

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**Submission for OMB Review;
Comment Request****AGENCY:** Department of Education.**SUMMARY:** The IC Clearance Official, Regulatory Information Management Services, Office of Management invites comments on the submission for OMB review as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.**DATES:** Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before May 31, 2006.**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should be addressed to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Rachel Potter, Desk Officer, Department of Education, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW., Room 10222, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503 or faxed to (202) 395-6974.**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35) requires that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) provide interested Federal agencies and the public an early opportunity to comment on information collection requests. OMB may amend or waive the requirement for public consultation to the extent that public participation in the approval process would defeat the purpose of the information collection, violate State or Federal law, or substantially interfere with any agency's ability to perform its statutory obligations. The IC Clearance Official, Regulatory Information Management Services, Office of Management, publishes that notice containing proposed information collection requests prior to submission of these requests to OMB. Each proposed information collection, grouped by office, contains the following: (1) Type of review requested, e.g. new, revision, extension, existing or reinstatement; (2) Title; (3) Summary of the collection; (4) Description of the need for, and proposed use of, the information; (5) Respondents and frequency of collection; and (6) Reporting and/or Recordkeeping burden. OMB invites public comment.

Dated: April 25, 2006.

Angela C. Arrington,*IC Clearance Official, Regulatory Information Management Services, Office of Management.***Office of Postsecondary Education***Type of Review:* Revision.*Title:* Higher Education Act (HEA)

Title II Reporting Forms on Teacher Quality and Preparation.

Frequency: Annually.*Affected Public:* State, Local, or Tribal Gov't, SEAs or LEAs; not-for-profit institutions.*Reporting and Recordkeeping Hour Burden:**Responses:* 1,309.*Burden Hours:* 121,632.*Abstract:* The Higher Education Act of 1998 calls for annual reports from states and institutions of higher education (IHE) on the quality of teacher education and related matters (Pub. L. 105-244, section 207:20 U.S.C. 1027). The purpose of the reports is to provide greater accountability in the preparation of America's teaching forces and to provide information and incentives for its improvement. Most IHEs that have teacher preparation programs must report annually to their states on the performance of their program completers on teacher certification tests. States, in turn, must report test performance information, institution by institution, to the Secretary of Education, along with institution rankings. They must also report on their requirements for licensing teachers, state standards, alternative routes to certifications, waivers, and related items.Requests for copies of the information collection submission for OMB review may be accessed from <http://edicsweb.ed.gov>, by selecting the "Browse Pending Collections" link and by clicking on link number 2975. When you access the information collection, click on "Download Attachments" to view. Written requests for information should be addressed to U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., Potomac Center, 9th Floor, Washington, DC 20202-4700. Requests may also be electronically mailed to ICDocketMgr@ed.gov or faxed to 202-245-6623. Please specify the complete title of the information collection when making your request.Comments regarding burden and/or the collection activity requirements should be electronically mailed to ICDocketMgr@ed.gov. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339.

[FR Doc. E6-6522 Filed 4-28-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000-01-P**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION****Notice of Proposed Information
Collection Requests****AGENCY:** Department of Education.**SUMMARY:** The Director, Regulatory Information Management Services,

Office of Management, invites comments on the proposed information collection requests as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before June 30, 2006.**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35) requires that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) provide interested Federal agencies and the public an early opportunity to comment on information collection requests. OMB may amend or waive the requirement for public consultation to the extent that public participation in the approval process would defeat the purpose of the information collection, violate State or Federal law, or substantially interfere with any agency's ability to perform its statutory obligations. The Director, Regulatory Information Management Services, Office of Management, publishes that notice containing proposed information collection requests prior to submission of these requests to OMB. Each proposed information collection, grouped by office, contains the following: (1) Type of review requested, e.g. new, revision, extension, existing or reinstatement; (2) Title; (3) Summary of the collection; (4) Description of the need for, and proposed use of, the information; (5) Respondents and frequency of collection; and (6) Reporting and/or Recordkeeping burden. OMB invites public comment.

The Department of Education is especially interested in public comment addressing the following issues: (1) Is this collection necessary to the proper functions of the Department; (2) will this information be processed and used in a timely manner; (3) is the estimate of burden accurate; (4) how might the Department enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (5) how might the Department minimize the burden of this collection on the respondents, including through the use of information technology.

Dated: April 25, 2006.

Jeanne Van Vlandren,*Director, Regulatory Information Management Services, Office of Management.***Office of Planning, Evaluation, and
Policy Development.***Type of Review:* Regular.*Title:* Annual Mandatory Collection of Elementary and Secondary Education Data for the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN).*Frequency:* Annually.

Affected Public: State, Local, or Tribal Gov't, SEAs or LEAs.

Reporting and Recordkeeping Hour Burden:

Responses: 6,052.

Burden Hours: 476,234.

Abstract: The Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) is in the implementation phase of a multiple year effort to consolidate the collection of education information about States, Districts, and Schools in a way that improves data quality and reduces paperwork burden for all of the national education partners. To minimize the burden on the data providers, EDEN seeks the transfer of the proposed data as soon as it has been processed for State, District, and School use. These data will then be stored in EDEN and accessed by federal education program managers and analysts as needed to make program management decisions. This process will eliminate redundant data collections while providing for the timeliness of data submission and use.

Additional Information: The Department of Education (ED) is specifically requesting the data providers in each the State Education Agency (SEA) to review the proposed data elements to determine which of these data can be provided for the upcoming 2006–2007 school year and which data would be available in later years (2007–2008 or 2008–2009) and which data, if any, is never expected to be available from the SEA. If information for a data group is not available, please provide information beyond the fact that it is not available. Are there specific impediments to providing this data that you can describe? Is the definition for the data group unclear or ambiguous? Do the requested code sets not align with the way your state collects the data? This is very important information because ED intends to make the collection of these data mandatory. ED also seeks to know if the SEA data definitions are consistent and compatible with the EDEN definitions and accurately reflect the way data is stored and used for education by the States, Districts, and Schools. The answers to these questions by the data providers will influence the timing and content of the final EDEN proposal for the collection of this elementary and secondary data. In addition to overall public comments, ED would also like state education data providers to consider and respond to a number of specific questions that were developed during the recent data definition cycle for EDEN 2006–07 data. While most of these questions address the ability of states to provide information, some speak to the potential

burden on states associated with overall changes in EDEN. When responding to these questions, please include the question number in your response.

1. Some of the EDEN data groups require additional information in order to interpret it properly; this is loosely described as metadata. For example, state proficiency levels and the levels that make up proficient and higher differ from one state to the next. Similarly, there are numerous data groups that collect information on state-defined items such as truants, persistently dangerous schools, and definition of school year. For all of these examples, additional information is needed in order to fully understand the reported data as well as to understand whether comparisons across the state are (or are not) appropriate. We are currently considering several ways to collect this information including web-based forms and a separate state-level submission file. What would be the most convenient way for your state to initially provide and subsequently update this information?

2. As EDEN matures, we are weighing the costs/benefits of standardizing the naming conventions of the data groups in order to align them more closely with the Federal Enterprise Architecture. We anticipate this effort would result in changes to approximately 1/3 of data group names and we would provide a crosswalk between the old name and the new name of each data group. The numbers assigned to the data groups would not change. What impact would data group name changes have on the burden associated with producing and submitting EDEN data files in your state? If we do elect to make these changes, what tools can ED provide to you to lessen your paperwork burden?

3. For the 2006–07 EDEN data set, we added a new topic area: Finance. This change was based on an understanding that in many states, data for files that include financial information come from a source that is separate from the rest of the EDEN data files. So far, we have moved the following data groups to this new topic area: 574—Federal Funding Allocation Table, 614—REAP Alternative Funding Indicator, 615—RLIS Program Table, 616—Transfer Funds Indicator, plus the two new data groups: Funds Spent on Supplemental Services and Funds Spent on School Choice. Is this conceptual change helpful in your state? Are there other data groups that you recommend that we move to this new topic area?

4. As part of the merge between NCES' Common Core of Data (CCD) and EDEN, we would like to modify the way the CCD ID code for schools and

districts are submitted in EDEN data files. The CCD ID code is made up of 3 components (a 2 digit FIPS code, a 5 digit district ID code, and a 5 digit school ID code). CCD collects all 3 of these components separately meaning that for schools, there are 3 ID codes that, together, make a unique identifier. EDEN collects a single 7 digit CCD District ID (FIPS thru District) and a single 12 digit CCD school ID (FIPS thru District thru School). What impact would there be on your state's ability to provide EDEN data files if EDEN changed to the CCD methodology for NCES IDs?

5. For Magnet School Status (at the school level) CCD collects only (1) Yes and (2) No. EDEN is set up to collect 4 categories of information regarding Magnet Schools: (1) Magnet All Students, (2) Magnet Not All Students, (3) Not Magnet, and (4) Not Collected by State. At what level of detail does your state collect information on Magnet Schools? What is the burden to your state to provide the data EDEN is requesting?

6. OSEP has historically collected placement information for school age children by age ranges (6–11, 12–17, and 18–21). For 2006–07, USED is proposing to collect this information using discrete ages (instead of the previously used age ranges). This change would take place in EDEN data group #74, Children with Disabilities (IDEA), in the category set that now contains Educational Environment (IDEA), Disability Category (IDEA), and Age Group (Placement). The comparable data group for early childhood (Data Group #613) already collects placement information by discrete age. How does this change affect your state's reporting ability and burden?

7. How do states track dropouts within each state? Would states be able to report dropout data by age or is this information only available by grade?

8. EDEN currently collects dropout data by grade for students in grades 7–12 but will be adding ungraded as an option for the 2006–07 reporting year. Does your state have a significant number of dropouts in grades other than 7–12 (e.g., a student in grade 6 who reaches the age where dropping out is an option)? Can you report this count as a single number (e.g., total dropouts below 7th grade)?

9. Please examine the two new data groups—Funds Spent on Supplemental Services and Funds Spent on School Choice. What information does your state ask LEAs to report on this subject? Can you provide the information requested? If you cannot provide data for these new data groups for 2006–07,

when will you be able to provide this data?

Requests for copies of the proposed information collection request may be accessed from <http://edicsweb.ed.gov>, by selecting the "Browse Pending Collections" link and by clicking on link number 03017. When you access the information collection, click on "Download Attachments" to view. Written requests for information should be addressed to U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., Potomac Center, 9th Floor, Washington, DC 20202-4700. Requests may also be electronically mailed to IC_DocketMgr@ed.gov or faxed to 202-245-6623. Please specify the complete title of the information collection when making your request.

Comments regarding burden and/or the collection activity requirements should be electronically mailed to IC_DocketMgr@ed.gov. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339.

[FR Doc. E6-6526 Filed 4-28-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Overview Information; Enhanced Assessment Instruments; Notice Inviting Applications for New Awards for Fiscal Year (FY) 2005

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number: 84.368.

Dates:

Applications Available: May 1, 2006.

Deadline for Transmittal of

Applications: June 15, 2006.

Eligible Applicants: State educational agencies (SEAs); consortia of SEAs.

Estimated Available Funds:

\$11,680,000 in FY 2005 funds.

Estimated Range of Awards: \$500,000 to \$2,000,000.

Estimated Average Size of Awards: \$1,460,000.

Estimated Number of Awards: 8.

Note: The Department is not bound by any estimates in this notice.

Project period: Up to 18 months.

Full Text of Announcement

I. Funding Opportunity Description

Purpose of Program: To enhance the quality of assessment instruments and systems used by States for measuring the achievement of all students.

Priorities: This application includes four absolute and three competitive

preference priorities. In accordance with 34 CFR 75.105(b)(2)(iv), the absolute priorities are from section 6112 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (ESEA). The competitive preference priorities are from Appendix E to the notice of final requirements for optional State consolidated applications submitted under section 9302 of the ESEA, published in the **Federal Register** on May 22, 2002 (67 FR 35967).

Absolute Priorities: For FY 2005, these priorities are absolute priorities. Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(3) we consider only applications that address one or more of these priorities.

These priorities are:

a. Collaborate with institutions of higher education, other research institutions, or other organizations to improve the quality, validity, and reliability of State academic assessments beyond the requirements for these assessments described in section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA;

b. Measure student academic achievement using multiple measures of student academic achievement from multiple sources;

c. Chart student progress over time; and

d. Evaluate student academic achievement through the development of comprehensive academic assessment instruments, such as performance and technology-based academic assessments.

Competitive Preference Priorities: For FY 2005, these priorities are competitive preference priorities. Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(2)(i) we will award up to an additional 35 points to an application, depending on the extent to which the application meets these priorities.

These priorities are: Test accommodations and alternate assessments (up to 15 points), collaborative efforts (up to 10 points), and dissemination (up to 10 points).

Note: The full text of these priorities is included in the notice of final requirements published in the **Federal Register** on May 22, 2002 (67 FR 35967) and in the application package.

Program Authority: 20 U.S.C. 7842 and 7301a.

Applicable Regulations: (a) The Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) in 34 CFR parts 74, 75, 77, 80, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86, 97, 98, and 99.

(b) The notice of final requirements published in the **Federal Register** on May 22, 2002 (67 FR 35967).

II. Award Information

Type of Award: Discretionary grants.

Estimated Available Funds:

\$11,680,000 in FY 2005 funds.

Estimated Range of Awards: \$500,000 to \$2,000,000.

Estimated Average Size of Awards:

\$1,460,000.

Estimated Number of Awards: 8.

Note: The Department is not bound by any estimates in this notice.

Project period: Up to 18 months.

III. Eligibility Information

1. **Eligible Applicants:** SEAs; consortia of SEAs.

2. **Cost Sharing or Matching:** This competition does not involve cost sharing or matching.

3. **Other:** An application from a consortium of SEAs must designate one SEA as the fiscal agent.

IV. Application and Submission Information

1. **Address to Request Application Package:** Zollie Stevenson, Jr., Student Achievement and School Accountability Program, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., Room 3W226, Washington, DC 20202-6132. Telephone: (202) 260-1824 or by e-mail: Zollie.Stevenson@ed.gov.

If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), you may call the Federal Relay Service (FRS) at 1-800-877-8339.

Individuals with disabilities may obtain a copy of the application package in an alternative format (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) by contacting the program contact person listed in this section.

2. **Content and Form of Application Submission:** Requirements concerning the content of an application, together with the forms you must submit, are in the application package for this competition.

Page Limit: The application narrative (Part III of the application) is where you, the applicant, address the selection criteria that reviewers use to evaluate your application. You must limit Part III to the equivalent of no more than 40 pages, using the following standards:

- A "page" is 8.5" x 11", on one side only with 1" margins at the top, bottom, and both sides.

- Double space (no more than three lines per vertical inch) all text in the application narrative, including titles, headings, footnotes, quotations, and captions as well as all text in charts, tables, figures, and graphs.

- Use a font that is either 12 point or larger or no smaller than 10 pitch (characters per inch).

The page limit does not apply to the cover sheet, budget section (chart and