic code. The DOD schools in the QED data file were identified by a file type designator. The DOD listings included these sources:

- a directory titled “Department of Defense Dependent Schools List of Schools 1995-96 School Year,” and
- a November 1997 listing of schools on the DOD Internet web site (see Appendix D for a full citation).

### **Section 5.1 Outlying Area Schools**

#### **Findings**

##### *How Many Outlying Area Schools?*

Based on the QED file, the total number of outlying area schools was 1,801. The number of outlying area schools found on the CCD file totaled 1,715. Based on comparison of the QED and CCD files, there were a total of 160 schools found on the QED file, but not on the CCD file and some 63 schools listed on the CCD file, but not on the QED file. See Tables 5-1 through 5-4 at the end of this chapter for area-by-area figures.

#### *Non-matching Schools*

##### *Schools Not on the CCD File*

All of the 160 schools found on the QED file which were not found on the CCD file were classified as regular for school type. For file type, nine of the schools (found in Puerto Rico) were identified as DOD with the remaining coded as public. See Tables 5-1 and 5-2 for counts by area.

##### *Schools Not on the QED File*

Of the 63 schools found on the CCD file but not on the QED file, Puerto Rico accounted for virtually all of these with 61 such schools. A majority (49) of these schools were classified as regular schools. The remaining 12 schools were evenly distributed over the other school types. See Tables 5-3 and 5-4 for counts by area.

### **Section 5.2 Department of Defense Schools**

#### **Definitions**

There were none in the sources reviewed.

#### **Findings**

##### *How Many Department of Defense Schools?*

##### *Domestic Schools*

The CCD file does not specifically code for domestic DOD schools by agency or file type. Most of these schools were, in fact, coded as regular in school type. These schools are generally accounted for (and, for the purposes of this evaluation, counted) by the state in which they are located. The QED file listed 79 domestic DOD schools, all of which were found in the states of Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, and Virginia.

##### *Overseas Schools*

The 1994-95 CCD file contained 190 DOD overseas schools, while the QED file listed 215. The DOD sources (the 1995-96 DOD directory and 1997 DOD Internet site) listed 195 overseas schools.

#### *Non-matching Schools*

##### *Schools Not on the CCD File*

There was a total of 22 schools (all regular schools) that were coded as overseas DOD schools on the QED file that were not on the CCD file. This total is listed on Tables 5-1 and 5-2 in the row for “Department of Defense”.

The five overseas DOD schools found on the DOD sources that were not listed on the 1994-95 CCD file include:

- The W. T. Sampson Elementary School and W. T. Sampson High School were not listed. These were the only DOD schools in Cuba. It is not known when these schools opened.
- The Hohenfels High School in Germany and the Osan Junior/Senior High School in Korea were not listed. The elementary school counterparts for these two schools were listed. It is not known when these schools opened.

The Liberty Intermediate School was not listed. It was opened in September of 1997 in England.

In addition, the DOD listed two boarding schools in England that were not on the CCD file: Lakenheath Dormitory and London Central Boarding School.

*Schools Not on the QED File*

There were two schools (both federally-operated agency type) coded as overseas DOD on the CCD file that were not on the QED file. This total is listed on Tables 5-3 and 5-4 in the row for “Department of Defense”.

**Table 5-1. Comparison of the Quality Education Data (QED) File to the Common Core of Data (CCD) File, by School Type and Outlying Area, for the 1994-95 School Year**

*This table shows the counts, by area and school type, of schools found on the Quality Education Data File but NOT found on the Common Core of Data File for the 1994-95 school year.*

State	Total no. of schools on QED File	Total no. of schools found on QED but NOT on CCD	Percentage of schools found on QED but NOT on CCD	No. of schools found on QED but NOT on CCD, by school type:				
				Regular	Special Ed.	Vocational	Alternative	Adult*
Total, All Areas	1,801	160	8.9	160	0	0	0	0
American Samoa	30	0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0
Guam	37	2	5.4	2	0	0	0	0
North. Marianas	25	0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	1,651	132	8.0	132	0	0	0	0
Virgin Islands	58	26	44.8	26	0	0	0	0
Dpt. of Defense <sup>#</sup>	215	22	10.2	22	0	0	0	0

<sup>#</sup>The DOD schools listed in this total include only overseas public schools. Domestic DOD schools are listed in state totals of Chapter 3 and 4 tables.

Sources: Quality Education Data. School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

**Table 5-2. Comparison of the Quality Education Data (QED) File to the Common Core of Data (CCD) File, by File Type and Outlying Area, for the 1994-95 School Year**

*This table shows the counts, by area and file type, of schools found on the Quality Education Data File but NOT found on the Common Core of Data File for the 1994-95 school year.*

State	Total no. of schools on QED File	Total no. of schools found on QED but NOT on CCD	No. of schools found on QED but NOT on CCD, by file type:			
			Public	State	DOD	BIA
Total, All Areas	1,801	160	151	0	9	0
American Samoa	30	0	0	0	0	0
Guam	37	2	2	0	0	0
North. Marianas	25	0	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	1,651	132	123	0	9	0
Virgin Islands	58	26	26	0	0	0
Dpt. of Defense <sup>#</sup>	215	22	0	0	22	0

<sup>#</sup>The DOD schools listed in this total include only overseas public schools. Domestic DOD schools are listed in state totals of Chapter 3 and 4 tables.

Sources: Quality Education Data. School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

<b>Table 5-3. Comparison of the Common Core of Data (CCD) File to the Quality Education Data (QED) File, by School Type and Outlying Area , for the 1994-95 School Year</b>							
<i>This table shows the counts, by area and school type, of schools found on the Common Core of Data File but NOT found on the Quality Education Data File for the 1994-95 school year.</i>							
State	Total no. of schools on CCD File	Total no. of schools found on CCD but NOT on QED	Percentage of schools found on CCD but NOT on QED	No. of schools found on CCD but NOT on QED, by school type:			
				Regular	Special Ed.	Vocational	Alternative
Total, All Areas	1,715	63	3.7	51	5	4	3
American Samoa	31	1	3.2	1	0	0	0
Guam	35	0	0.0	0	0	0	0
North. Marianas	25	1	4.0	1	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	1,592	61	3.8	49	5	4	3
Virgin Islands	32	0	0.0	0	0	0	0
Dpt. of Defense <sup>#</sup>	190	2	1.1	2	0	0	0

<sup>#</sup>The DOD schools listed in this total include only overseas public schools. Domestic DOD schools are listed in state totals of Chapter 3 and 4 tables.  
Sources: Quality Education Data. School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ.  
U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

<b>Table 5-4. Comparison of the Common Core of Data (CCD) File to the Quality Education Data (QED) File, by Agency Type and Outlying Area, for the 1994-95 School Year</b>							
<i>This table shows the counts, by state and agency type, of schools found on the Common Core of Data File but NOT found on the Quality Education Data File for the 1994-95 school year.</i>							
State	Total no. of schools on CCD File	Total no. of schools found on CCD but NOT on QED	No. of schools found on CCD but NOT on QED, by agency type:				
			Local	County	State	Federal	Other
Total, All Areas	1,715	63	63	0	0	0	0
American Samoa	31	1	1	0	0	0	0
Guam	35	0	0	0	0	0	0
North. Marianas	25	1	1	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	1,592	61	61	0	0	0	0
Virgin Islands	32	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dpt. of Defense <sup>#</sup>	190	2	0	0	0	2	0

<sup>#</sup>The DOD schools listed in this total include only overseas public schools. Domestic DOD schools are listed in state totals of Chapter 3 and 4 tables.  
Sources: Quality Education Data. School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ.  
U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## **Appendix A. Identifiers and Counts for the Common Core of Data, Market Data Retrieval, and Quality Education Data Files**

### **The CCD File Identifiers**

Schools in the CCD file were classified by school type and agency type. The CCD file had school types for regular, special, vocational and alternative education. The agency types covered local, regional, state and federal schools. Counts of open domestic schools by agency type<sup>8</sup> and school type are shown in Table A-1.

DOD domestic, BIA and charter schools existed in the file but were not identified as such. All of the DOD and most of the BIA schools were found under the federal agency type.

### **The MDR File Identifiers**

The MDR file contained file types for public,<sup>9</sup> BIA, state-operated and regionally-operated schools. For schools typed as public, the MDR file had school types of regular,<sup>10</sup> special, vocational and adult education. Regular type schools were also categorized by grade ranges. The MDR survey items queried if the schools were chartered or offered alternative education. Charter and alternative education were considered characteristics, not types, of schools. The DOD schools were not made available. Counts of open domestic schools by file type and school type are shown in Table A-2.

### **The QED File Identifiers**

The QED file contained file types for public,<sup>11</sup> BIA, state-operated, DOD and prison schools. A code in the district type field indicated if a school was regionally- operated. A code in the grade-level field indicated if a school was special, vocational, alternative or adult education. These grade-level field codes were treated as school types for this report. All schools typed as public and not identified as special, vocational, alternative or adult education were

---

<sup>8</sup>See Appendix B for a description of education agency type codes.

<sup>9</sup>BIA, state and regional schools also are publicly owned.

<sup>10</sup>The MDR does not use the term "regular." All schools typed as public and not special, adult or vocation education were referred to as "regular" in this report.

<sup>11</sup>BIA, state, DOD and prison schools also are publicly owned.

considered to be regular schools for this report. A school's status as a charter school was indicated by a code in the Innovative Program field. Counts of open domestic and DOD overseas schools by file type and program are shown in Table A-3.

### **Comparison of File Identifiers**

Although much of the organization and presentation of the findings of this evaluation appear by school and agency type, the schools were first compared and matched by state. The schools were then compared by file identifier. Generally, the classification order was 1) file or agency type, 2) school type, and 3) school characteristics. See Table A-4 for a comparison of the classification of schools between the CCD, MDR and QED files.

#### ***File or Agency Types***

The primary category at this level of organization on the CCD survey was agency type. Local, state-operated and regionally-operated schools were identified by their agency type. DOD and some BIA schools were identified under the federal agency type.

The primary category for the MDR and QED surveys was file type. The applicable MDR file types for this evaluation included: public, BIA, state-operated and county-operated (described as regionally-operated in this report). The applicable QED file types included: public, BIA, state-operated, DOD and prisons.

#### ***School Types***

The CCD and the MDR files contained school type fields. The QED file had grade-level field notations that indicated school types. The CCD file had school types of regular, special, vocational and alternative education for all schools. The MDR file had school types of regular, special, vocational and adult education for all schools except BIA schools. The QED file had special, vocational, alternative and adult education indicators in the grade ranges for the state and public schools.

#### ***Characteristics***

##### ***Alternative Education***

The MDR survey considered alternative education to be a characteristic, while the CCD and QED surveys treated it as a school type. The MDR definitions classified alternative education as a characteristic of public, state and county schools. A school could be regular, special, vocational or adult and also report that it had an alternative program. Only the BIA

schools were not asked if they offered an alternative program.

#### *Charter Schools*

Both the MDR and QED surveys classified charter school<sup>12</sup> status as a characteristic of schools. The CCD instructions did not address charter schools.

#### *Additional Programs*

The QED and MDR surveys questioned respondents about programs in addition to the main curriculum, while the CCD survey did not. The QED survey definitions classified special education as a possible additional program to the curriculum of any school. On the MDR survey, the definitions classified special and vocational education as possible additional programs at any school; alternative education as a possible additional program at any school except the BIA schools; and adult education as a possible additional program at the state and county schools. The CCD survey did not request information on additional programs.

---

<sup>12</sup>*The indicators in the charter school field represented a later school year and were not used for this evaluation.*

<b>Table A-1. School and Agency Types for the 1994-95 Common Core of Data File</b>				
CCD School Type	CCD Agency Type	U.S. Domestic School Counts*	Outlying Areas School Counts*	Total
Regular	Local	79,966	1,640	81,606
	County	278	0	278
	State	35	0	35
	Federal	64	190	254
	Other	30	0	30
	Total		80,373	1,830
Special Education	Local	1,497	23	1,520
	County	403	0	403
	State	114	0	114
	Total	2,014	23	2,037
Vocational	Local	688	20	708
	County	154	0	154
	State	19	0	19
	Other	34	0	34
	Total	895	20	915
Alternative	Local	2,633	6	2,639
	County	159	0	159
	State	136	0	136
	Federal	1	0	1
	Other	9	0	9
	Total	2,938	6	2,944
Total		86,220	1,879	88,099
<p>*The U.S. domestic total consists of the fifty states and the District of Columbia. The outlying areas consist of American Samoa, Guam, the Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the Department of Defense (overseas).  Sources: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".</p>				

MDR File Type	MDR School Type*	U.S. Domestic School Counts**
Public	Regular	79,402
	Special	941
	Vocational	1,035
	Adult	453
	Total	81,831
State	Regular	170
	Special	313
	Vocational	37
	Adult	98
	Total	618
County	Regular	642
	Special	529
	Vocational	158
	Adult	6
	Total	1,335
BIA	Na	169
Total		83,953
*The MDR survey considered alternative education to be a characteristic. A school could be regular, special education, vocational or adult and also report that it had an alternative program. There are 1,768 schools on the MDR file with an alternative program.		
**The MDR files did not contain the outlying areas.		
Source: Market Data Retrieval Database. School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT.		

QED File Type	QED Program (School Type)	U.S. Domestic School Counts*	Outlying Areas School Counts*	Total
Public	Regular	78,976	1,792	80,768
	Special	1,416	0	1,416
	Vocational	1,403	0	1,403
	Alternative	1,759	0	1,759
	Adult	600	0	600
	Total		84,154	1,792
State	Regular	48	0	48
	Special	104	0	104
	Vocational	17	0	17
	Alternative	7	0	7
	Adult	2	0	2
	Total		178	0
DOD	Na	70	221	291
BIA	Na	219	0	219
Prison	Na	2,514	3	2,517
Total		87,135	2,016	89,151
*The U.S. domestic total consists of the fifty states and the District of Columbia. The outlying areas consist of American Samoa, Guam, the Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the Department of Defense (overseas).				
Source: Quality Education Data. School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ.				

<b>Table A-4. Comparison of School Classifications between the 1994-95 Common Core of Data, Market Data Retrieval, and Quality Education Data Files</b>			
School Description	CCD	MDR	QED
public	All schools	file type	file type
regular	school type	not mentioned	not mentioned
special	school type	School type	school type
vocational	school type	School type	school type
alternative	school type	Characteristic	school type
adult	not mentioned	School type	school type
DOD	not mentioned	not available	file type
BIA	not mentioned	file type	file type
charter	not mentioned	Characteristic	Characteristic
state	agency type	file type	file type
regional	agency type	file type	district type/characteristic
Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database. School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation. Shelton, CT. Quality Education Data. School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".			

**Table A-5. Summary of Matching Schools – Common Core of Data (CCD) File and the Market Data Retrieval (MDR) File: 1994-95 School Year**

*This table shows, by state, the number and percent of electronic matches and hand matches based on the comparison of the Common Core of Data file and the Market Data Retrieval file for the 1994-95 school year.*

State	Common Core of Data (CCD)					Market Data Retrieval (MDR)				
	Total no. of schools	Electronic matches		Hand matches		Total no. of schools	Electronic matches		Hand matches	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total, All States	86,220	76,923	89.2	6,601	7.7	83,953	76,923	91.6	4,208	5.0
Alabama	1,309	1,253	95.7	42	3.2	1,400	1,253	89.5	33	2.4
Alaska	496	436	87.9	26	5.2	458	436	95.2	18	3.9
Arizona	1,136	1,018	89.6	64	5.6	1,146	1,018	88.8	47	4.1
Arkansas	1,061	969	91.3	92	8.7	1,086	969	89.2	45	4.1
California	7,821	7,221	92.3	366	4.7	8,162	7,221	88.5	358	4.4
Colorado	1,460	1,244	85.2	153	10.5	1,334	1,244	93.3	67	5.0
Connecticut	1,045	936	89.6	53	5.1	994	936	94.2	48	4.8
Delaware	182	161	88.5	8	4.4	184	161	87.5	8	4.3
Dis. of Columbia	175	165	94.3	4	2.3	173	165	95.4	3	1.7
Florida	2,733	2,370	86.7	114	4.2	2,498	2,370	94.9	122	4.9
Georgia	1,766	1,657	93.8	111	6.3	1,903	1,657	87.1	122	6.4
Hawaii	242	235	97.1	6	2.5	248	235	94.8	6	2.4
Idaho	607	545	89.8	37	6.1	577	545	94.5	24	4.2
Illinois	4,195	3,737	89.1	370	8.8	3,945	3,737	94.7	184	4.7
Indiana	1,911	1,806	94.5	66	3.5	1,885	1,806	95.8	54	2.9
Iowa	1,555	1,314	84.5	229	14.7	1,423	1,314	92.3	86	6.0
Kansas	1,491	1,395	93.6	90	6.0	1,479	1,395	94.3	38	2.6
Kentucky	1,374	1,263	91.9	79	5.7	1,426	1,263	88.6	42	2.9
Louisiana	1,459	1,410	96.6	38	2.6	1,524	1,410	92.5	35	2.3
Maine	733	675	92.1	47	6.4	724	675	93.2	42	5.8
Maryland	1,263	1,233	97.6	40	3.2	1,288	1,233	95.7	39	3.0
Massachusetts	1,831	1,671	91.3	114	6.2	1,813	1,671	92.2	111	6.1
Michigan	3,432	3,182	92.7	157	4.6	3,466	3,182	91.8	113	3.3
Minnesota	2,099	1,185	56.5	408	19.4	1,516	1,185	78.2	298	19.7
Mississippi	1,018	929	91.3	55	5.4	983	929	94.5	50	5.1
Missouri	2,234	1,904	85.2	251	11.2	2,050	1,904	92.9	134	6.5
Montana	903	622	68.9	271	30.0	690	622	90.1	52	7.5
Nebraska	1,422	799	56.2	549	38.6	1,195	799	66.9	387	32.4
Nevada	421	356	84.6	41	9.7	393	356	90.6	31	7.9
New Hampshire	458	426	93.0	30	6.6	440	426	96.8	3	0.7
New Jersey	2,295	2,221	96.8	51	2.2	2,332	2,221	95.2	51	2.2
New Mexico	715	618	86.4	72	10.1	722	618	85.6	53	7.3
New York	4,130	3,821	92.5	290	7.0	4,175	3,821	91.5	202	4.8
North Carolina	1,968	1,819	92.4	151	7.7	2,002	1,819	90.9	146	7.3
North Dakota	619	421	68.0	165	26.7	456	421	92.3	32	7.0
Ohio	3,813	3,629	95.2	98	2.6	3,928	3,629	92.4	58	1.5
Oklahoma	1,824	1,596	87.5	237	13.0	1,739	1,596	91.8	65	3.7
Oregon	1,214	1,103	90.9	94	7.7	1,230	1,103	89.7	102	8.3
Pennsylvania	3,190	3,031	95.0	146	4.6	3,204	3,031	94.6	116	3.6
Rhode Island	308	298	96.8	10	3.2	317	298	94.0	9	2.8
South Carolina	1,094	1,047	95.7	34	3.1	1,134	1,047	92.3	37	3.3
South Dakota	825	435	52.7	371	45.0	594	435	73.2	136	22.9
Tennessee	1,555	1,479	95.1	56	3.6	1,579	1,479	93.7	54	3.4
Texas	6,477	5,797	89.5	374	5.8	6,203	5,797	93.5	262	4.2
Utah	727	683	93.9	28	3.9	724	683	94.3	23	3.2
Vermont	394	320	81.2	10	2.5	356	320	89.9	14	3.9
Virginia	1,851	1,754	94.8	76	4.1	1,868	1,754	93.9	69	3.7
Washington	2,066	1,722	83.3	119	5.8	1,837	1,722	93.7	90	4.9
West Virginia	883	838	94.9	51	5.8	885	838	94.7	36	4.1
Wisconsin	2,030	1,833	90.3	191	9.4	1,911	1,833	95.9	44	2.3
Wyoming	410	341	83.2	66	16.1	354	341	96.3	9	2.5

Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database. School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT. Quality Education Data. School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

**Table A-6. Summary of Matching Schools – Common Core of Data (CCD) File and the Quality Education Data (QED) File: 1994-95 School Year**

*This table shows, by state, the number and percent of electronic matches and hand matches based on the comparison of the Common Core of Data file and the Quality Education Data file for the 1994-95 school year.*

State	Common Core of Data (CCD)					Quality Education Data (QED)				
	Total no. of schools	Electronic matches		Hand matches		Total no. of schools*	Electronic matches		Hand matches	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total, All States	86,220	72,719	84.3	10,437	12.1	87,135	72,719	83.5	9,170	10.5
Alabama	1,309	1,223	93.4	66	5.0	1,436	1,223	85.2	81	5.6
Alaska	496	408	82.3	45	9.1	481	408	84.8	41	8.5
Arizona	1,136	971	85.5	119	10.5	1,175	971	82.6	96	8.2
Arkansas	1,061	983	92.6	81	7.6	1,137	983	86.5	89	7.8
California	7,821	6,647	85.0	868	11.1	8,357	6,647	79.5	888	10.6
Colorado	1,460	1,232	84.4	119	8.2	1,393	1,232	88.4	105	7.5
Connecticut	1,045	928	88.8	68	6.5	1,028	928	90.3	44	4.3
Delaware	182	152	83.5	15	8.2	194	152	78.4	16	8.2
Dis. of Columbia	175	159	90.9	7	4.0	200	159	79.5	5	2.5
Florida	2,733	2,184	79.9	360	13.2	2,823	2,184	77.4	321	11.4
Georgia	1,766	1,473	83.4	278	15.7	1,991	1,473	74.0	295	14.8
Hawaii	242	232	95.9	9	3.7	265	232	87.5	9	3.4
Idaho	607	500	82.4	62	10.2	579	500	86.4	60	10.4
Illinois	4,195	3,693	88.0	436	10.4	4,119	3,693	89.7	342	8.3
Indiana	1,911	1,766	92.4	102	5.3	1,925	1,766	91.7	97	5.0
Iowa	1,555	1,310	84.2	222	14.3	1,522	1,310	86.1	163	10.7
Kansas	1,491	1,334	89.5	142	9.5	1,520	1,334	87.8	119	7.8
Kentucky	1,374	1,206	87.8	136	9.9	1,517	1,206	79.5	119	7.8
Louisiana	1,459	1,332	91.3	115	7.9	1,501	1,332	88.7	115	7.7
Maine	733	633	86.4	84	11.5	733	633	86.4	79	10.8
Maryland	1,263	1,158	91.7	96	7.6	1,354	1,158	85.5	111	8.2
Massachusetts	1,831	1,561	85.3	215	11.7	1,909	1,561	81.8	216	11.3
Michigan	3,432	3,001	87.4	293	8.5	3,550	3,001	84.5	285	8.0
Minnesota	2,099	1,053	50.2	541	25.8	1,585	1,053	66.4	475	30.0
Mississippi	1,018	856	84.1	122	12.0	1,025	856	83.5	123	12.0
Missouri	2,234	1,835	82.1	321	14.4	2,181	1,835	84.1	276	12.7
Montana	903	584	64.7	293	32.4	725	584	80.6	107	14.8
Nebraska	1,422	1,005	70.7	324	22.8	1,332	1,005	75.5	304	22.8
Nevada	421	296	70.3	104	24.7	432	296	68.5	98	22.7
New Hampshire	458	399	87.1	60	13.1	444	399	89.9	29	6.5
New Jersey	2,295	2,143	93.4	119	5.2	2,391	2,143	89.6	113	4.7
New Mexico	715	597	83.5	86	12.0	786	597	76.0	85	10.8
New York	4,130	3,695	89.5	340	8.2	4,305	3,695	85.8	282	6.6
North Carolina	1,968	1,671	84.9	305	15.5	2,095	1,671	79.8	284	13.6
North Dakota	619	408	65.9	174	28.1	468	408	87.2	49	10.5
Ohio	3,813	3,534	92.7	207	5.4	3,905	3,534	90.5	178	4.6
Oklahoma	1,824	1,426	78.2	399	21.9	1,892	1,426	75.4	335	17.7
Oregon	1,214	1,043	85.9	142	11.7	1,235	1,043	84.5	153	12.4
Pennsylvania	3,190	2,933	91.9	239	7.5	3,260	2,933	90.0	212	6.5
Rhode Island	308	262	85.1	43	14.0	324	262	80.9	39	12.0
South Carolina	1,094	1,030	94.1	60	5.5	1,162	1,030	88.6	59	5.1
South Dakota	825	501	60.7	289	35.0	740	501	67.7	201	27.2
Tennessee	1,555	1,433	92.2	105	6.8	1,652	1,433	86.7	107	6.5
Texas	6,477	4,846	74.8	1,334	20.6	6,263	4,846	77.4	1,213	19.4
Utah	727	667	91.7	35	4.8	739	667	90.3	31	4.2
Vermont	394	302	76.6	30	7.6	376	302	80.3	34	9.0
Virginia	1,851	1,642	88.7	167	9.0	1,914	1,642	85.8	165	8.6
Washington	2,066	1,575	76.2	249	12.1	1,892	1,575	83.2	232	12.3
West Virginia	883	808	91.5	80	9.1	899	808	89.9	69	7.7
Wisconsin	2,030	1,765	86.9	255	12.6	2,032	1,765	86.9	190	9.4
Wyoming	410	324	79.0	76	18.5	372	324	87.1	31	8.3

\*Includes the 2,514 prison schools. No attempt was made to match these schools to the CCD file, thus, they do not appear in the match or non-match counts.

Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database. School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT.

Quality Education Data. School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## Appendix B. Type Codes for the Common Core of Data File Education Agencies

Table B-1. The Common Core of Data File Education Agency Type Codes		
Level	Code	Description
Local	1	Local school district that is not a component of a supervisory union.
	2	Local school district component of a supervisory union sharing a superintendent and administrative services with other local school districts.
Regional	3	Supervisory union administrative center, or a county superintendent serving the same purposes.
	4	Regional education services agency, or a county superintendent serving the same purposes.
State	5	State-operated institution charged, at least in part, with providing elementary and/or secondary instruction or services to a special need population.
Federal	6	Federally-operated institution charged, at least in part, with providing elementary and/or secondary instruction or services to a special need population.
Other	7	Other education agencies that do not fit into the first six categories.
Sources: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".		

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## Appendix C. State-by-State Listing Tables

<b>Table C-1. Special Education Schools on the Market Data Retrieval (MDR) File Classified as Regular, Alternative, or Vocational on the Common Core of Data (CCD) File: 1994-95 School Year</b>			
State	CCD School Type	CCD Identification Number	CCD School Name
Alabama	regular	010180001669	Center for Developmental Learning
		010189001675	North Highland School
		010237001618	Augusta Evans School
		010243001691	Children's Center
		010243001692	Davis Learning Center
		010243001693	Madison Park Hope Center
		010273001698	Lakeside Center
		010303001803	Special Services Center/ Center for Exceptional Children
		010336001610	Oak Hill Special Education Facility
Alaska	alternative	010102001497	Cullman Child Development Center
		020018000061	Crossroads
Arizona	regular	020018000084	Jesse Lee Home
		040831001258	Getz School
		040253001291	Maryvale Elementary School
		040593001313	Roadrunner School
	040817000751	Ocotillo School	
	alternative	040880001450	Howenstine
Arkansas	regular	051068001410	Baring Cross Center
California	regular	063531005988	Harvey (Carl) Elementary
Connecticut	regular	090483000993	Wilson Learning Center
	alternative	090045001111	Franklin Education Center (Kolbe)
Florida	regular	120051000831	Sid Nelson Middle/Senior High School
		120162002530	Eleanor H. Miller School
	alternative	120039002129	Citrus Grove Occupational Training
		120192002270	Riverview Learning Center
		120039002814	Ruth Owens Kruse Education Center
Idaho	regular	160219000735	Idaho Youth Ranch
Indiana	regular	181305002385	Pershing Education Center
Kansas	alternative	201299000100	Greiffenstein Special Education Center
		201299000321	Wells Alternative Middle School
		201299000113	Levy Special Education Center
		200594000043	Stanton Street Early Childhood
		200360000187	Beamgard Center of Northwest K
		201014000036	Developmental Learning Center
Kentucky	alternative	210299000698	Central Kentucky Treatment Center
		210299000705	Cardinal Treatment Center
		210299000759	Hazelwood Facility School
		210299000788	Rice Audubon
		210299001613	Peace Academy
		210299001614	Johnson Breckinridge
		210309000814	Northern Kentucky Treatment Center Junior High
		210372001678	Madison Day Treatment Center

Continued

<b>Table C-1. Special Education Schools on the Market Data Retrieval (MDR) File Classified as Regular, Alternative, or Vocational on the Common Core of Data (CCD) File: 1994-95 School Year – Continued</b>			
State	CCD School Type	CCD Identification Number	CCD School Name
Louisiana	vocational	220054000451	Zion City Vocational Center
		220117001526	Danneel Pre-Vocational School
Maryland	alternative	240030090445	Choptank Youth Center
		240006090462	Phoenix Center – Annapolis
Massachusetts	regular	250279000210	Carter Development Day Care
		250279000342	William McKinley
Michigan	regular	262469007737	Lincoln School
		263531007470	Stepanski Childhood Center
	vocational	261803005480	Marta Jardon Vocational School
		262184005894	North West Wayne Skill Center
	alternative	263663000055	New Horizons Education Center
Minnesota	alternative	272124002048	Learning Rock
Mississippi	regular	280228000440	Mount Olive Attendance Center
Missouri	regular	292453000278	Early Child Special Education Center
		293144000229	Piney Ridge Center
		292928001929	Gallaudet School for Deaf Elementary
		292607002505	Northwood School
		291854002502	Ozanam/Liverty Northland Cooperative
		291640000865	R. J. Delano Elementary
		291434002287	Crittenton Center
		291434000661	Spofford Elementary
		290702002489	Cameron Special Services
		290537002407	Bolivar Severely Handicapped
		290531000270	Special Service Center
	292928001917	Elias Michael Elementary	
North Carolina	regular	370488000413	Edgewood Community Development
North Dakota	regular	380678000196	Evaluation and Training Center
New Hampshire	regular	330459000494	Chandler Elementary School
New Jersey	regular	340783002818	Number 31 Elementary School
		341134002244	Branch Brook H.
		341254006098	Passaic Alternative School
New Mexico	regular	350126000357	Washington Elementary
New York	regular	360475804758	Kiryas Joel Village School
		360744004507	Randolph Academy
		361240001008	Greenburgh-Graham Elementary School
		361542001311	Hopevale School
		362121004565	Main Street Elementary School
		362202004365	Roosevelt Education Center
	363076004137	West Park School	

Continued

<b>Table C-1. Special Education Schools on the Market Data Retrieval (MDR) File Classified as Regular, Alternative, or Vocational on the Common Core of Data (CCD) File: 1994-95 School Year – Continued</b>			
State	CCD School Type	CCD Identification Number	CCD School Name
Ohio	regular	390438000581	Alexander Graham Bell School
		391002203925	Lincolnview Marsh School
		390447404464	Barker School
		390438000587	Beatty Park School
		390438000611	Cole Rain School
	390438000608	Clearbrook School	
	vocational	390451004406	Industrial Training Center
		390513504081	Penta Skill Center Junior Vocational School
Pennsylvania	regular	420204006464	Rydalbrook School
		421899006960	Overbrook Education Center
Rhode Island	vocational	440090000214	Birch Vocational
South Dakota	regular	465982000531	Kibben-Kuster School
Texas	regular	483540004014	Wheatley Elementary School
		484122004722	Wunsche School
		481800000714	Carver Early Education Center
		482328006423	Harris Career Center
	alternative	483873006612	Gonzales Achievement Center
		482566006573	Killeen Development Center
		481168005663	Lincoln Park School
		483873006611	Alamo Achievement Center
Virginia	regular	510027000096	Jackson Center
Washington	regular	530003002271	Hopkins Elementary
West Virginia	vocational	540087000712	Clary Street Learning Center
Wisconsin	regular	551599002349	Plank Road School Complex
		550582000612	Bay View School
		550921001095	Life Task Center Prekindergarten
		551236001613	Garfield
		551368002450	Lightfoot School

Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database, School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

**Table C-2. Special Education Schools on the Quality Education Data (QED) File Classified as Regular, Alternative, or Vocational on the Common Core of Data (CCD) File: 1994-95 School Year**

State	CCD School Type	CCD Identification Number	CCD School Name
Alabama	regular	010039001643	Alabama School of Fine Arts High School
		010237001618	Augusta Evans School
		010243001691	Children's Center
		010237001686	Continuous Learning Center
		010102001497	Cullman Child Development Center
		010243001692	Davis Learning Center
		010273001698	Lakeside Center
		010243001693	Madison Park Hope Center
		010189001675	North Highland School
		010336001610	Oak Hill Special Education Facility
Arizona	regular	040831001258	Getz School
		040253001291	Maryvale Elementary School
		040593001313	Roadrunner School
	alternative	040880001450	Howenstine
Arkansas	regular	051068001410	Baring Cross Centre
California	regular	062121002545	Anderson (William) Elementary
		063462008195	Children's Receiving Home of S
		061146001264	Downey High School
		061455008842	Figarden Elementary School
		061111001230	Lincoln (Abraham) Elementary School
		062958004573	Manzanita Elementary School
		062985004652	Mokler (Major Lynn) Elementary School
062547003807	Rosewood Park Elementary School		
Colorado	regular	080345000445	Roxborough Elementary School
Connecticut	regular	090483000993	Wilson Learning Center
	alternative	090045001111	Franklin Education Center (Kolbe)
		090279000569	Polly T. McCabe Center
Florida	regular	120162002530	Eleanor H. Miller School
		120051002165	Judy Andrews Prekindergarten School
		120039002135	Merrick Education Center
	alternative	120177002637	Woodlands Academy
Illinois	regular	174333004331	Northwood Elementary School
		171371005505	Streamwood Elementary School
Indiana	regular	180477000814	Cold Spring School
	alternative	181272000233	Phoenix School
Iowa	regular	190858001881	Harry S. Truman School
Kansas	alternative	201014000036	Developmental Learning Center
		201299000100	Greiffenstein Special Education Center
Kentucky	regular	210249000527	Mulberry Helm Alternative High School
		210186000354	Scapa at Bluegrass
	alternative	210532001690	Cropper Day Treatment Center
		210299000759	Hazelwood Facility School
		210147000312	Owensboro Special Education School

Continued

<b>Table C-2. Special Education Schools on the Quality Education Data (QED) File Classified as Regular, Alternative, or Vocational on the Common Core of Data (CCD) File: 1994-95 School Year – Continued</b>			
State	CCD School Type	CCD Identification Number	CCD School Name
Louisiana	regular	220030000182	Northwood High School
	alternative	220099000749	Lincoln Center
		220120001006	Richardson School
Maryland	regular	240051001125	Panorama Elementary School
		240048000496	Stephen Knolls School
	alternative	240006090462	Phoenix Center – Annapolis
		240009001375	Upton School - Home and Hospital
Michigan	regular	262184007549	Webster Elementary School
Minnesota	alternative	272124002048	Learning Rock
		270609000468	State Hospital School
Missouri	regular	292706001647	Buchanan County Academy
		291434002287	Crittenton Center
		292928001917	Elias Michael Elementary School
		292928001929	Gallaudet School for Deaf Elementary
		292607002505	Northwood School
		291640000865	R. J. Delano Elementary School
	alternative	292280002535	Center For Educational Development
		291635002428	Washington Educational Center
New Jersey	regular	341377006057	Bergen Boulevard School
		341134002238	Boylan Street High School
		341134002244	Branch Brook High School
		340783002818	Number 3L Elementary School
		341680005971	South Vineland Elementary School
New Mexico	regular	350126000357	Washington Elementary School
New York	regular	360474000218	Central Boulevard Elementary School
		361542001311	Hopevale School
		360744004507	Randolph Academy
		362769003757	Rhinecliff High School
		362202004365	Roosevelt Education Center
		363076004137	West Park School
		362859003882	Y-Med Center
North Carolina	regular	370488000413	Edgewood Community Development School
	alternative	370387000788	Leak Street School
		370072000303	Memorial Hospital
North Dakota	regular	380678000196	Evaluation and Training Center
Ohio	regular	390438000581	Alexander Graham Bell School
		390438000587	Beatty Park School
		390438000608	Clearbrook School
		390438000611	Cole Rain School
		390449204473	Forest Special Needs School
	vocational	390508504055	Harrison Career Center
		390513504081	Penta Skill Center Junior Vocational School

Continued

<b>Table C-2. Special Education Schools on the Quality Education Data (QED) File Classified as Regular, Alternative, or Vocational on the Common Core of Data (CCD) File: 1994-95 School Year – Continued</b>			
State	CCD School Type	CCD Identification Number	CCD School Name
Oklahoma	regular	403012001576	Tonkawa Elementary School
Oregon	alternative	410348000049	Farm Home Junior/Senior High School
Pennsylvania	regular	421899003638	Boone Daniel School
		421899003711	Hill J. E./Freedman Samson School
		420204006464	Rydalbrook School
South Carolina	regular	450150000271	Blacksburg Elementary School
South Dakota	regular	465982000531	Kibben-Kuster School
Tennessee	regular	470027000060	Pikeville Elementary School
	alternative	470369001513	Daniel McKee Alternative School
Texas	regular	482028001994	Alamo Elementary School
		483873004378	Neal Elementary School
	alternative	484428005048	Hillcrest Professional Development School
		481168005663	Lincoln Park School
Virginia	regular	510027000096	Jackson Center
	alternative	510126000080	Falls Church Center
Washington	regular	530792002152	Fircrest School
	alternative	530825001397	Alternative Marian Heights High School
		530927001579	Alternative Pan Terra School
		530825001401	Alternative Real School
Wisconsin	regular	550921001095	Life Task Center Prekindergarten
		551368002450	Lightfoot School
		551599002349	Plank Road School Complex
		550732000829	Vernon Wing Elementary School

Sources: Quality Education Data, School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ.  
U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

**Table C-3. Schools Classified as Special Education that Match Between the Market Data Retrieval (MDR) and the Common Core of Data (CCD) Files on School Identification Number but Differ in Name: 1994-95 School Year**

State	CCD Identification Number	CCD School Name	MDR School Name
Alaska	020018000061	Crossroads	Booth Memorial Home School
Florida	120051000831	Sid Nelson Middle/ Senior High School	Eseal School
Illinois	170993004382	Rudolph School	Spaulding Branch Elementary School
Louisiana	220102001610	Livingston Parish Special Education Center	Pine Ridge School
Louisiana	220054000451	Zion City Vocational Center	Baton Rouge Prep Academy
Michigan	263654007247	Lincoln School	Josephine Brighton Skill Center
New Jersey	340000606082	Absecon Campus	Atlantic County Special Service
New Jersey	340145006046	Regional Day School at Millbur	Erickson Regional Day School
New York	362798003792	Greenburgh - North Castle School	Saint Christopher School
<p>Note: Address may not match.  Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database, School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun &amp; Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT.  U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".</p>			

**Table C-4. Schools Classified as Special Education that Match Between the Quality Education Data (QED) and the Common Core of Data (CCD) Files on School Identification Number but Differ in Name: 1994-95 School Year**

State	CCD Identification Number	CCD School Name	QED School Name
Alabama	010039001764	Homebound Elementary School	Brookwood Forest Elementary
Colorado	080345000445	Roxborough Elementary School	Plum Creek Academy
Connecticut	090007001153	A. C. E. S.	Hamden Middle School
Delaware	100124000295	Brandywine Intensive Learning Center	Springer Learning Center
Florida	120129002214	E. S. E. Homebound	Spectrum Junior-Senior High School
Illinois	171356005422	Funkhouser School	Green Creek Grade School
Illinois	170993004382	Rudolph School	Spalding Branch Elementary
Illinois	170002605175	P. A. C. E. Elementary Program	Sandburg Elementary School
Indiana	180061000114	Miller Road School	Blue River Career Center
Indiana	180120000197	H. B. M. Special Education	Carmel-Clay Special Education
Kentucky	210459001569	Cooperative Team School	Mary Mitchell Preschool
Louisiana	220084001597	Lincoln Career Center	Cuillier Career Center
Louisiana	220102001610	Livingston Parish Special Education Center	Pine Ridge Center
New Jersey	341536005999	Grant School	South Plainfield Adult High School
New Jersey	340145000234	Program 1-Hearing Impaired	Hawes Elementary School
New York	362859003882	Y-Med Center	Blodgett Center
New York	362058004319	PS 753 School for Career DVLPM	PS 771
New York	362058001932	PS 811	PS 079 Horan School
New York	362769003757	Rhinecliff High School	Morton Road School
Ohio	391000004263	Millstream, East Campus	McKinley Vocational Center
Tennessee	470027000060	Pikeville Elementary School	Bledsoe Development Center
Texas	482028001994	Alamo Elementary	Administrative Annex
Texas	483873004378	Neal Elementary	Regional Day School for the Deaf
Texas	484428005035	Dripping Springs Special Education	Doris Miller Montessori School
Texas	483294003629	Center School	Garner Middle School
Wisconsin	551599002075	C. A. T. C. Elementary	River Hills School

Note: Address may not match.  
Sources: Quality Education Data, School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ.  
U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

<b>Table C-5. Vocational Schools on the Market Data (MDR) Retrieval File Classified as Regular, Special, or Alternative on the Common Core of Data (CCD) File: 1994-95 School Year</b>			
State	CCD School Type	CCD Identification Number	CCD School Name
California	regular	061455008841	Duncan (ERMA) Polytechnical High School
	special	080435000617	Career Center
Connecticut	alternative	090045000078	Park City Alternative
Florida	alternative	120045002599	Dixie County Adult Center
		120150002234	South Technical Education Center
Georgia	alternative	130228002037	Frank McClaring High School
Illinois	regular	170993000943	Chicago Vocational High School
		170993001208	Cregier Vocational High School
		170993000588	Dunbar Vocational High School
		170993001167	Flower Vocational High School
		170993000917	Near North Career Magnet High School
		170993000681	Prosser Vocational High School
		170993000718	Richards Vocational High School
		170993000758	Simeon Vocational High School
	170993000798	Westinghouse Area Vocational High School	
	special	173441003541	Vocational Improvement Program
Iowa	regular	192640001499	Central Campus Individual Learning
Kansas	alternative	201299000093	Vocational-Technical Center
Louisiana	special	220174001654	East Street School
		220084001597	Lincoln Career Center
		220174001657	Terrebonne Vocational Rehabilitation Center
	alternative	220174001658	Terrebonne Vocational/Technical High School
Maryland	alternative	240009001504	Fairmount-Harford Institute
Massachusetts	regular	250279000282	Madison Park High School
Michigan	regular	261200004669	Cass Technical High School
Minnesota	special	270001202063	Carver-Scott Educational Cooperative
Mississippi	regular	280110000137	Coahoma Agricultural High School
	alternative	280264000514	Eva H. Harris School
New Jersey	special	341750005990	Monmouth County Career Center
North Carolina	alternative	370393002049	Robeson County Career Center
		370462001806	Union County Career Center
Ohio	regular	390437500336	Hughes Center
	special	391000004263	Millstream, East Campus
Oregon	alternative	411004000972	Vocational Village High School
Pennsylvania	regular	420930000016	Central High School
		421917000417	South Vocational-Technical High School
		421917007040	Washington Polytechnic Academy
Tennessee	regular	470252000898	Chestnut Ridge Learning Center
Texas	regular	482364005490	Barbara Jordan High School
		483312006023	Health Careers High School
	alternative	484578000736	Harrell Center
Virginia	special	510324001393	Richmond Career Education Center
	alternative	510012000049	Sec. Training and Education Program

Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database, School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

**Table C-6. Vocational Schools on the Quality Education Data (QED) File Classified as Regular, Special, or Alternative on the Common Core of Data (CCD) File: 1994-95 School Year**

State	CCD School Type	CCD Identification Number	CCD School Name
California	regular	061455008841	Duncan (Erma) Polytechnical High School
		063441007350	O'Connell (John A.) High School
		062805004305	Oakland Technical Senior High School
	alternative	061692002149	Alessandro High (Continuing) School
		060985001047	Buena Vista High (Occupation/Continuing)School
		063560006064	Loma Prieta High (Continuing) School
		063511005937	Madrone High (Continuing) School
	060939000956	Slover Mountain High (Continuing) School	
Connecticut	special	090231000427	Manchester Regional Academy
	alternative	090309000641	Richard C. Briggs High School
District of Columbia	regular	110003000014	Phelps Career High School
Florida	special	120018001356	Cross Creek School
		120048000635	Grand Park Career Center
		120018000188	Seagull School
	alternative	120039002141	D. A. Dorsey Education Center
		120159002253	Lake Alfred Career Development Center
		120048002162	Marine Science Education Center
	120150002234	South Technical Education Center	
Illinois	regular	170993000943	Chicago Vocational High School
		170993001208	Cregier Vocational High School
		170993000588	Dunbar Vocational High School
		170993001167	Flower Vocational High School
		170993000912	Industrial Skill Center
		170993000942	Lane Technical High School
		170993000954	Lindblom Technical High School
		170993000917	Near North Career Magnet High School
		170993000681	Prosser Vocational High School
		170993000718	Richards Vocational High School
	170993000758	Simeon Vocational High School	
	170993000798	Westinghouse Area Vocational High School	
	special	170001604746	Jamp Vocational Center
		170993000701	Las Casas Occupational High School
		170005204759	Tri-County South
173441003541		Vocational Improvement Program	
Indiana	regular	180477000801	Arsenal Technical High School
Iowa	regular	192640001499	Central Campus Individual Learning
Kansas	regular	200795001662	Career Learning Center
	alternative	201236000714	Career Opportunity Center
Kentucky	alternative	210299000713	Louisville Day Treatment Center
Louisiana	special	220174001654	East Street School
		220084001597	Lincoln Career Center
	alternative	220174001657	Terrebonne Vocational Rehabilitation Center
		220174001658	Terrebonne Vocational/Technical High School

Continued

**Table C-6. Vocational Schools on the Quality Education Data (QED) File Classified as Regular, Special, or Alternative on the Common Core of Data (CCD) File: 1994-95 School Year – Continued**

State	CCD School Type	CCD Identification Number	CCD School Name
Maryland	special	240066001484	Washington County Job Development Center
	alternative	240012000318	Rosedale Center for Alternative S
Massachusetts	alternative	251113001793	Bridge Academy Junior and Senior High School
		251113002415	Massachusetts Career Development Institute
Michigan	special	261200004852	Washington Careers Center
Minnesota	alternative	270609001874	Brainerd Alternative Learning Center
		272124001909	Work Opportunity Center
Mississippi	regular	280110000137	Coahoma Agricultural High School
		280151000222	Forrest County Agricultural High School
		280184000319	Hinds County Agricultural High School
		280208000355	Itawamba Agricultural High School
	alternative	280264000514	Eva H. Harris School
Nebraska	regular	317482001859	Magnet Career Center
New Jersey	special	341750005990	Monmouth County Career Center
		340147000254	Vocational, Teterboro (Special)
New York	regular	360450000198	Belmont Central School
		362058001916	High School of Telecommunications
		362058001908	Paul Robeson School of Business
	special	360585000338	Public School 42 Occupational Training Center
		362058002870	Public School 751 School for Career DVLPM
North Carolina	alternative	370393002049	Robeson County Career Center
		370462001806	Union County Career Center
Ohio	regular	390437800456	East Technical
		390438400823	John H. Patterson Career Center
Oregon	alternative	410474000567	Opportunity Center High School
		411004000972	Vocational Village High School
Pennsylvania	regular	421917000417	South Vocational-Technical High School
Tennessee	regular	470252000898	Chestnut Ridge Learning Center
Texas	regular	481623001225	Business and Management Center
		483873004350	Fox Technical High School
		481970001920	Trimble Technical High School
	special	482406005507	Transition Program
	alternative	484578000736	Harrell Center
		482730006744	Learning Center
Virginia	regular	510384001720	Virginia Beach Career Development Center
		510126002033	Earl L. Pulley Vocational Center
		510324001393	Richmond Career Education Center
	alternative	510126002008	S. John Davis Center
		510333002162	Roanoke County Career Center
		510012000049	Sec. Training and Education Program
		510189000805	Virginia Randolph Community High School

Sources: Quality Education Data, School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

**Table C-7. Schools Classified as Alternative Education that Match Between the Market Data Retrieval (MDR) and Common Core of Data (CCD) Files on School Identification Number but Differ in Name: 1994-95 School Year**

State	CCD Identification Number	CCD School Name	MDR School Name
California	060723000658	Campbell UN. High Alternative Education	Blackford Alternative High School
California	061291009539	Escondido Union Alternative/Op	Center City High School
California	063559010080	Monarch Elementary Alternative	Santa Cruz City Elementary Alternative Education
California	060263000743	Trident Continuation High School	Gilbert South High School
California	063372010257	Yolla Bolly High (Continuing)	Round Valley Continuation High School
Colorado	080669001386	Darrell Smith High School	Sterling Alternative High School
Idaho	160285000700	Bridgeview Alternative High School	Salmon Alternative High School
Kentucky	210198001524	Frankfort Alternative	Wilkinson Street Alternative School
Louisiana	220030001697	Caddo P. M. High School	Hamilton Terrace Learning Center
Louisiana	220072001996	Iberia Parish Career Center	Pass School
Massachusetts	250711002555	O'Keefe Alternative High School	Lynn Alternative High School
Michigan	261910000053	Imlay City Alternative High School	Ventura Alternative High School
Michigan	263657007588	Huntington Woods School	Horizons Alternative High School
North Dakota	380678000827	Heartland School	Rivers Edge School
Texas	483808006605	Jollyville Learning Center	Round Rock Opportunity Center
Texas	484668005938	Valdespino Education Center	Tejas School of Choice
Washington	530816001355	Alternative Discovery High School	South Kitsap Alternative High School
Washington	530870000092	Aly Middle School	Eugene Tone School

Note: Address may not match.

Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database, School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

**Table C-8. Schools Classified as Alternative Education that Match Between the Quality Education Data (QED) and Common Core of Data (CCD) Files on School Identification Number but Differ in Name: 1994-95 School Year**

State	CCD Identification Number	CCD School Name	QED School Name
Alaska	020018000061	Crossroads	Booth Memorial School
California	060193009513	Independence High School	Garfield Adult Education Center
California	060483000470	Moreno Continuing High School	Beverly Hills High School
California	061970009385	Mountain View	King's Canyon Alternative School
Colorado	080690001172	Vantage Point	Eastlake Campus
District of Columbia	110003000079	Dunbar High School	Washington Career High School
Iowa	190654000264	Truman Elementary School	Taft-Jackson Alternative School
Illinois	170009805220	Illinois Center for Rehabilitation and Education	Chalmers Elementary School
Michigan	262484006146	Froebel Elementary	Children's Home
Michigan	261473005169	H. T. Smith Elementary School	Carlson Community Education Center
Minnesota	270729002171	Cedar School	Thomas Lake Elementary School
South Carolina	450000101414	McCormick Correctional Institute	Williston-Elko High School
Texas	484578005197	Alamo Elementary	Holland School
Texas	480771000056	Aldine Contemporary Education Center	Carver Contemporary Education Center
Texas	482247002267	Multi-Handicapped Center	Wright Elementary School
Wisconsin	551236001643	Walden III Middle School	Walden III High School

Note: Address may not match.

Sources: Quality Education Data, School Year 1994-95, A division of Peterson's, Princeton, NJ.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

**Table C-9. Schools Classified as Adult Education that Match Between the Market Data Retrieval (MDR) and the Common Core of Data (CCD) Files on School Identification Number but Differ in Name: 1994-95 School Year**

State	CCD School Identification Number	CCD School Name	MDR School Name
California	062637000183	Crossroads High (Continuing)	Loma Vista Adult Center
California	064098001880	El Camino High (Alternative)	Ventura Adult Education School
Colorado	080510001452	La Jara Second Chance School	North Conejos Community Education Center
Delaware	100128000327	Del Castle Intensive Learning Center	Delaware Skills Center
Florida	120096002195	Marianna Adult Center	Jackson County Adult Education Center

Note: Address may not match.  
 Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database, School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT.  
 U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

<b>Table C-10. State-Operated Schools on the Market Data Retrieval (MDR) File Not Classified as State-Operated on the Common Core of Data (CCD) File: 1994-95 School Year</b>				
State	CCD Agency Level	CCD School Type	CCD School Identification Number	CCD School Name
District of Columbia	local school district	special	110003000205	Jackie Robinson Center
Florida	local school district	alternative	120123002840	Gulf Coast Marine Institute
Illinois	other	vocational	170003604548	Bloomington Area Vocational Center
Indiana	other	regular	180105500185	Burriss Laboratory School
	regional	vocational	181193001880	Heartland Career Center
Iowa	local school district	regular	190651000044	Price Laboratory School
Nebraska	regional	special	318008001972	Western Learning Center
North Dakota	local school district	regular	380001400822	Manchester House
Oregon	local school district	special	411052001328	Edgefield Children's Center
		alternative	411004000976	Rosemont School
South Carolina	local school district	alternative	450342001185	Birchwood High School
			450000301401	Felton Laboratory School
Texas	local school district	special	481128006515	Brenham State School
			480915006216	Methodist Home Boys Ranch
		vocational	483264006588	Gulf Coast Trades Center
Washington	local school district	special	530375001773	Echo Glen School
			530117000213	Green Hill School
			530747001797	Maple Lane School
			530066001751	Morgan Center School

Note: Other = Not at the school district, regional, state or federal level.  
Sources: Market Data Retrieval Database, School Year 1994-95, A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Shelton, CT.  
U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

**Table C-11. Schools Matching Between the 1997 Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) List of Schools and the 1994-95 Common Core of Data (CCD)  
File Federal Agency Type Schools**

BIA Agency	BIA School	Grade Range	CCD Local Education Agency	CCD School	Grade Range
Cheyenne River Agency (South Dakota)	Cheyenne-Eagle Butte School	K - 12	Cheyenne River BIA School (South Dakota)	Cheyenne River BIA Elementary	K - 6
				Cheyenne River BIA Junior High	7 - 8
				Cheyenne River BIA Senior High	9 - 12
	Swift Bird Day School	K - 8		Swift Bird Elementary	K - 8
	Promise Day School	K - 12		Promise Elementary	K - 8
	White Horse Day School	K - 8		White Horse Elementary	K - 8
	Takini School	K - 12		Takini School (South Dakota)	Takini Elementary
			Takini Junior High	7 - 8	
			Takini Senior High	9 - 12	
	Pierre Indian Learning Center	1 - 8	Pierre Indian Learning Center (South Dakota)	Pierre Indian Elementary	1 - 6
				Pierre Indian Junior High	7 - 8
Choctaw Field Office (Mississippi)	Red Water Elementary School	K - 8	Choctaw Tribal School System (Mississippi)	Red Water Day School	K - 8
	Standing Pine Elementary School	K - 6		Standing Pine Elementary	K - 6
	Tucker Elementary School	K - 8		Tucker Elementary School	K - 8
	Boque Chitto Elementary School	K - 8		Bogue [SIC] Chitto Elementary	K - 8
	Conehatta Elementary School	K - 8		Conehatta Elementary School	K - 8
	Choctaw Central High School	9 - 12		Choctaw Central High School	9 - 12
	Choctaw Central Middle School	7 - 8		Choctaw Central Middle School	7 - 8
	Pearl River Elementary School	K - 6		Pearl River Elementary School	K - 6
Crow Creek/Lower Brule Agencies (South Dakota)	Crow Creek Sioux Tribal Elementary School	K - 6	Crow Creek Tribal School (South Dakota)	Crow Creek Elementary	K - 5
	Crow Creek Reservation High School	7 - 12		Crow Creek Middle School	6 - 8
				Crow Creek High School	9 - 12
	Lower Brule Day School	K - 12	Lower Brule School System (South Dakota)	Lower Brule Elementary	K - 6
				Lower Brule Junior High	7 - 8
			Lower Brule High School	9 - 12	

Continued

**Table C-11. Schools Matching Between the 1997 Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) List of Schools and the 1994-95 Common Core of Data (CCD)  
Federal File Agency Type Schools – Continued**

BIA Agency	BIA School	Grade Range	CCD Local Education Agency	CCD School	Grade Range
Minneapolis Area Office (South Dakota, North Dakota)	Flandreau Indian School (SD)	9 - 12	Flandreau Indian School (South Dakota)	Flandreau Indian High School	9 - 12
	Circle of Nations Wahpeton Indian Boarding School (ND)	3 - 9	Wahpeton Indian School (North Dakota)	Wahpeton Indian Elementary School	2 - 8
Pine Ridge Agency (South Dakota)	American Horse School	K - 8	American Horse Day School (South Dakota)	American Horse Elementary	K - 8
	Little Wound Day School	K - 12	Little Wound School (South Dakota)	Little Wound Elementary	K - 5
				Little Wound Middle School	6 - 8
				Little Wound High School	9 - 12
	Wounded Knee School District	K - 8	Wounded Knee School System (South Dakota)	Wounded Knee Elementary	K - 8
	Loneman Day School	K - 8	Loneman School (South Dakota)	Loneman Elementary	K - 8
	Pine Ridge School	K - 12	Pine Ridge School (South Dakota)	Pine Ridge Elementary	K - 8
				Pine Ridge High School	9 - 12
Porcupine Day School	K - 8	Porcupine Contract School (South Dakota)	Porcupine Elementary	K - 8	
Crazy Horse School	K - 12	Crazy Horse Day School (South Dakota)	Crazy Horse Elementary	K - 6	
			Crazy Horse Junior High	7 - 8	
			Crazy Horse Senior High	9 - 12	
Portland Area Office (Oregon)	Chemewa Indian School	9 - 12	Bureau of Indian Affairs (Oregon)	Chemewa Indian School	NA
Rosebud Agency (South Dakota)	St. Francis Indian School	K - 12	St. Francis Indian School (South Dakota)	St. Francis Elementary	K - 6
				St. Francis Junior High	7 - 8
	St. Francis High School	9 - 12			
Marty Indian School	K - 12	Marty Indian School (South Dakota)	Marty Elementary	K - 5	
			Marty Middle School	6 - 8	
			Marty High School	9 - 12	

Continued

**Table C-11. Schools Matching Between the 1997 Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) List of Schools and the 1994-95 Common Core of Data (CCD) Federal File Agency Type Schools – Continued**

BIA Agency	BIA School	Grade Range	CCD Local Education Agency	CCD School	Grade Range
Sisseton Agency (South Dakota, North Dakota)	Enemy Swim Day School (SD)	K - 8	Enemy Swim Day School (South Dakota)	Enemy Swim Elementary	K - 8
	Tiospa Zina Tribal School (SD)	K - 12	Tiospa Zina Tribal School (South Dakota)	Tiospa Zina Elementary	K - 5
				Tiospa Zina Middle School	6 - 8
		Tiospa Zina High School	9 - 12		
	Tate Topa Tribal School (ND)	K - 8	Tate Topa Tribal School (North Dakota)	Tate Topa Tribal Elementary School	K - 8
Standing Rock Agency (South Dakota, North Dakota)	Rock Creek Day School (SD)	K - 8	Rock Creek Day School (South Dakota)	Rock Creek Elementary	K - 8
	Little Eagle Day School (SD)	K - 8	Little Eagle Day School (South Dakota)	Little Eagle Elementary	K - 8
	Standing Rock Community School (ND)	K - 12	Standing Rock Community Grant (North Dakota)	Standing Rock Community Grant Elementary	K - 6
				Standing Rock Community Grant High School	7 - 12
	Theodore Jamerson Elementary School (ND)	K - 8	Theodore Jamerson Elementary School (North Dakota)	Theodore Jamerson Elementary School	K - 8
Turtle Mountain Agency (North Dakota)	Dunseith Day School	K - 8	Dunseith Day Elementary School (North Dakota)	Dunseith Day Elementary School	K - 8
Note: K = Kindergarten    PK = Prekindergarten Sources: Bureau of Indian Affairs, Office of Indian Education Programs, Online, <a href="http://shaman.unm.edu/oiiep/address.htm">http://shaman.unm.edu/oiiep/address.htm</a> , September 1997. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".					

**Table C-12. Schools Listed on the National Charter School Directory and Found on the Common Core of Data (CCD) File: 1994-95 School Year**

State	School Name as it Appears in the National Charter School Directory
California	Bowling Green Elementary School Canyon Elementary Charter School Carlin C. Coppin Elementary School Charter Community School and Extended Day Program Choice 2000 On-Line School Clear View Charter School  Creekside Oaks Charter Elementary School Darnall E-Campus Deterding Elementary School Discovery Charter School Excelsior Academy Alternative Education  Fenton Avenue Charter School Folsom Middle School Garfield Charter School Grass Valley Charter School Guajome Park Academy  Horizon Instructional Systems International Studies Academy Linscott Charter School Marquez Charter School Moreno Valley Community Learning Center Charter School  Mountain Home School Charter Mueller Elementary School Natomas Charter School Nevada City Home Study Charter School O'Farrell Community School  Options for Youth Palisades Charter High School Palisades Elementary Charter School Peabody Charter School Pioneer Middle  Pioneer Primary Ready Springs Charter School Richgrove Elementary School San Carlos Charter Learning Center San Lorenzo Valley Unified School District Charter School  Santa Barbara Charter School Sonoma Charter School Temecula Learning Center The Accelerated School The Charter School of San Diego  The Eel River School The Harriet Tubman Village School The Open Charter School

Continued

**Table C-12. Schools Listed on the National Charter School Directory and Found on the Common Core of Data (CCD) File: 1994-95 School Year – Continued**

<b>State</b>	<b>School Name as it Appears in the National Charter School Directory</b>
	Twin Ridges Home Study Charter School Vaughn Next Century Learning Center Washington Charter School West Park Charter Academy Westwood Charter School
Colorado	Academy Charter School Academy of Charter Schools Battle Rock Charter School Clayton Charter School Community Involved Charter School Community of Learners  Core Knowledge Charter School Eagle County Charter Academy Jefferson Academy Charter School Pueblo School for the Arts and Sciences Sci-Tech Academy  Stargate School The Connect School The EXCEL School
Minnesota	Bluffview Montessori School Cedar Riverside Community School City Academy Dakota Open Charter School Emily Charter School Metro Deaf  Minnesota New Country School New Heights Schools, Inc. New Visions School Parents Allied with Children and Teachers (PACT) Skills for Tomorrow  Toivola - Meadowlands Charter School
New Mexico	Highland High School Taylor Middle School Turquoise Trail Elementary
Wisconsin	James C. Wright Middle School
Sources: National Charter School Directory, Fall 1996, The Center for Education Reform, Washington, DC. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".	

<b>Table C-13. Schools Listed on the National Charter School Directory but Not on the Common Core of Data (CCD) File: 1994-95 School Year</b>	
<b>State</b>	<b>School Name</b>
Arizona	Payson Center for Success
California	CATO School of Reason Charter Oak School Creative Arts Charter School Elise P. Buckingham Center School Excelsior Education Center Hickman Home Study Charter School Kern Workforce 2000 Academy Charter Lincoln High School Louisiana Schnell Elementary Oakland Charter Middle Rite of Passage School Sheridan School Yucca Mesa Charter School
Michigan	New Branches School University Public School Wayne County West Michigan Academy of Environmental Science
Minnesota	Community of Peace Academy Frederick Douglass Math Science Technical Academy
New Mexico	Broad Horizons Educational Center
Wisconsin	TEAMS School
Sources: National Charter School Directory, Fall 1996, The Center for Education Reform, Washington, DC. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95" and "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".	

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## **Appendix D. Bibliography**

Bureau of Indian Affairs. Office of Indian Education Programs. Online. September 1997. <http://shaman.unm.edu/oiiep/address.htm>.

Department of Defense. Online. November 1997. <http://www.tmn.com/dodea/home.htm>.

Market Data Retrieval Database. School Year 1994-95. A company of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation. Shelton, CT.

National Charter School Directory. Fall 1996. The Center for Education Reform. Washington, DC.

Quality Education Data. School Year 1994-95. A division of Peterson's. Princeton, NJ.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, "Public Elementary/Secondary Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, "Local Education Agency Universe Survey: School Year 1994-95".

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## Listing of NCES Working Papers to Date

Working papers can be downloaded as pdf files from the NCES Electronic Catalog (<http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/>). You can also contact Sheilah Jupiter at (202) 502-7444 (sheilah\_jupiter@ed.gov) if you are interested in any of the following papers.

### Listing of NCES Working Papers by Program Area

No.	Title	NCES contact
<b>Baccalaureate and Beyond (B&amp;B)</b>		
98-15	Development of a Prototype System for Accessing Linked NCES Data	Steven Kaufman
<b>Beginning Postsecondary Students (BPS) Longitudinal Study</b>		
98-11	Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study First Follow-up (BPS:96–98) Field Test Report	Aurora D’Amico
98-15	Development of a Prototype System for Accessing Linked NCES Data	Steven Kaufman
1999-15	Projected Postsecondary Outcomes of 1992 High School Graduates	Aurora D’Amico
<b>Common Core of Data (CCD)</b>		
95-12	Rural Education Data User’s Guide	Samuel Peng
96-19	Assessment and Analysis of School-Level Expenditures	William J. Fowler, Jr.
97-15	Customer Service Survey: Common Core of Data Coordinators	Lee Hoffman
97-43	Measuring Inflation in Public School Costs	William J. Fowler, Jr.
98-15	Development of a Prototype System for Accessing Linked NCES Data	Steven Kaufman
1999-03	Evaluation of the 1996–97 Nonfiscal Common Core of Data Surveys Data Collection, Processing, and Editing Cycle	Beth Young
2000-12	Coverage Evaluation of the 1994–95 Common Core of Data: Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey	Beth Young
<b>Decennial Census School District Project</b>		
95-12	Rural Education Data User’s Guide	Samuel Peng
96-04	Census Mapping Project/School District Data Book	Tai Phan
98-07	Decennial Census School District Project Planning Report	Tai Phan
<b>Early Childhood Longitudinal Study (ECLS)</b>		
96-08	How Accurate are Teacher Judgments of Students’ Academic Performance?	Jerry West
96-18	Assessment of Social Competence, Adaptive Behaviors, and Approaches to Learning with Young Children	Jerry West
97-24	Formulating a Design for the ECLS: A Review of Longitudinal Studies	Jerry West
97-36	Measuring the Quality of Program Environments in Head Start and Other Early Childhood Programs: A Review and Recommendations for Future Research	Jerry West
1999-01	A Birth Cohort Study: Conceptual and Design Considerations and Rationale	Jerry West
2000-04	Selected Papers on Education Surveys: Papers Presented at the 1998 and 1999 ASA and 1999 AAPOR Meetings	Dan Kasprzyk
<b>Education Finance Statistics Center (EDFIN)</b>		
94-05	Cost-of-Education Differentials Across the States	William J. Fowler, Jr.
96-19	Assessment and Analysis of School-Level Expenditures	William J. Fowler, Jr.
97-43	Measuring Inflation in Public School Costs	William J. Fowler, Jr.
98-04	Geographic Variations in Public Schools’ Costs	William J. Fowler, Jr.
1999-16	Measuring Resources in Education: From Accounting to the Resource Cost Model Approach	William J. Fowler, Jr.
<b>High School and Beyond (HS&amp;B)</b>		
95-12	Rural Education Data User’s Guide	Samuel Peng
1999-05	Procedures Guide for Transcript Studies	Dawn Nelson
1999-06	1998 Revision of the Secondary School Taxonomy	Dawn Nelson

No.	Title	NCES contact
<b>HS Transcript Studies</b>		
1999-05	Procedures Guide for Transcript Studies	Dawn Nelson
1999-06	1998 Revision of the Secondary School Taxonomy	Dawn Nelson
<b>International Adult Literacy Survey (IALS)</b>		
97-33	Adult Literacy: An International Perspective	Marilyn Binkley
<b>Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS)</b>		
97-27	Pilot Test of IPEDS Finance Survey	Peter Stowe
98-15	Development of a Prototype System for Accessing Linked NCES Data	Steven Kaufman
<b>National Assessment of Adult Literacy (NAAL)</b>		
98-17	Developing the National Assessment of Adult Literacy: Recommendations from Stakeholders	Sheida White
1999-09a	1992 National Adult Literacy Survey: An Overview	Alex Sedlacek
1999-09b	1992 National Adult Literacy Survey: Sample Design	Alex Sedlacek
1999-09c	1992 National Adult Literacy Survey: Weighting and Population Estimates	Alex Sedlacek
1999-09d	1992 National Adult Literacy Survey: Development of the Survey Instruments	Alex Sedlacek
1999-09e	1992 National Adult Literacy Survey: Scaling and Proficiency Estimates	Alex Sedlacek
1999-09f	1992 National Adult Literacy Survey: Interpreting the Adult Literacy Scales and Literacy Levels	Alex Sedlacek
1999-09g	1992 National Adult Literacy Survey: Literacy Levels and the Response Probability Convention	Alex Sedlacek
2000-05	Secondary Statistical Modeling With the National Assessment of Adult Literacy: Implications for the Design of the Background Questionnaire	Sheida White
2000-06	Using Telephone and Mail Surveys as a Supplement or Alternative to Door-to-Door Surveys in the Assessment of Adult Literacy	Sheida White
2000-07	“How Much Literacy is Enough?” Issues in Defining and Reporting Performance Standards for the National Assessment of Adult Literacy	Sheida White
2000-08	Evaluation of the 1992 NALS Background Survey Questionnaire: An Analysis of Uses with Recommendations for Revisions	Sheida White
2000-09	Demographic Changes and Literacy Development in a Decade	Sheida White
<b>National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)</b>		
95-12	Rural Education Data User’s Guide	Samuel Peng
97-29	Can State Assessment Data be Used to Reduce State NAEP Sample Sizes?	Steven Gorman
97-30	ACT’s NAEP Redesign Project: Assessment Design is the Key to Useful and Stable Assessment Results	Steven Gorman
97-31	NAEP Reconfigured: An Integrated Redesign of the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Steven Gorman
97-32	Innovative Solutions to Intractable Large Scale Assessment (Problem 2: Background Questionnaires)	Steven Gorman
97-37	Optimal Rating Procedures and Methodology for NAEP Open-ended Items	Steven Gorman
97-44	Development of a SASS 1993–94 School-Level Student Achievement Subfile: Using State Assessments and State NAEP, Feasibility Study	Michael Ross
98-15	Development of a Prototype System for Accessing Linked NCES Data	Steven Kaufman
1999-05	Procedures Guide for Transcript Studies	Dawn Nelson
1999-06	1998 Revision of the Secondary School Taxonomy	Dawn Nelson
<b>National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS:88)</b>		
95-04	National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988: Second Follow-up Questionnaire Content Areas and Research Issues	Jeffrey Owings
95-05	National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988: Conducting Trend Analyses of NLS-72, HS&B, and NELS:88 Seniors	Jeffrey Owings
95-06	National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988: Conducting Cross-Cohort Comparisons Using HS&B, NAEP, and NELS:88 Academic Transcript Data	Jeffrey Owings
95-07	National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988: Conducting Trend Analyses HS&B and NELS:88 Sophomore Cohort Dropouts	Jeffrey Owings
95-12	Rural Education Data User’s Guide	Samuel Peng

No.	Title	NCES contact
95-14	Empirical Evaluation of Social, Psychological, & Educational Construct Variables Used in NCES Surveys	Samuel Peng
96-03	National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS:88) Research Framework and Issues	Jeffrey Owings
98-06	National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS:88) Base Year through Second Follow-Up: Final Methodology Report	Ralph Lee
98-09	High School Curriculum Structure: Effects on Coursetaking and Achievement in Mathematics for High School Graduates—An Examination of Data from the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988	Jeffrey Owings
98-15	Development of a Prototype System for Accessing Linked NCES Data	Steven Kaufman
1999-05	Procedures Guide for Transcript Studies	Dawn Nelson
1999-06	1998 Revision of the Secondary School Taxonomy	Dawn Nelson
1999-15	Projected Postsecondary Outcomes of 1992 High School Graduates	Aurora D'Amico

### **National Household Education Survey (NHES)**

95-12	Rural Education Data User's Guide	Samuel Peng
96-13	Estimation of Response Bias in the NHES:95 Adult Education Survey	Steven Kaufman
96-14	The 1995 National Household Education Survey: Reinterview Results for the Adult Education Component	Steven Kaufman
96-20	1991 National Household Education Survey (NHES:91) Questionnaires: Screener, Early Childhood Education, and Adult Education	Kathryn Chandler
96-21	1993 National Household Education Survey (NHES:93) Questionnaires: Screener, School Readiness, and School Safety and Discipline	Kathryn Chandler
96-22	1995 National Household Education Survey (NHES:95) Questionnaires: Screener, Early Childhood Program Participation, and Adult Education	Kathryn Chandler
96-29	Undercoverage Bias in Estimates of Characteristics of Adults and 0- to 2-Year-Olds in the 1995 National Household Education Survey (NHES:95)	Kathryn Chandler
96-30	Comparison of Estimates from the 1995 National Household Education Survey (NHES:95)	Kathryn Chandler
97-02	Telephone Coverage Bias and Recorded Interviews in the 1993 National Household Education Survey (NHES:93)	Kathryn Chandler
97-03	1991 and 1995 National Household Education Survey Questionnaires: NHES:91 Screener, NHES:91 Adult Education, NHES:95 Basic Screener, and NHES:95 Adult Education	Kathryn Chandler
97-04	Design, Data Collection, Monitoring, Interview Administration Time, and Data Editing in the 1993 National Household Education Survey (NHES:93)	Kathryn Chandler
97-05	Unit and Item Response, Weighting, and Imputation Procedures in the 1993 National Household Education Survey (NHES:93)	Kathryn Chandler
97-06	Unit and Item Response, Weighting, and Imputation Procedures in the 1995 National Household Education Survey (NHES:95)	Kathryn Chandler
97-08	Design, Data Collection, Interview Timing, and Data Editing in the 1995 National Household Education Survey	Kathryn Chandler
97-19	National Household Education Survey of 1995: Adult Education Course Coding Manual	Peter Stowe
97-20	National Household Education Survey of 1995: Adult Education Course Code Merge Files User's Guide	Peter Stowe
97-25	1996 National Household Education Survey (NHES:96) Questionnaires: Screener/Household and Library, Parent and Family Involvement in Education and Civic Involvement, Youth Civic Involvement, and Adult Civic Involvement	Kathryn Chandler
97-28	Comparison of Estimates in the 1996 National Household Education Survey	Kathryn Chandler
97-34	Comparison of Estimates from the 1993 National Household Education Survey	Kathryn Chandler
97-35	Design, Data Collection, Interview Administration Time, and Data Editing in the 1996 National Household Education Survey	Kathryn Chandler
97-38	Reinterview Results for the Parent and Youth Components of the 1996 National Household Education Survey	Kathryn Chandler
97-39	Undercoverage Bias in Estimates of Characteristics of Households and Adults in the 1996 National Household Education Survey	Kathryn Chandler
97-40	Unit and Item Response Rates, Weighting, and Imputation Procedures in the 1996 National Household Education Survey	Kathryn Chandler
98-03	Adult Education in the 1990s: A Report on the 1991 National Household Education Survey	Peter Stowe

No.	Title	NCES contact
98-10	Adult Education Participation Decisions and Barriers: Review of Conceptual Frameworks and Empirical Studies	Peter Stowe
<b>National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972 (NLS-72)</b>		
95-12	Rural Education Data User's Guide	Samuel Peng
<b>National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS)</b>		
96-17	National Postsecondary Student Aid Study: 1996 Field Test Methodology Report	Andrew G. Malizio
<b>National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF)</b>		
97-26	Strategies for Improving Accuracy of Postsecondary Faculty Lists	Linda Zimpler
98-15	Development of a Prototype System for Accessing Linked NCES Data	Steven Kaufman
2000-01	1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99) Field Test Report	Linda Zimpler
<b>Postsecondary Education Descriptive Analysis Reports (PEDAR)</b>		
2000-11	Financial Aid Profile of Graduate Students in Science and Engineering	Aurora D'Amico
<b>Private School Universe Survey (PSS)</b>		
95-16	Intersurvey Consistency in NCES Private School Surveys	Steven Kaufman
95-17	Estimates of Expenditures for Private K-12 Schools	Stephen Broughman
96-16	Strategies for Collecting Finance Data from Private Schools	Stephen Broughman
96-26	Improving the Coverage of Private Elementary-Secondary Schools	Steven Kaufman
96-27	Intersurvey Consistency in NCES Private School Surveys for 1993-94	Steven Kaufman
97-07	The Determinants of Per-Pupil Expenditures in Private Elementary and Secondary Schools: An Exploratory Analysis	Stephen Broughman
97-22	Collection of Private School Finance Data: Development of a Questionnaire	Stephen Broughman
98-15	Development of a Prototype System for Accessing Linked NCES Data	Steven Kaufman
2000-04	Selected Papers on Education Surveys: Papers Presented at the 1998 and 1999 ASA and 1999 AAPOR Meetings	Dan Kasprzyk
<b>Recent College Graduates (RCG)</b>		
98-15	Development of a Prototype System for Accessing Linked NCES Data	Steven Kaufman
<b>Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS)</b>		
94-01	Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) Papers Presented at Meetings of the American Statistical Association	Dan Kasprzyk
94-02	Generalized Variance Estimate for Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS)	Dan Kasprzyk
94-03	1991 Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) Reinterview Response Variance Report	Dan Kasprzyk
94-04	The Accuracy of Teachers' Self-reports on their Postsecondary Education: Teacher Transcript Study, Schools and Staffing Survey	Dan Kasprzyk
94-06	Six Papers on Teachers from the 1990-91 Schools and Staffing Survey and Other Related Surveys	Dan Kasprzyk
95-01	Schools and Staffing Survey: 1994 Papers Presented at the 1994 Meeting of the American Statistical Association	Dan Kasprzyk
95-02	QED Estimates of the 1990-91 Schools and Staffing Survey: Deriving and Comparing QED School Estimates with CCD Estimates	Dan Kasprzyk
95-03	Schools and Staffing Survey: 1990-91 SASS Cross-Questionnaire Analysis	Dan Kasprzyk
95-08	CCD Adjustment to the 1990-91 SASS: A Comparison of Estimates	Dan Kasprzyk
95-09	The Results of the 1993 Teacher List Validation Study (TLVS)	Dan Kasprzyk
95-10	The Results of the 1991-92 Teacher Follow-up Survey (TFS) Reinterview and Extensive Reconciliation	Dan Kasprzyk
95-11	Measuring Instruction, Curriculum Content, and Instructional Resources: The Status of Recent Work	Sharon Bobbitt & John Ralph
95-12	Rural Education Data User's Guide	Samuel Peng
95-14	Empirical Evaluation of Social, Psychological, & Educational Construct Variables Used in NCES Surveys	Samuel Peng
95-15	Classroom Instructional Processes: A Review of Existing Measurement Approaches and Their Applicability for the Teacher Follow-up Survey	Sharon Bobbitt
95-16	Intersurvey Consistency in NCES Private School Surveys	Steven Kaufman

No.	Title	NCES contact
95-18	An Agenda for Research on Teachers and Schools: Revisiting NCES' Schools and Staffing Survey	Dan Kasprzyk
96-01	Methodological Issues in the Study of Teachers' Careers: Critical Features of a Truly Longitudinal Study	Dan Kasprzyk
96-02	Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS): 1995 Selected papers presented at the 1995 Meeting of the American Statistical Association	Dan Kasprzyk
96-05	Cognitive Research on the Teacher Listing Form for the Schools and Staffing Survey	Dan Kasprzyk
96-06	The Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) for 1998-99: Design Recommendations to Inform Broad Education Policy	Dan Kasprzyk
96-07	Should SASS Measure Instructional Processes and Teacher Effectiveness?	Dan Kasprzyk
96-09	Making Data Relevant for Policy Discussions: Redesigning the School Administrator Questionnaire for the 1998-99 SASS	Dan Kasprzyk
96-10	1998-99 Schools and Staffing Survey: Issues Related to Survey Depth	Dan Kasprzyk
96-11	Towards an Organizational Database on America's Schools: A Proposal for the Future of SASS, with comments on School Reform, Governance, and Finance	Dan Kasprzyk
96-12	Predictors of Retention, Transfer, and Attrition of Special and General Education Teachers: Data from the 1989 Teacher Followup Survey	Dan Kasprzyk
96-15	Nested Structures: District-Level Data in the Schools and Staffing Survey	Dan Kasprzyk
96-23	Linking Student Data to SASS: Why, When, How	Dan Kasprzyk
96-24	National Assessments of Teacher Quality	Dan Kasprzyk
96-25	Measures of Inservice Professional Development: Suggested Items for the 1998-1999 Schools and Staffing Survey	Dan Kasprzyk
96-28	Student Learning, Teaching Quality, and Professional Development: Theoretical Linkages, Current Measurement, and Recommendations for Future Data Collection	Mary Rollefson
97-01	Selected Papers on Education Surveys: Papers Presented at the 1996 Meeting of the American Statistical Association	Dan Kasprzyk
97-07	The Determinants of Per-Pupil Expenditures in Private Elementary and Secondary Schools: An Exploratory Analysis	Stephen Broughman
97-09	Status of Data on Crime and Violence in Schools: Final Report	Lee Hoffman
97-10	Report of Cognitive Research on the Public and Private School Teacher Questionnaires for the Schools and Staffing Survey 1993-94 School Year	Dan Kasprzyk
97-11	International Comparisons of Inservice Professional Development	Dan Kasprzyk
97-12	Measuring School Reform: Recommendations for Future SASS Data Collection	Mary Rollefson
97-14	Optimal Choice of Periodicities for the Schools and Staffing Survey: Modeling and Analysis	Steven Kaufman
97-18	Improving the Mail Return Rates of SASS Surveys: A Review of the Literature	Steven Kaufman
97-22	Collection of Private School Finance Data: Development of a Questionnaire	Stephen Broughman
97-23	Further Cognitive Research on the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) Teacher Listing Form	Dan Kasprzyk
97-41	Selected Papers on the Schools and Staffing Survey: Papers Presented at the 1997 Meeting of the American Statistical Association	Steve Kaufman
97-42	Improving the Measurement of Staffing Resources at the School Level: The Development of Recommendations for NCES for the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS)	Mary Rollefson
97-44	Development of a SASS 1993-94 School-Level Student Achievement Subfile: Using State Assessments and State NAEP, Feasibility Study	Michael Ross
98-01	Collection of Public School Expenditure Data: Development of a Questionnaire	Stephen Broughman
98-02	Response Variance in the 1993-94 Schools and Staffing Survey: A Reinterview Report	Steven Kaufman
98-04	Geographic Variations in Public Schools' Costs	William J. Fowler, Jr.
98-05	SASS Documentation: 1993-94 SASS Student Sampling Problems; Solutions for Determining the Numerators for the SASS Private School (3B) Second-Stage Factors	Steven Kaufman
98-08	The Redesign of the Schools and Staffing Survey for 1999-2000: A Position Paper	Dan Kasprzyk
98-12	A Bootstrap Variance Estimator for Systematic PPS Sampling	Steven Kaufman
98-13	Response Variance in the 1994-95 Teacher Follow-up Survey	Steven Kaufman
98-14	Variance Estimation of Imputed Survey Data	Steven Kaufman
98-15	Development of a Prototype System for Accessing Linked NCES Data	Steven Kaufman
98-16	A Feasibility Study of Longitudinal Design for Schools and Staffing Survey	Stephen Broughman
1999-02	Tracking Secondary Use of the Schools and Staffing Survey Data: Preliminary Results	Dan Kasprzyk
1999-04	Measuring Teacher Qualifications	Dan Kasprzyk
1999-07	Collection of Resource and Expenditure Data on the Schools and Staffing Survey	Stephen Broughman

No.	Title	NCES contact
1999-08	Measuring Classroom Instructional Processes: Using Survey and Case Study Fieldtest Results to Improve Item Construction	Dan Kasprzyk
1999-10	What Users Say About Schools and Staffing Survey Publications	Dan Kasprzyk
1999-12	1993–94 Schools and Staffing Survey: Data File User’s Manual, Volume III: Public-Use Codebook	Kerry Gruber
1999-13	1993–94 Schools and Staffing Survey: Data File User’s Manual, Volume IV: Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) Restricted-Use Codebook	Kerry Gruber
1999-14	1994–95 Teacher Followup Survey: Data File User’s Manual, Restricted-Use Codebook	Kerry Gruber
1999-17	Secondary Use of the Schools and Staffing Survey Data	Susan Wiley
2000-04	Selected Papers on Education Surveys: Papers Presented at the 1998 and 1999 ASA and 1999 AAPOR Meetings	Dan Kasprzyk
2000-10	A Research Agenda for the 1999–2000 Schools and Staffing Survey	Dan Kasprzyk

## Listing of NCES Working Papers by Subject

No.	Title	NCES contact
<b>Adult education</b>		
96-14	The 1995 National Household Education Survey: Reinterview Results for the Adult Education Component	Steven Kaufman
96-20	1991 National Household Education Survey (NHES:91) Questionnaires: Screener, Early Childhood Education, and Adult Education	Kathryn Chandler
96-22	1995 National Household Education Survey (NHES:95) Questionnaires: Screener, Early Childhood Program Participation, and Adult Education	Kathryn Chandler
98-03	Adult Education in the 1990s: A Report on the 1991 National Household Education Survey	Peter Stowe
98-10	Adult Education Participation Decisions and Barriers: Review of Conceptual Frameworks and Empirical Studies	Peter Stowe
1999-11	Data Sources on Lifelong Learning Available from the National Center for Education Statistics	Lisa Hudson
<b>Adult literacy—see Literacy of adults</b>		
<b>American Indian – education</b>		
1999-13	1993–94 Schools and Staffing Survey: Data File User’s Manual, Volume IV: Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) Restricted-Use Codebook	Kerry Gruber
<b>Assessment/achievement</b>		
95-12	Rural Education Data User’s Guide	Samuel Peng
95-13	Assessing Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficiency	James Houser
97-29	Can State Assessment Data be Used to Reduce State NAEP Sample Sizes?	Larry Ogle
97-30	ACT’s NAEP Redesign Project: Assessment Design is the Key to Useful and Stable Assessment Results	Larry Ogle
97-31	NAEP Reconfigured: An Integrated Redesign of the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Larry Ogle
97-32	Innovative Solutions to Intractable Large Scale Assessment (Problem 2: Background Questions)	Larry Ogle
97-37	Optimal Rating Procedures and Methodology for NAEP Open-ended Items	Larry Ogle
97-44	Development of a SASS 1993–94 School-Level Student Achievement Subfile: Using State Assessments and State NAEP, Feasibility Study	Michael Ross
98-09	High School Curriculum Structure: Effects on Coursetaking and Achievement in Mathematics for High School Graduates—An Examination of Data from the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988	Jeffrey Owings
<b>Beginning students in postsecondary education</b>		
98-11	Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study First Follow-up (BPS:96–98) Field Test Report	Aurora D’Amico
<b>Civic participation</b>		
97-25	1996 National Household Education Survey (NHES:96) Questionnaires: Screener/Household and Library, Parent and Family Involvement in Education and Civic Involvement, Youth Civic Involvement, and Adult Civic Involvement	Kathryn Chandler
<b>Climate of schools</b>		
95-14	Empirical Evaluation of Social, Psychological, & Educational Construct Variables Used in NCES Surveys	Samuel Peng
<b>Cost of education indices</b>		
94-05	Cost-of-Education Differentials Across the States	William J. Fowler, Jr.
<b>Course-taking</b>		
95-12	Rural Education Data User’s Guide	Samuel Peng

No.	Title	NCES contact
98-09	High School Curriculum Structure: Effects on Coursetaking and Achievement in Mathematics for High School Graduates—An Examination of Data from the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988	Jeffrey Owings
1999-05	Procedures Guide for Transcript Studies	Dawn Nelson
1999-06	1998 Revision of the Secondary School Taxonomy	Dawn Nelson
<b>Crime</b>		
97-09	Status of Data on Crime and Violence in Schools: Final Report	Lee Hoffman
<b>Curriculum</b>		
95-11	Measuring Instruction, Curriculum Content, and Instructional Resources: The Status of Recent Work	Sharon Bobbitt & John Ralph
98-09	High School Curriculum Structure: Effects on Coursetaking and Achievement in Mathematics for High School Graduates—An Examination of Data from the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988	Jeffrey Owings
<b>Customer service</b>		
1999-10	What Users Say About Schools and Staffing Survey Publications	Dan Kasprzyk
2000-02	Coordinating NCES Surveys: Options, Issues, Challenges, and Next Steps	Valena Plisko
2000-04	Selected Papers on Education Surveys: Papers Presented at the 1998 and 1999 ASA and 1999 AAPOR Meetings	Dan Kasprzyk
<b>Data quality</b>		
97-13	Improving Data Quality in NCES: Database-to-Report Process	Susan Ahmed
<b>Data warehouse</b>		
2000-04	Selected Papers on Education Surveys: Papers Presented at the 1998 and 1999 ASA and 1999 AAPOR Meetings	Dan Kasprzyk
<b>Design effects</b>		
2000-03	Strengths and Limitations of Using SUDAAN, Stata, and WesVarPC for Computing Variances from NCES Data Sets	Ralph Lee
<b>Dropout rates, high school</b>		
95-07	National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988: Conducting Trend Analyses HS&B and NELS:88 Sophomore Cohort Dropouts	Jeffrey Owings
<b>Early childhood education</b>		
96-20	1991 National Household Education Survey (NHES:91) Questionnaires: Screener, Early Childhood Education, and Adult Education	Kathryn Chandler
96-22	1995 National Household Education Survey (NHES:95) Questionnaires: Screener, Early Childhood Program Participation, and Adult Education	Kathryn Chandler
97-24	Formulating a Design for the ECLS: A Review of Longitudinal Studies	Jerry West
97-36	Measuring the Quality of Program Environments in Head Start and Other Early Childhood Programs: A Review and Recommendations for Future Research	Jerry West
1999-01	A Birth Cohort Study: Conceptual and Design Considerations and Rationale	Jerry West
<b>Educational attainment</b>		
98-11	Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study First Follow-up (BPS:96–98) Field Test Report	Aurora D’Amico
<b>Educational research</b>		
2000-02	Coordinating NCES Surveys: Options, Issues, Challenges, and Next Steps	Valena Plisko
<b>Employment</b>		
96-03	National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS:88) Research Framework and Issues	Jeffrey Owings
98-11	Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study First Follow-up (BPS:96–98) Field Test Report	Aurora D’Amico

No.	Title	NCES contact
<b>Engineering</b>		
2000-11	Financial Aid Profile of Graduate Students in Science and Engineering	Aurora D'Amico
<b>Faculty – higher education</b>		
97-26	Strategies for Improving Accuracy of Postsecondary Faculty Lists	Linda Zimbler
2000-01	1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99) Field Test Report	Linda Zimbler
<b>Finance – elementary and secondary schools</b>		
94-05	Cost-of-Education Differentials Across the States	William J. Fowler, Jr.
96-19	Assessment and Analysis of School-Level Expenditures	William J. Fowler, Jr.
98-01	Collection of Public School Expenditure Data: Development of a Questionnaire	Stephen Broughman
1999-07	Collection of Resource and Expenditure Data on the Schools and Staffing Survey	Stephen Broughman
1999-16	Measuring Resources in Education: From Accounting to the Resource Cost Model Approach	William J. Fowler, Jr.
<b>Finance – postsecondary</b>		
97-27	Pilot Test of IPEDS Finance Survey	Peter Stowe
<b>Finance – private schools</b>		
95-17	Estimates of Expenditures for Private K–12 Schools	Stephen Broughman
96-16	Strategies for Collecting Finance Data from Private Schools	Stephen Broughman
97-07	The Determinants of Per-Pupil Expenditures in Private Elementary and Secondary Schools: An Exploratory Analysis	Stephen Broughman
97-22	Collection of Private School Finance Data: Development of a Questionnaire	Stephen Broughman
1999-07	Collection of Resource and Expenditure Data on the Schools and Staffing Survey	Stephen Broughman
<b>Geography</b>		
98-04	Geographic Variations in Public Schools' Costs	William J. Fowler, Jr.
<b>Graduate students</b>		
2000-11	Financial Aid Profile of Graduate Students in Science and Engineering	Aurora D'Amico
<b>Imputation</b>		
2000-04	Selected Papers on Education Surveys: Papers Presented at the 1998 and 1999 ASA and 1999 AAPOR Meetings	Dan Kasprzyk
<b>Inflation</b>		
97-43	Measuring Inflation in Public School Costs	William J. Fowler, Jr.
<b>Institution data</b>		
2000-01	1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99) Field Test Report	Linda Zimbler
<b>Instructional resources and practices</b>		
95-11	Measuring Instruction, Curriculum Content, and Instructional Resources: The Status of Recent Work	Sharon Bobbitt & John Ralph
1999-08	Measuring Classroom Instructional Processes: Using Survey and Case Study Field Test Results to Improve Item Construction	Dan Kasprzyk
<b>International comparisons</b>		
97-11	International Comparisons of Inservice Professional Development	Dan Kasprzyk
97-16	International Education Expenditure Comparability Study: Final Report, Volume I	Shelley Burns
97-17	International Education Expenditure Comparability Study: Final Report, Volume II, Quantitative Analysis of Expenditure Comparability	Shelley Burns
<b>Libraries</b>		
94-07	Data Comparability and Public Policy: New Interest in Public Library Data Papers Presented at Meetings of the American Statistical Association	Carrol Kindel

No.	Title	NCES contact
97-25	1996 National Household Education Survey (NHES:96) Questionnaires: Screener/Household and Library, Parent and Family Involvement in Education and Civic Involvement, Youth Civic Involvement, and Adult Civic Involvement	Kathryn Chandler
<b>Limited English Proficiency</b>		
95-13	Assessing Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficiency	James Houser
<b>Literacy of adults</b>		
98-17	Developing the National Assessment of Adult Literacy: Recommendations from Stakeholders	Sheida White
1999-09a	1992 National Adult Literacy Survey: An Overview	Alex Sedlacek
1999-09b	1992 National Adult Literacy Survey: Sample Design	Alex Sedlacek
1999-09c	1992 National Adult Literacy Survey: Weighting and Population Estimates	Alex Sedlacek
1999-09d	1992 National Adult Literacy Survey: Development of the Survey Instruments	Alex Sedlacek
1999-09e	1992 National Adult Literacy Survey: Scaling and Proficiency Estimates	Alex Sedlacek
1999-09f	1992 National Adult Literacy Survey: Interpreting the Adult Literacy Scales and Literacy Levels	Alex Sedlacek
1999-09g	1992 National Adult Literacy Survey: Literacy Levels and the Response Probability Convention	Alex Sedlacek
1999-11	Data Sources on Lifelong Learning Available from the National Center for Education Statistics	Lisa Hudson
2000-05	Secondary Statistical Modeling With the National Assessment of Adult Literacy: Implications for the Design of the Background Questionnaire	Sheida White
2000-06	Using Telephone and Mail Surveys as a Supplement or Alternative to Door-to-Door Surveys in the Assessment of Adult Literacy	Sheida White
2000-07	“How Much Literacy is Enough?” Issues in Defining and Reporting Performance Standards for the National Assessment of Adult Literacy	Sheida White
2000-08	Evaluation of the 1992 NALS Background Survey Questionnaire: An Analysis of Uses with Recommendations for Revisions	Sheida White
2000-09	Demographic Changes and Literacy Development in a Decade	Sheida White
<b>Literacy of adults – international</b>		
97-33	Adult Literacy: An International Perspective	Marilyn Binkley
<b>Mathematics</b>		
98-09	High School Curriculum Structure: Effects on Coursetaking and Achievement in Mathematics for High School Graduates—An Examination of Data from the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988	Jeffrey Owings
1999-08	Measuring Classroom Instructional Processes: Using Survey and Case Study Field Test Results to Improve Item Construction	Dan Kasprzyk
<b>Parental involvement in education</b>		
96-03	National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS:88) Research Framework and Issues	Jeffrey Owings
97-25	1996 National Household Education Survey (NHES:96) Questionnaires: Screener/Household and Library, Parent and Family Involvement in Education and Civic Involvement, Youth Civic Involvement, and Adult Civic Involvement	Kathryn Chandler
1999-01	A Birth Cohort Study: Conceptual and Design Considerations and Rationale	Jerry West
<b>Participation rates</b>		
98-10	Adult Education Participation Decisions and Barriers: Review of Conceptual Frameworks and Empirical Studies	Peter Stowe
<b>Postsecondary education</b>		
1999-11	Data Sources on Lifelong Learning Available from the National Center for Education Statistics	Lisa Hudson

No.	Title	NCES contact
<b>Postsecondary education – persistence and attainment</b>		
98-11	Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study First Follow-up (BPS:96–98) Field Test Report	Aurora D’Amico
1999-15	Projected Postsecondary Outcomes of 1992 High School Graduates	Aurora D’Amico
<b>Postsecondary education – staff</b>		
97-26	Strategies for Improving Accuracy of Postsecondary Faculty Lists	Linda Zimbler
2000-01	1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99) Field Test Report	Linda Zimbler
<b>Principals</b>		
2000-10	A Research Agenda for the 1999–2000 Schools and Staffing Survey	Dan Kasprzyk
<b>Private schools</b>		
96-16	Strategies for Collecting Finance Data from Private Schools	Stephen Broughman
97-07	The Determinants of Per-Pupil Expenditures in Private Elementary and Secondary Schools: An Exploratory Analysis	Stephen Broughman
97-22	Collection of Private School Finance Data: Development of a Questionnaire	Stephen Broughman
<b>Projections of education statistics</b>		
1999-15	Projected Postsecondary Outcomes of 1992 High School Graduates	Aurora D’Amico
<b>Public school finance</b>		
1999-16	Measuring Resources in Education: From Accounting to the Resource Cost Model Approach	William J. Fowler, Jr.
<b>Public schools</b>		
97-43	Measuring Inflation in Public School Costs	William J. Fowler, Jr.
98-01	Collection of Public School Expenditure Data: Development of a Questionnaire	Stephen Broughman
98-04	Geographic Variations in Public Schools’ Costs	William J. Fowler, Jr.
1999-02	Tracking Secondary Use of the Schools and Staffing Survey Data: Preliminary Results	Dan Kasprzyk
2000-12	Coverage Evaluation of the 1994–95 Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey	Beth Young
<b>Public schools – secondary</b>		
98-09	High School Curriculum Structure: Effects on Coursetaking and Achievement in Mathematics for High School Graduates—An Examination of Data from the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988	Jeffrey Owings
<b>Reform, educational</b>		
96-03	National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS:88) Research Framework and Issues	Jeffrey Owings
<b>Response rates</b>		
98-02	Response Variance in the 1993–94 Schools and Staffing Survey: A Reinterview Report	Steven Kaufman
<b>School districts</b>		
2000-10	A Research Agenda for the 1999–2000 Schools and Staffing Survey	Dan Kasprzyk
<b>School districts, public</b>		
98-07	Decennial Census School District Project Planning Report	Tai Phan
1999-03	Evaluation of the 1996–97 Nonfiscal Common Core of Data Surveys Data Collection, Processing, and Editing Cycle	Beth Young
<b>School districts, public – demographics of</b>		
96-04	Census Mapping Project/School District Data Book	Tai Phan
<b>Schools</b>		
97-42	Improving the Measurement of Staffing Resources at the School Level: The Development of Recommendations for NCES for the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS)	Mary Rollefson

No.	Title	NCES contact
98-08	The Redesign of the Schools and Staffing Survey for 1999–2000: A Position Paper	Dan Kasprzyk
1999-03	Evaluation of the 1996–97 Nonfiscal Common Core of Data Surveys Data Collection, Processing, and Editing Cycle	Beth Young
2000-10	A Research Agenda for the 1999–2000 Schools and Staffing Survey	Dan Kasprzyk
<b>Schools – safety and discipline</b>		
97-09	Status of Data on Crime and Violence in Schools: Final Report	Lee Hoffman
<b>Science</b>		
2000-11	Financial Aid Profile of Graduate Students in Science and Engineering	Aurora D’Amico
<b>Software evaluation</b>		
2000-03	Strengths and Limitations of Using SUDAAN, Stata, and WesVarPC for Computing Variances from NCES Data Sets	Ralph Lee
<b>Staff</b>		
97-42	Improving the Measurement of Staffing Resources at the School Level: The Development of Recommendations for NCES for the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS)	Mary Rollefson
98-08	The Redesign of the Schools and Staffing Survey for 1999–2000: A Position Paper	Dan Kasprzyk
<b>Staff – higher education institutions</b>		
97-26	Strategies for Improving Accuracy of Postsecondary Faculty Lists	Linda Zimbler
<b>State</b>		
1999-03	Evaluation of the 1996–97 Nonfiscal Common Core of Data Surveys Data Collection, Processing, and Editing Cycle	Beth Young
<b>Statistical methodology</b>		
97-21	Statistics for Policymakers or Everything You Wanted to Know About Statistics But Thought You Could Never Understand	Susan Ahmed
<b>Students with disabilities</b>		
95-13	Assessing Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficiency	James Houser
<b>Survey methodology</b>		
96-17	National Postsecondary Student Aid Study: 1996 Field Test Methodology Report	Andrew G. Malizio
97-15	Customer Service Survey: Common Core of Data Coordinators	Lee Hoffman
97-35	Design, Data Collection, Interview Administration Time, and Data Editing in the 1996 National Household Education Survey	Kathryn Chandler
98-06	National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS:88) Base Year through Second Follow-Up: Final Methodology Report	Ralph Lee
98-11	Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study First Follow-up (BPS:96–98) Field Test Report	Aurora D’Amico
98-16	A Feasibility Study of Longitudinal Design for Schools and Staffing Survey	Stephen Broughman
1999-07	Collection of Resource and Expenditure Data on the Schools and Staffing Survey	Stephen Broughman
1999-17	Secondary Use of the Schools and Staffing Survey Data	Susan Wiley
2000-01	1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99) Field Test Report	Linda Zimbler
2000-02	Coordinating NCES Surveys: Options, Issues, Challenges, and Next Steps	Valena Plisko
2000-04	Selected Papers on Education Surveys: Papers Presented at the 1998 and 1999 ASA and 1999 AAPOR Meetings	Dan Kasprzyk
2000-12	Coverage Evaluation of the 1994–95 Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey	Beth Young
<b>Teachers</b>		
98-13	Response Variance in the 1994–95 Teacher Follow-up Survey	Steven Kaufman
1999-14	1994–95 Teacher Followup Survey: Data File User’s Manual, Restricted-Use Codebook	Kerry Gruber
2000-10	A Research Agenda for the 1999–2000 Schools and Staffing Survey	Dan Kasprzyk

No.	Title	NCES contact
<b>Teachers – instructional practices of</b>		
98-08	The Redesign of the Schools and Staffing Survey for 1999–2000: A Position Paper	Dan Kasprzyk
<b>Teachers – opinions regarding safety</b>		
98-08	The Redesign of the Schools and Staffing Survey for 1999–2000: A Position Paper	Dan Kasprzyk
<b>Teachers – performance evaluations</b>		
1999-04	Measuring Teacher Qualifications	Dan Kasprzyk
<b>Teachers – qualifications of</b>		
1999-04	Measuring Teacher Qualifications	Dan Kasprzyk
<b>Teachers – salaries of</b>		
94-05	Cost-of-Education Differentials Across the States	William J. Fowler, Jr.
<b>Variance estimation</b>		
2000-03	Strengths and Limitations of Using SUDAAN, Stata, and WesVarPC for Computing Variances from NCES Data Sets	Ralph Lee
2000-04	Selected Papers on Education Surveys: Papers Presented at the 1998 and 1999 ASA and 1999 AAPOR Meetings	Dan Kasprzyk
<b>Violence</b>		
97-09	Status of Data on Crime and Violence in Schools: Final Report	Lee Hoffman
<b>Vocational education</b>		
95-12	Rural Education Data User's Guide	Samuel Peng
1999-05	Procedures Guide for Transcript Studies	Dawn Nelson
1999-06	1998 Revision of the Secondary School Taxonomy	Dawn Nelson