



Case Studies

The case studies presented in this document detail the actual experiences of local education agencies (LEAs) in reporting the data required for the Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC). The case studies are grouped according to CRDC Collection Year; case studies 1-2 are from the 2013-14 Collection Year, and case studies 3-6 are from the 2015-16 Collection Year. The case studies comprise a range of models for how LEAs manage CRDC reporting. These include LEAs that have limited capacity to automate the preparation of their files for CRDC reporting and/or receive no assistance from their state education agency (SEA) or data system vendor, as well as LEAs for which the SEA submits most of the required data for the CRDC. Each case study includes the information outlined below.

- An overview of the LEA for which the case study is written, including the number of schools in the LEA, total student enrollment, and the percentage of students who are English language learners or students with an Individualized Education Program (IEP).
- The CRDC collection year for which the case study is written.
- An overview of the data sources the LEA used for CRDC reporting.
- A description of the type of assistance received from the SEA or data system vendor.
- The approximate percentage of data reported to the CRDC by the LEA and SEA.
- A description of the LEA's overall reporting burden, including the LEA staff involved in CRDC reporting along with a total, approximate number of staff hours needed for CRDC reporting.
- A description of the LEA's CRDC reporting process.
- For LEAs that received voluntary assistance from the SEA, an overview of the SEA, including the number of LEAs in the state and the total number of students enrolled, and a description of the SEA's reporting process.
- A description of the lessons learned for streamlining the reporting process and reporting accurate data.

Case Study #1. Bossier Parish Schools (Louisiana)

LEA Overview

Bossier Parish Schools has 33 schools in the district and a student enrollment of approximately 22,000. About 3 percent of the students are English language learners and about 12 percent are students with IEPs.

CRDC Collection Year

2013-14 CRDC

LEA Data Sources

The student data that Louisiana LEAs report to the SEA consist of unit records that have much of what the CRDC requires, such as student demographics; enrollment history; attendance totals; limited English proficiency (LEP) indicators; special education information, including students with disabilities served under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; discipline events with actions taken; snapshot class schedules; and high school transcript data. The data reported to the state comes from local SISs, so it is feasible to complete much of the CRDC by utilizing vendor extracts or LEA queries against the local database. Other possible approaches include querying the source data files used for state reporting, and/or utilizing any feedback data files provided by the SEA. Bossier Parish Schools chose to use the feedback data files provided by the SEA because these data files were more readily available and in a format more suitable for CRDC reporting purposes.

In addition to building queries from state feedback reports to complete the student and staffing portions of the CRDC, the district also sought input from the local finance department, which computed the required financial elements using their department resources. Other information that was not in state feedback reports nor in any local database was obtained by surveying local program offices for either summary data (e.g., school athletics data) or paper reports (e.g., bullying investigation forms). This information was compiled into the proper format and manually entered into the Excel template provided by OCR for inclusion in the batch upload.

SEA or Vendor Assistance

No assistance was received from the SEA or from a vendor.

Percentage of Data Reported, by Source

LEA: 100 percent

SEA: 0 percent

LEA Reporting Burden

One LEA staff person was responsible for compiling and reporting the data needed for the CRDC. The total number of hours spent on preparing the data for submission, submitting the data, correcting any errors, and certifying the report came to approximately 250.

LEA Reporting Process

The state-reported data used to help complete the CRDC were originally submitted by the LEA to the SEA in either separate collections, or in separate tables or records within a single collection. All collections had a unique state identifier and a local identifier as part of each student record. The LEA compiled all pertinent CRDC data into a set of tables within a PC software applications database. The database software had built-in functionality to create and run crosstab queries.¹

¹ A crosstab is a function that combines data from one or more sources into a concise format for analysis or reporting. Crosstabs typically display the joint distribution of two or more variables. For example, using the unique student identifier as the common variable, a crosstab might pull demographic data about the students, such as sex, from an enrollment database and combine it with course enrollment data to produce a report that shows the number of students enrolled in a particular course by sex.

A single crosstab query with inner joins (on student ID) between tables that had unit record data was created to produce the information needed in the proper format to complete a single CRDC table.

The LEA created one or more separate crosstab queries for each specific CRDC table. It typically took three queries to complete each table: one to do the racial breakdown, another to do the English language learner counts, and another to do the counts of students with disabilities. To complete the 2013-14 CRDC, over 200 queries were created.

The LEA used the CRDC spreadsheet template to organize and upload the data. This approach allowed the LEA to gather the required data offline and use the copy/paste function to reduce the likelihood of data entry errors, and then use the functionality of the spreadsheet to create the flat file for upload. This minimized the time spent online when the CRDC Online Submission System could be slow, such as during peak times near deadlines.

Lessons Learned

The district found that the biggest challenge in CRDC reporting was the time it took to write and run the hundreds of queries needed to complete the report. However, most of the queries could likely be reused against an updated data source for future reporting. In addition, the district found that using the OCR-provided template to prepare data files for submission was much easier than entering data manually for multiple schools.

Verifying the Completeness and Accuracy of CRDC Data

Recommendations from Bossier Parish Schools

Prior to an LEA's certification of the CRDC submission, the data must be complete and error free. The CRDC School Submission Form within the CRDC Online Submission System can be used to verify completeness. Users can select a school they wish to check, and the form will show the "Percentage of Required Cells Filled" for each module in the survey. If the data are not required for a particular module, an "N/A" (not applicable) will show in the field. There is also a checkbox that LEAs can use to indicate when they have finished entering data. However, if the percentage of required cells filled is less than 100 percent, it would not make sense for the LEA to indicate that data entry is complete.

To check that the submission is error free, LEAs can use the Current Submission Status Form. This form shows the total completeness of the survey (all modules combined) for each school in the district as well as for the LEA-level data. It also shows the error and warning count for each school. The user can drill down to the error report for each school to see the summary of warnings and errors by category, and then drill down further to see the errors and warnings within each category.

In cases of errors, the system requires resolution. The LEA should either correct incorrect values or explain the error condition by using the resolution reason codes (such as "Different Count Dates" or "High Mobility School") and providing explanatory comments. It is good practice to provide as much information as possible in the comments field in order to adequately explain the situation. Otherwise, the LEA may be contacted by the CRDC Partner Support for additional clarification.

In addition to resolving all errors, it is good practice to review warnings as well. Warnings often originate when values are not consistent over multiple questions. Investigating the warnings can help locate errors of omission. For example, if a school reports in the survey that they do not have preschool, but values for preschool enrollment are reported, a warning will show. Even values of zero can trigger the warnings if the survey is expecting no value (N/A). In order to clear this particular warning, either the preschool grade level indicator needs to be modified to "Yes" in the School Characteristics/Grades with Students Enrolled table and valid numbers (including zeros) entered in the various preschool count fields, or—if there are truly no preschool students—the grade level indicator should be "no" and the preschool count fields need to have no values (N/A); or an explanation reason for the discrepancy between data tables needs to be provided.

Case Study #2. Bonner Springs/Edwardsville Unified School District 204 (Kansas)

LEA Overview

Unified School District 204 in Bonner Springs/Edwardsville has seven schools in the district and a student enrollment of approximately 2,700. About 6 percent of the students are English language learners and about 13 percent are students with IEPs.

CRDC Collection Year

2013-14 CRDC

LEA Data Sources

Most of the data that were not prepopulated by the SEA for the instructional component of the CRDC were pulled from the district's SIS. Part of the reason that the district chose its particular SIS is because the vendor provided specific reports to help reduce the time needed for data reporting. Specifically, the company advertised on its website that "The Civil Rights Data Collection report is coded directly into your [Company Name] solution." Additional data needed for the CRDC came from the district's school accounting system, which is used for payroll and purchasing.

SEA or Vendor Assistance

The SEA prepopulated approximately 20 percent of the CRDC data into the CRDC Online Submission System. The LEA's SIS vendor provided the district with an extraction process that helped pull approximately 30 to 35 percent of the information needed for the CRDC from the LEA's SIS. The vendor also provided assistance in completing the extraction process through multiple webinars and online resources.

Percentage of Data Reported, by Source:

LEA: 80 percent

SEA: 20 percent

LEA Reporting Burden

The district's director of elementary instruction was responsible for CRDC reporting and coordinated the LEA's reporting process. Other individuals—including the payroll clerk, the district accountant, and the director of business—gathered information related to school personnel (such as licensure and absenteeism) and district financial data. The total time that LEA staff spent on preparing the data for submission, submitting the data, correcting any errors, and certifying the report came to approximately 100 hours. Much of the burden was related to submission errors. For the 2013-14 CRDC, many of the errors were caused by the need to add zeroes to the file, as blanks were not allowed if a valid count was required. Staff needed to manually go through each field and add zeroes where needed.

LEA Reporting Process

After the SEA prepopulated data into the CRDC and the CRDC Online Submission System opened for district data submission, the LEA reviewed and corrected the data prepopulated by the state and submitted the remaining data. Approximately 90 percent of the data reported by the LEA were submitted as batch loads of flat files. As noted above, the LEA used a vendor-provided template for extracting data from the SIS to create the necessary flat files. District staff aligned the specific fields that matched the data requested to the template. It was important to align the fields accurately, because if there was an error in a data field, it would not only cause that file to upload improperly, but also affect all data after that point. Other data needed for the CRDC that were not available from the SIS were manually pulled from the source data system and formatted for manual entry into the CRDC's online survey forms.

SEA Overview

The Kansas Department of Education (KSDE) has 286 LEAs and a total student enrollment of about 477,010.

SEA Reporting Process

The KSDE collects data from its districts through the Kansas Individual Data on Students (KIDS) reporting system. KIDS is the core data collection system that assigns the state student ID numbers. The goal of the KIDS system is to eliminate duplication of data reporting and support the management of longitudinal records for state and federal reporting and program monitoring. Some of the data collected in KIDS are needed for the CRDC. Beginning with the 2011-12 CRDC, the KSDE prepopulated the 28 questions below:

LEA-01: Count of students LEA-02: Count of Schools
LEA-12: Preschool Program Provided by the LEA Indicator
LEA-14: Preschool Age for non-IDEA Children
LEA-15: Preschool Eligibility-All Children
LEA-16: Pre-school Eligibility-Student Groups
LEA 17: Kindergarten Program Indicator
SCH-01-1: Grades with Students Enrolled
SCH-02: Preschool Eligibility-All Children
SCH-08: Preschool Enrollment
SCH-09: Enrollment of Limited English Proficient Students
SCH-11: Gifted/Talented Education Programs
SCH-12: Gifted/Talented Student Enrollment \
SCH-13: Classes in Algebra 1
SCH-15: Classes in Geometry
SCH-18: Classes in Mathematics Courses in High School
SCH-20: Classes in Science Courses in High School
SCH-25: Different AP-Advanced Placement courses
SCH-50: Teachers-FTE Count and Certification
SCH-51: Teacher years of experience
SCH-52: School Counselors
SCH-01-02: Middle School Students who Passed Algebra 1
SCH-02: High School Students who Passed Algebra 1
SCH-07: Student participation in SAT Reasoning Test or ACT
SCH-09: Students who received a qualifying score on Advanced Placement AP Exams
SCH-15: Preschool suspensions and expulsions
SCH-32: Students Disciplined for Harassment or Bullying
SCH-39: Full-term Equivalency Count and Salary Amount for Teachers funded with State and Local Funds

Lessons Learned

The size and timing of the CRDC contributed to the challenges for LEA reporting. During the spring, district staff are involved in many other activities, including state assessments, and staff must balance CRDC reporting with additional priorities. In addition, sufficient time needed to be allocated for uploading files to the CRDC Online Submission System. Staff had to be prepared for the possibility of limited access to the system if many other districts were attempting to upload files at the same time.

Case Study #3. Columbine Elementary (California)

LEA Overview

Columbine Elementary is a single-school district in Tulare County, CA, with a student enrollment of approximately 200. About 10 percent of the students are English language learners and about 2 percent are students with IEPs.

CRDC Collection Year

2015-16 CRDC

LEA Data Sources

Columbine Elementary does not have a student information system (SIS). Student data are stored in spreadsheets. Information is updated monthly as needed, and a spreadsheet is created for each month. Most of the CRDC data are included in the monthly spreadsheets for the collection year. Financial data are stored in a countywide system, and the district receives regular financial reports from the county. These reports are used as the data source for some of the CRDC data elements.

SEA or Vendor Assistance

No assistance was received from the SEA or from a vendor.

Percentage of Data Reported, by Source

LEA: 100 percent

SEA: 0 percent

LEA Reporting Burden

Two staff persons worked on CRDC reporting: the district superintendent and an administrative assistant. A total of approximately 40 staff hours were needed to prepare the data for submission, submit the data, correct any errors, and certify the report.

LEA Reporting Process

The administrative assistant reviewed the data elements to be collected, identified the appropriate spreadsheets and reports to be used as data sources, and prepared the data to be entered. The superintendent manually entered all of the required data into the online forms in the CRDC Online Submission System and certified the submission.

Lessons Learned

The district has found that given its size and the amount of data they are required to report, it is easier and faster to enter the data manually into the online forms than it is to create flat files for the data submissions. In addition, the district has found that new data elements significantly increase the amount of time needed for reporting, as the data elements must be accurately defined and located in the correct data source.

Case Study #4. Loudoun County Public Schools (Virginia)

LEA Overview

Loudoun County Public Schools has 91 schools and centers in the district and a student enrollment of approximately 79,000. About 16 percent of these students are English language learners and about 12 percent are students with IEPs.

CRDC Collection Year

2015-16 CRDC

LEA Data Sources

Most of the data for the 2015-16 CRDC came from the district's SIS. The following offices provided data for the collection: Career and Technical Education, Virtual Learning, School Administration, Testing and Diagnostic Services, Head Start, Gifted, Financial Services, Human Resources and Talent Development, Athletics, Discipline, and Counseling.

SEA or Vendor Assistance

The Virginia Department of Education populated most of the enrollment portion of the survey. However, the data for LEP, IEP, and Section 504 students were not included in the prepopulation. The SEA also sent periodic emails notifying the LEA of key dates in the CRDC timeline. The LEA does not contract with a vendor specifically for support in completing the CRDC submission; rather, the SIS vendor provides an extract tool with data fields mapped.

Approximate Percentage of Data Reported, by Source

LEA: 90 percent

SEA: 10 percent

LEA Reporting Burden

For the 2015-16 CRDC, multiple offices were involved in data reporting. Altogether, approximately 234 staff hours by two staff working full time and six staff working part time were needed to review the data submitted by the state, prepare the remaining data for submission, submit the data, correct any errors, and certify the report. Multiple submission trials were required before the report was completed.

LEA Reporting Process

Listed below are the steps in the reporting process that the LEA followed for the 2015-16 CRDC.

- Identify all required schools to be reported and preregister in the CRDC Advance Website.
- Review the requirements and definitions for the new data collection for 2015-16.
- Contact CRDC support with questions throughout the process as needed.
- Send out notices to appropriate designees within the LEA (Human Resources, Budget, Information Management, Offenses, Discipline, Athletics, Gifted and Talented, Math, Science, etc.).
- Convene an information session with participating staff regarding the CRDC requirements, such as due dates, specific documentation for each designee, and other details.
- Gather and extract enrollment, schedules, programs, testing, discipline, and other data points for processing by the Research Office.
- Collaborate with the SIS Information Management team to ensure the accurate use and interpretation of the data. Revise data extracts and processes as necessary from the SIS conversion and any new data collection items requested by the CRDC.

- Complete the quality assurance and quality control process.
- Prepare the CRDC flat file for upload.
- Format and upload the data received from designees.
- Run and correct error reports in conjunction with multiple uploads.
- Validate the reports with the schools and central office staff.
- Certify the CRDC report.
- Present the final results of the CRDC report to participants and key stakeholders.
- Archive the final report.

SEA Overview

The Virginia Department of Education has 132 LEAs and a total student enrollment of about 1.28 million.

SEA Reporting Process

The 2015-16 CRDC was the first collection for which the SEA was able to prepopulate CRDC data for its LEAs. The SEA had planned to create data files for CRDC submission if the data were previously collected from the LEAs as part of the annual state reporting requirements. For the 2015-16 CRDC, the SEA was able to prepopulate only portions of the enrollment data for its LEAs as a proof of concept before delving into a more comprehensive prepopulation effort for the next CRDC.

As with all state collections, each data element is defined to ensure that the data collected are reliable. In terms of using existing state data for the CRDC, the SEA recognized that there could be mismatches or slight variations in data definitions. If the SEA blindly submitted existing data for similarly named data elements, the reliability of state prepopulation would diminish significantly, which would ultimately lead to more work for the LEAs to certify the CRDC. To avoid that, the SEA needed to complete an element to element study before sending data to CRDC on behalf of the LEAs. For the limited amount of data the SEA was able to prepopulate for the 2015-16 CRDC, it required approximately 16 hours by one staff person working full time to prepare and submit the data, plus an additional 22 hours by SEA staff in program offices to review and validate the data prior to submission. Although the SEA began prepopulation efforts in mid-2016, it did not have sufficient available staff time to do more than a minimal prepopulation of enrollment data for the 2015-16 CRDC collection. Efforts continue, and the SEA is on target to prepopulate 50 percent or more of the CRDC data for the next collection.

Lessons Learned

LEA: The difficulties in completing the 2015-16 CRDC revolved around new staff who were not familiar with the CRDC process. This was resolved through information sessions with staff before the 2015-16 CRDC submission window opened, as well as ongoing follow-up during the data collection process.

SEA: The ability to prepopulate data in the CRDC is largely dependent on the availability of knowledgeable SEA staff both in Information Management and the program offices, as well as coordinated efforts of an LEA advisory group.

Case Study #5. Paulding County (Georgia)

LEA Overview

The Paulding County School District has 33 schools and a student enrollment of about 29,000. About 2 percent of the students are English language learners and about 1 percent are students with IEPs.

CRDC Collection Year

2015-16 CRDC

LEA Data Sources

Paulding County uses a single source SIS. Data from this system are used for mandated state reporting, such as the Full Time Equivalency (FTE) and Student Record collections. These two data collections were used to compile some of the data required for the CRDC. The LEA also used data received from other agencies and organizations, such as The College Board. Survey sections relating to teacher absenteeism and teacher salaries were given to the LEA's payroll department for completion, and sections relating to school expenditures were provided to the finance department for completion.

SEA or Vendor Assistance

The Georgia Department of Education assisted its LEAs with the CRDC by prepopulating pertinent data previously collected from the LEA.

Percentage of Data Reported, by Source:

LEA: 30 percent

SEA: 70 percent

LEA Reporting Burden

After the SEA provided prepopulation support, the Paulding County School District needed approximately 275 additional hours to create data queries to run the necessary reports and to manually enter the data into the online survey forms. If the SEA had not assisted, schools and the district would have spent considerable additional time completing

the CRDC: assistance from the SEA saved approximately 3-4 hours per school in completing the CRDC. It also reduced the district-level reporting burden by approximately 1-2 hours per school. In addition, prepopulation of data by the SEA helped to reduce errors that could be caused by the manual entry process used by the district.

LEA Reporting Process

The first step in the reporting process was to review the data elements that had not been prepopulated by the SEA, and determine the source system for those elements. School staff were directly involved in entering data for the CRDC. The LEA sent a copy of the school sections of the survey to the schools so that school staff could see what was needed for the collection. The LEA created data queries that schools could run to pull the necessary data. A work session was held in a computer lab for each level of school (i.e., elementary, high school, etc.). During the work sessions, school staff entered data for their schools directly into the CRDC online survey forms. LEA staff were present at the work sessions to answer questions and help resolve errors.

SEA Overview

The Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has 207 LEAs and a total student enrollment of about 1.76 million.

SEA Reporting Process

The GaDOE began assisting its LEAs with the CRDC beginning with the 2011-12 collection. For that collection, the GaDOE provided reports to the LEAs containing the answers to about half of the questions in the survey. The LEAs could use these reports to manually enter the data into the survey. The LEAs then needed to identify the data sources for the remaining data elements and complete the remainder of the survey.

For the 2013-14 CRDC, the GaDOE participated in a pilot wherein states prepopulated data for their districts into the CRDC Online Submission System. Through this process, the SEA was able to provide about 70 percent of the data required for the survey. The SEA notified districts of its plan to enter data on their behalf, and districts were asked to not enter any data into the survey tool until the SEA had finished uploading data. Once the SEA uploaded the files and corrected any errors, the districts were informed that the GaDOE file upload process was complete and they could change any or all of the data that the GaDOE had uploaded.

The data that the SEA uploaded into the CRDC Online Submission System for its LEAs came from data that were previously reported to the SEA by the LEAs. The types of data the SEA collects from its LEAs fall into the following categories:

- Student Attendance and Enrollment Data
- Student Class Schedules
- Student Demographic Data
- Student Discipline Data
- Student Program Participation
- Staff Certification and Assignment Data
- Staff Demographic Data
- Private School Enrollment Data
- Quality Basic Education (QBE) Funding Data
- Career, Technical, and Agricultural Education (CTAE) End of Pathway Data

The actual collection process occurs using a system created by GaDOE. Each LEA selects an SIS vendor of its own choice. There are 11 SIS vendors in Georgia, with two of those vendors representing 92 percent of the districts. GaDOE provides each vendor with a file specification for each collection cycle to create the data extract. LEAs extract and upload the data required for state reporting purposes by using the state system's web portal, where validation rules are applied and reports are generated. All errors must be corrected before the LEA superintendent can certify the data as accurate and complete. Because the SEA is not responsible for reporting data for the CRDC, some data needed for the CRDC remain in each LEA's SIS and are not uploaded through the web portal. These data cannot be prepopulated and must be provided by each LEA.

Lessons Learned

LEA: Nuances in definitions of the data required for the CRDC presented challenges in finding and reporting the necessary data. For example, the CRDC defines "allegation" as a claim or assertion that someone has done something wrong or illegal, typically made without proof. However, the school district tracks bullying or harassment incidents only if the claim is substantiated; it does not track allegations only.

Reporting ACT and SAT scores for the CRDC also presented a challenge for the district. District staff had to review the data provided by The College Board in order to accurately report the data by sex, race/ethnicity, disability status, and limited English proficiency status. This took many staff hours.

Another lesson learned is that the printed version of the data collection elements were numbered, but the website version was not numbered. This presented a challenge when keying data from the data report based on the printed version into the online survey forms.

SEA: Initially, GaDOE found that the biggest challenge in assisting LEAs with CRDC reporting was finding enough resource time to write the queries to extract and format the necessary data to prepopulate the survey. Once the queries were written, prepopulation required less time in subsequent years.

Case Study #6. Clark County (Kentucky)

LEA Overview

The Clark County Public Schools school district includes nine schools and has a student enrollment of about 5,300 students. About 2 percent of the students are English language learners and about 13 percent are students with IEPs.

CRDC Collection Year

2015-16 CRDC

LEA Data Sources

Kentucky has a statewide SIS and a statewide financial system. The SEA and all of the LEAs in the state use the same SIS and the same financial system. This allows the SEA to extract data populated in the local SIS and financial system for required state reporting. Districts have the flexibility to customize their SIS and financial system at the local level to collect and store additional data beyond what is required for state reporting. Some of the additional data collected by Clark County were needed for the CRDC. The SEA was able to prepopulate 92 percent of the necessary data in the CRDC Online Submission System using the data it pulled from the local SIS and financial system. The LEA only needed to submit additional data that were not collected and used by the SEA for state reporting. This included data related to school and school support staff, school security staff, and discipline offenses.

SEA or Vendor Assistance

The SEA assisted with approximately 92 percent of the required data reporting. All other data was prepared and submitted locally without additional vendor assistance.

Percentage of Data Reported, by Source:

LEA: 8 percent

SEA: 92 percent

LEA Reporting Burden

The LEA's reporting burden for the CRDC was greatly reduced by the SEA's ability to prepopulate the majority of the required data. For the 2015-16 CRDC, one staff person spent approximately 15 hours total to prepare the data for submission, submit the data, correct any errors, and certify the report.

LEA Reporting Process

The SEA prepopulated 92 percent of the required data in the CRDC. Once the CRDC Online Submission System opened for LEAs to submit data, the LEA verified the data the state had reported during the SEA-defined validation window.

When the state validation period was over, the LEA manually entered data into the remaining fields for which the SEA did not submit data. Once all data had been entered and verified, the LEA certified its report in the CRDC system.

SEA Overview

The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) has 173 LEAs and a total student enrollment of about 655,500.

SEA Reporting Process

KDE and all of its districts use the same SIS. This allows KDE to access data in the local SISs. Kentucky also has a statewide financial reporting system. These two data systems contain much of the data required for the CRDC. For the 2011-12 CRDC collection, KDE was able to provide minimal support by creating a set of ad hoc queries that LEAs could use. The queries allowed LEAs to pull CRDC data elements for their schools from the local SIS in a way that was consistent across the state. For the 2013-14 CRDC, KDE extracted data from the state data system to prepopulate the CRDC for its LEAs. For that collection, the SEA was able to provide about 80 percent of school-related data and 50 percent of LEA-related data.

By refining its process for extracting the data, KDE was able to provide 95 percent of school-related data for the 2015-16 CRDC and 54 percent of LEA-related data—in total, 92 percent of all data. Data already in the LEA's SIS or part of the district financial report were used to report to the CRDC. No additional data were collected by the SEA for the purpose of CRDC reporting. Kentucky created ETL (Extract, Transfer, and Load) scripts to pull data from the SIS in the CRDC format.

The steps in the KDE reporting process were as follows:

1. LEA and school data were collected and stored in the local SIS and financial reporting system.
2. These data were then available to the KDE, which extracted data from the system for uploading to the CRDC Online Submission System.
3. LEAs entered additional data and certified their CRDC reports.

KDE established a reporting timeline once OCR notified agencies of the collection window dates. KDE informed LEAs when the SEA completed its data upload and the KDE-established validation window was open. The validation window provided LEAs an opportunity to review the data, and it also reserved time for the state to reload data if necessary. If the SEA had to reload data, anything a district had loaded would be overwritten. During the district data entry period, the state served as a resource for LEAs to help answer questions until the CRDC collection window closed.

Lessons Learned

LEA: Prepopulation by the SEA through data extracts generally results in more accurate data than keying data into a flat file or the online survey forms. It is important that LEAs adhere to the state-established timelines, so the SEA conducts a number of trainings to ensure that LEAs are aware of the timeline and expectations. If an LEA does not follow the timeline and procedures, it may end up entering data that are ultimately overwritten if the SEA needs to reload data during the state-established validation period.

SEA: KDE found that prepopulating data for the CRDC for the first time was more work than expected. No additional staff were hired. Existing staff wrote the extracts, pulled the data, and entered the data into the CRDC Online Submission System. As much work as possible was done during the slower summer months preceding the CRDC collection window. Once the scripts were written to extract the data, the time requirement was lower. Changes to the biennial collection can create additional and ongoing difficulties, but communication and early planning can ease this burden. Communication throughout the process is a key component in successful reporting. KDE communicates with districts through webcasts and in-person trainings. A state CRDC web page (<http://education.ky.gov/districts/tech/sis/Pages/KY-CRDC.aspx>) is used as a one-stop shop for updates and information. LEAs are encouraged to use a team approach to CRDC reporting by involving applicable data stewards to help with reporting and validation.