

Deirdre Magnan:

[slide 6] All right, Leticia, handing things over to you.

Leticia Braga:

All right, thank you, Deirdre, and welcome everyone. It's great to see everyone saying hi, introducing yourselves in the chat. I'm Leticia Braga, Team Lead for the Title III program, and we are going to get started. We know that this is a really busy time period for data and other things and it may be lunchtime for some folks, so we appreciate you taking the time to join us today and go through some updates for the program.

So for our agenda today, we're going to do a quick introduction and overview, talk about the Guide to Collecting and Reporting Title III Data, some changes to the school year (SY) 2022–23 file specifications that we want to highlight, talk a little bit about ED*Facts* Modernization and some ED Data Express (EDE) updates, and then finally do some wrap up. Next slide.

[slide 7] So, Introduction and Overview. We can go to the next slide.

[slide 8] We always present this slide, but we know that we have folks who maybe haven't joined previous webinars and we always like to highlight the team because it is a team effort. And so we have key staff here for Title III, which include Deborah Spitz, who is our Group Leader overseeing multiple programs including Title III; myself, Leticia Braga, I'm the Title III Team Lead. And then we have a great group of program officers including Fariba Hamedani who is on the presentation today, Sophie Hart, and Scott Richardson. And then we are very close partners in this work with the OESE Data Team, and today we're happy to have Melissa Wilks representing the OESE Data Team on the webinar. Next slide.

[slide 9] So again, the goals of the Title III data quality effort are to provide technical assistance (TA) and support for State educational agency (SEA) Title III and ED*Facts* coordinators to improve the quality of Title III-related data that states submit through ED*Facts* and Consolidated State Performance Reports (CSPRs), encourage collaboration between SEA Title III and ED*Facts* coordinators, and help us determine priorities for future state TA work. Next slide.

[slide 10] An overview of the activities we've been up to. One, of course, is the guidance document on Title III data, which we'll be covering today; quarterly meetings between U.S. Department of Education (ED) staff, SEA Title III staff, and SEA ED*Facts* coordinators, of which this is one; a Community of Practice (COP) for SEA Title III coordinators and ED*Facts* coordinators around specific topics of interest. We're currently in the middle of our Community of Practice on Language Instruction Educational Programs (LIEPs) and our next session, the third session, is actually next week so, again, we know that we're sending a lot your way, but hopefully you're finding those engagements useful. And then also some training and materials for new SEA Title III and ED*Facts* coordinators, such as the infographics that we have posted at our website. Next slide.

[slide 11] The Guide to Collecting and Reporting Title III Data is the document that we released in March, which I had highlighted previously, and was hopefully useful to you during the resubmission period.

[slide 12] It is highlighted here that it is posted under the Title III Data Quality Effort on our website. It covers school year 2021–22 specifically and we are planning to make updates that address school year 2022–23 and beyond. I can't currently commit that each year we will be changing it, but certainly we wanted to have a guide for this year, and we think it makes sense to update the guide, given the changes with EDPass and ED*Facts* Modernization, and the new OMB clearance package that was finalized and that impacts the school year 2022–23 and beyond reporting. And here is the link again to highlight so that you can go there. But again, if you just go to the Title III website under the Reporting and Performance tab, you'll find the guide posted there. Next slide.

[slide 13] This is a high-level overview of the contents included in the guide. There is some new content in the guide, but mostly this is a compilation of information that is in the file specifications and in other documents. We wanted to have really a one-stop shop for you to be able to go to and access some of this information with the understanding, of course, that the statute and the file specifications are the official source documents for any information.

We cover responsible parties (basically who does what in terms of the data submission), what data to submit and how, and when to submit the data. Then we take a closer look at the ED*Facts* file specifications, one by one, and then the CSPR Part I manual entry requirements (and we highlight Part I because all of the Title III components are within Part I of the CSPR). We have a data quality checklist, SEA communication with ED, a section on what happens once data are submitted, how ED uses the Title III data, and then some changes to file specifications and reporting requirements for 2021–22, and then a section on resources and help. We also have an appendix with data comments that we hope is useful in terms of thinking about best practices for data comments. As we highlighted previously, data comments are going to be especially important in the upcoming submissions when states essentially get one chance to submit their data and include in the comments any caveats or any information that would be useful to ED and to the public in interpreting that data. So making those comments clear is really important. And then some frequently used terms, which include some statutorily-defined terms as well as some terms that are used just for the purpose of clarification of use in the data guide. Next slide.

[slide 14] This is, again, and we won't be going section by section here, but a highlight of some of the information that we included that we hope to be useful to you. Title III has a lot of different reporting requirements so we included a crosswalk between the CSPR and ED*Facts* requirements to have an understanding of how the CSPR questions connect to the different ED*Facts* file specifications. Next slide.

[slide 15] We also dive into the reporting requirements for the different file specifications, trying to compile it and distill it in a way that is easy to look for information quickly, if you will. Next slide.

[slide 16] This is an example of one of the sections on the file specifications. So we have information on the data group, the reporting level and reporting period, guidance for specific data elements, relationships to other file specifications, and then some of the data validation checks that come up, which, again, some of these may be shifting for the 2022–23 reporting period but you may have received some of these flags for your submission in 2021–22. And so again, I'm not expecting anyone to be able to read the small text here, but this is just an overview of the type of information that you'll see in the data guide. Next slide.

[slide 17] And then there's also a section on the CSPR manual entry requirements as I had noted. This really goes through the different components of what's included in each of those manual entry requirements and gives a little bit more detail than sometimes we're able to provide within the CSPR document. Next slide.

[slide 18] So I'll pause here and see if you have any questions on the guide specifically. And as a reminder, please use the Q&A function to ask your questions. It makes it a lot more likely that we'll be able to see them and answer them. The chat tends to zoom by and we may miss your question there. I see that Fariba included the link to the guide within the chat. So thank you, Fariba, to make it handy to folks.

And again, hopefully this is something that folks have found to be useful. We haven't really received a lot of feedback yet. So if you've had a chance to look at it, if you'd like to just put in the chat that it's been useful or that it looks good, we love the positive feedback. If you have specific things as you go through it that aren't clear or that you'd like to see more of, we're also very much open to that feedback either today or by emailing the Title III mailbox, because we want to be thinking about that as we make any updates for 2022–23 and beyond.

We did receive a question that isn't specific to the guide, but, since it isn't going to be covered in the file specification updates later, I can go ahead and address it now. It was a question related to reporting on immigrant children and youth and whether Local Education Agencies (LEAs) that don't receive the immigrant subgrant are required to report in FS045. If you look at the requirements for the FS045, it tells you which students should be reported. Those would be students who meet the definition of immigrant and are enrolled in public elementary and secondary schools, regardless of whether the LEA in which they are located receives Title III funds. So it really goes beyond even the immigrant children and youth subgrant. This is a broad-based file reporting requirement about students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth.

Pausing here. Okay, we've got a thank you for the document, and questions about what's changed. So I think in the data guide we do have a section that highlights some of the changes that occurred in 2021–22. I will say there weren't a lot of changes because we were in a period of the existing OMB package.

[slide 19] So I will use that as a segue to talking about 2022–23, because that's where you're really going to see some additional changes based on the new package that goes into effect. We didn't make huge changes to the Title III data reporting, so not to fear on that, but we did want to take the time to highlight some of the areas where we did try to elaborate, especially in the Q&A sections of the file specifications, to try to clarify as much as possible the reporting requirements. So with that, we can go ahead to changes to school year 2022–23 file specifications and move on to the next slide.

[slide 20] The first file that we would like to cover is FS116, because this is where you'll see, I think, the most substantive change to the files that the Title III team covers. And as a reminder, FS116 provides information on how to report the unduplicated number of English learners (ELs) served by an LIEP supported with Title III funds, and the number of ELs served by an LIEP supported with Title III funds. There were a couple of key changes made from school year 2021–22 through the new OMB clearance process, which was adding a collection of data by racial and ethnic breakdown to this file specification. Then we also changed the reporting period for data group 648 from a point-in-time count from “October 1 or the closest school day to October 1” to “School Year - Any 12-month period”, which matches the reporting window for many of the other file specifications under Title III, for ease of reporting and just comparability there. Next slide.

[slide 21] So again, to highlight here, you'll see this change in the file specification, that the reporting period now is what the state defines or the LEA defines as the school year, which would be a specific 12-month period. Students who are present during that period would be included in this reporting. Next slide.

[slide 22] Also, as noted, you'll see a new Category Set B here, which is the student count by racial and ethnic breakdown. And if we go to the next slide, you'll be able to see that these really are the categories that you're familiar with.

[slide 23] So this shouldn't come as a surprise to anyone in terms of the type of information that's collected here; it mirrors the racial and ethnic reporting requirements in other file specifications that you see for other programs. Next slide.

[slide 24] And we're getting a “happy for the school year” for this one, so that's good to hear. And then one thing we did want to highlight here, we're highlighting it in FS116 because that's really the first file spec that we're covering here, but it is similar across Title III-specific file specifications, which is that—and the pre-K piece here is unchanged, but I really want to highlight that, if a student is listed as an English learner whose parent opted their child out of participation in an LIEP in an LEA receiving Title III funds (so these are the Title III-specific file specifications) that child would not be included in the file. So you should really only be including students who “participated in the Title III program” either directly or indirectly by not being an opt-out student; essentially, they would be in that LEA that received Title III

funds and their parents did not opt them out. Those are the students that you would be reporting on in this file specification. Next slide.

[slide 25] Okay, I'll pause here to see if we have any questions. I don't see anything so far, give it another beat and then we can move on. All right, seeing nothing, let's go ahead to the next slide.

[slide 26] All right, so FS139: These are the English language proficiency (ELP) results, based on the unduplicated number of ELs who were assessed on the annual state English language proficiency assessment; in this case, of course, for school year 2022–23. So this is a very minor change. We just want to highlight it because we're covering the file specification and because it is a change to the data group, which is usually considered significant, but we essentially changed the language from who “took” the assessment to who “were assessed on” the ELP assessment. That matches what we have in FS050, and it's more consistent with the language in the statute, so that's the reason that change was made, but it doesn't have any substantive impact on the data that you collect or report. Next slide.

[slide 27] This looks a little messy, but I think the goal here is to just show you some of where the changes were, since this is a revised question. Again, we're highlighting that these are the students who were assessed on the state annual ELP assessment, highlighting the definition of “English Learner Students” as it's framed in the EDFacts Workbook. However, the definition really mirrors the definition in the statute. And then what we want to do is really highlight this additional context that we provided here in the data reporting guidelines to be clear on what's expected.

English learners who participated in an alternate assessment to the state ELP, so this is really the students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, they should be included. We've had some questions I think over the past year from states, or comments in the data reporting, about including or not including this population of students, and we do want to be clear that when you're assessing students with the most significant cognitive disabilities on an alternate assessment, you should also be including them in the reporting requirements here. Additionally, we wanted to emphasize that since the data group, when you look at the data group definition, is based on students who were assessed on the annual ELP assessment, only students reported as participated in FS137 should have their proficiency results reported in FS139. Those who have anything other than PART should not be included in reporting.

So if you have students who did not participate or who had a medical exemption, they should not be included for the purpose of this file specification because, again, this is based on the results of the students who actually took the assessment. And then additionally, students counted as “assessed first time” in FS137 will only have one data point, and as such, we would not expect them to have values of “PROGRESS” or “NO PROGRESS” in FS139. This is, again, just making very clear what the population of students is that should be included, not only for the overall file specification, but for the purpose of reporting in “PROGRESS” and “NO PROGRESS”. All right, next slide.

[slide 28] All right, so questions on changes to FS139. I'm seeing a question here about including students whose parents refused services in the funding, essentially in the subgrant to districts. I'm going to ask that you submit that question to the Title III mailbox because it's not really specific to the reporting requirements and sometimes we like to ask follow-up questions specific to your state. We're happy to answer, but if you could please write to the Title III mailbox, we'd be happy to answer through that. I want to remind folks that if you want to make sure that your question is answered, please use the Q&A function because I want to make sure that we don't skip over anything.

I see your question. Definitely a good question about students who don't take all four domains. It is the case that, yes, they did participate in the assessment. This might also be a follow-up question, if you want to write to the Title III mailbox. I would say that ED's expectation would be that if a student does not take four domains, this is in our non-regulatory guidance that we would expect that the state has a

mechanism of calculating a proficiency score for that student. So talking to your technical group about how you may be able to use the sub-domains that were assessed to come up with an overall score to determine proficiency for those students. I know that can get very in the weeds and we have worked with different states on that, so if that's a concern for your state and you want to write in to us, we'd be happy to speak with you and, again, get that conversation started.

But for the purpose of reporting, it would be our expectation that any student who is assessed, and by virtue of their disability is unable to take all four domains of the assessment, that there would be a mechanism for determining proficiency or else, if we think about that, the implication would be that a student would never be eligible to exit from EL services by virtue of their disability, which would be a concern for us and I believe a civil rights concern as well. Happy to talk about that more, and I see... Oh, I see, you're saying that this is a student who maybe missed a portion of the assessment and not necessarily a student with a disability.

I think we might want to talk more with the assessment team about this one and look at specific scenarios. I'd encourage you to write into the Title III mailbox on that one and if it's something that's broadly applicable, we're happy to include those types of answers in future webinars. But I think that the broad point here would be that if a student takes the assessment, we would expect them to have a proficiency result reported in FS139. Okay?

Any other questions? I don't see anything else, so I'm going to go ahead and ask for the next slide.

Fariba Hamedani:

Leticia, can I just pause here just to clarify one thing, if we can go to the previous slide for FS139? Thank you.

Leticia Braga:

Go ahead.

Fariba Hamedani:

Thank you. Since we did just get a question in the Q&A about whether it's, first, permissible to include EL students whose parents refuse EL services in the Title III LIEP formula fund. As Leticia mentioned, please submit that question to the Title III mailbox. But I just wanted to clarify and remind everyone that FS139 collects data for all ELs, whether or not their parents opted them out of Title III services. So as Leticia mentioned, students whose parents opted them out of EL services should not be included in our file specs that specifically collect data for Title III services. But file specs such as FS141, FS137, and FS139 expect data to be reported for all English learners, regardless of whether or not they are receiving Title III services or regardless of whether or not their parents opted them out of Title III services. Thank you, Leticia.

Leticia Braga:

Thank you, Fariba. That's an important point in highlighting that the opt-out reporting point is specific to the Title III-specific files, and this is not one of them.

All right, so we can go ahead to the next slide.

[slide 29] This is a very complex file specification, which is FS210. It provides information on how to report the number of ELs who have attained and not attained English language proficiency within five years of initial classification as an EL and first enrollment in an LEA that receives Title III funds. And I

think that language is really important and something that we're going to focus on in the next couple of slides.

The change here was not to the specific reporting requirements. What we tried to do, given that this is a newer file specification, is to add and revise the data reporting guidelines section to hopefully make clearer what the expectation is in terms of reporting. I'll also note that because this is a newer file specification, we've had some conversations and tweaked, even internally, our understanding of what we think should be reported here based on the statutory language. We'll go over that on the next slide.

[slide 30] Highlighting here again that if the student, since this is a Title III-specific file, that if they're listed as an EL whose parent opted them out of participation in the LIEP in an LEA receiving Title III funds, they would not be included in this file, in this data group. Also, ELs who have not yet attained proficiency on the annual ELP assessment but have been in EL status for less than five years are not included in this data group, because this is the within the five year period.

And then this is actually a little bit out of order when you look at the file specification, but we put it here just for the presentation, to highlight FS210 and FS211. Sometimes it can seem a little confusing on its face why we're asking about exit and proficiency. As you know for FS210, English language proficiency is measured by the annual ELP assessment, while for FS211, the term proficiency is measured by exit from EL status. And as we know, states have different criteria in terms of what constitutes meeting the requirements for exit, as some states have requirements in addition to the ELP assessment. So FS211 really is looking at exit from the program, whereas 210 is focused on the proficiency on the ELP assessment specifically. Next slide.

[slide 31] The “what students are included as proficient within five years” question was added here to clarify which students fall within the PROF5YRSYES category. So these would be all students who attain proficiency on the annual ELP assessment in the current reporting school year, and who were within five years of identification as an EL and first enrollment in the LEA.

If we're thinking about school year 2022–23, an LEA would first identify students who attained proficiency on the annual ELP assessment and who were first identified as EL in an LEA receiving Title III funds in school year 2018–19, 2019–20, 2020–21, 2021–22, or 2022–23, which is the current year. So we're really looking at that five school year window. And so the “proficient within five years” count for 2022–23 must not include any students who were first identified as an EL and first enrolled in the LEA prior to 2018–19, as that goes beyond the parameters for reporting on, essentially, the YES category. It must also not include students who were listed as an EL whose parents opted their child out of LIEP participation, which was already noted previously.

[slide 32] And when thinking about the other category, which is students reported as “not proficient within five years”, the PROF5YRSNO, the LEAs that received Title III funds must report on all ELs who have not attained proficiency on the annual ELP assessment within five years. And that is if, by the end of the 12-month reporting period, the student is in his or her fifth year, or beyond, of identification as an EL and has not attained proficiency on the annual ELP assessment, then they would be reported in that category. So again, thinking about 2022–23, the LEA would determine which students enrolled during 2022–23 were first identified as an EL in school year 2018–19 or earlier, and then report on how many of those students had not attained proficiency on the ELP assessment by the end of that 12-month reporting period.

This is a very weedy file specification. We feel your pain, but we were trying to elaborate on the data reporting guidelines for the purpose of clarifying some of these reporting requirements. And I did see that there's a question coming in about whether these are five years in the same LEA, which I'll call out now because it segues nicely into what we'll be talking about next. Next slide.

[slide 33] Sorry, we're actually not there yet, but we're going to get there shortly because this is a long answer here. So for the student to be included in the "not proficient within five years" count, again, it doesn't matter what year prior to school year 2018–19 the student was identified, as long as the EL had not attained proficiency on the annual ELP assessment by the end of the 12-month reporting period. So again, when you're thinking about the proficient YES category, it's really important to be thinking they achieved proficiency in those five years, but then for the NO category, the student could be six years or 10 years in the program, again, hopefully not, but we know that sometimes we have those long-term ELs, it doesn't matter what year that was, as long as it was prior to the five-year window.

Also, students who were not assessed on the annual ELP assessment in their fifth year, which we count as the current reporting school year, they need to be included in the "not proficient within five years" because you wouldn't have the information to make the determination that they were proficient. And then as noted, if the student's parents opted them out of services, they also would not be included at all. And so they would not be included in the "not proficient within five years" category, they just wouldn't be included in this file specification at all. Okay, next slide.

[slide 34] This speaks to the question of timelines, and again, this is an existing question, but we did revise it to clarify a bit. The question is whether students have to be enrolled in a Title III LEA for all five years in order to be included in the data group. And the answer is no, and that LEAs that receive Title III funds must report on all ELs who have attained and not attained proficiency on the annual ELP assessment within five years of, and there are two criteria really: identification as an EL and first enrollment in the LEA. And this does not require that the student is enrolled in the same LEA for all five years in order to be included. LEAs receiving Title III funds should include ELs who first enroll in their LEA, and then transfer to another LEA and then transfer back.

So there's a scenario here that shows an example with 2022–23 as the reporting year where the students started in Title III LEA A, they transferred to other LEAs, and then in the fifth year they're back to Title III LEA A. The timeline does not necessarily need to reset. We would consider that since first enrollment in that LEA occurred in school year 2018–19, that school year 2022–23 could count as the fifth year of the student enrolled. Next slide.

[slide 35] However, we do acknowledge that sometimes LEAs may be unable to accurately track an EL's identification timeline for a student who, perhaps, is highly mobile and transfers in and out of their LEA. In those cases, the LEA may choose to reset the identification timeline. We have a scenario here where, perhaps, the same student started school year 2018–19 in Title III LEA A, but then each time that they transfer to another LEA, they reset that timeline, if you will. One thing that we did want to highlight though is, given the language in the statute, that LEAs receiving Title III funds must reset the identification timeline for ELs entering their LEA for the first time, even though they were previously identified as an EL in another LEA.

And so for example, let's say... Well, we can use the example here of the student in school year 2018–19 enrolled in Title III LEA A. If in 2019–20 they enrolled in Title III LEA B, and that's the first time that the student is enrolling in that LEA, there would not be the option to consider that student as a year two student because they would be enrolling in that LEA for the first time. So the clock really starts for understanding the LEA's accountability towards that student. It would be the first year of identification in that LEA for the student.

All right, and then because this can get really complicated very quickly, we do ask that states submit in their state submission plan (SSP) an indication of whether the LEAs receiving Title III funds can track ELs who transfer in and out of the LEA, and how ELs who transfer in and out of LEAs are being accounted for in this data group.

So certainly, as a best practice we would expect that states have some consistency, in terms of the guidance to LEAs, of how they should be considering these transfers in the reporting so that the state can speak to this in the state submission plan. And again, we do get questions about this, we get case-specific questions. If you have a question like that for your state, please write into the Title III mailbox and we'll do our best to go through those scenarios and try to address them for you. Next slide.

[slide 36] All right, I am going to look at the Q&A now. Again, if you have some questions here and you're currently still thinking them through, please take the time to submit them in the Q&A. So I think the five years in the same LEA, we did address that question. And then there's a question about, for students who were not proficient in five years, if a student was served in the LIEP for three years, opted out for one year, and then returned, the student would have only four years of LIEP time and not be included.

That is a good question. It gets very weedy. For the purpose of reporting, we've determined that the school year of reporting is really the anchor year. If the student is enrolled in the LEA for the reporting year, and they have five years of time within the LEA, and they are not an opt-out student for the reporting year, then their whole time in the LEA essentially should be considered. So the opt-out piece really only is relevant to the reporting year because it does get very complex to track that over years of time. So you really should only be looking at opt-out status and the implications for reporting for the specific reporting year that you're speaking to.

Then, there was a comment about leaving out mobile EL students. I'd be happy to speak to that further if you have questions that you want to submit to the Title III mailbox.

The resetting, yes. I do want to say resetting is not the ideal of what we're proposing here. We recognize however that reporting can be very complex for this population of students and so we're essentially giving you an option to be able to do that. However, as the state, when we speak in terms of your state's submission, if you want to have a bar of rigor where you believe that LEAs should have a mechanism to report and track students across LEA transfers, that's a conversation that you can be having within your state. We just believe, given that this is a relatively new file specification in this format, that we needed to allow for some flexibility in the reporting in the cases where students may not be able to be tracked in that manner. But I would agree that the ideal would be to be able to track the student consistently over time and to not reset the clock, if you will.

So there's the ideal and then there's the reality, and we're trying to strike the right balance on that. But again, if anyone feels that we've missed the mark, we're always happy to take feedback either in the webinars or writing into the Title III mailbox and we can take that into consideration, moving forward. Any additional questions on FS210?

Okay, let's see. There's a question about whether these are LEAs receiving Title III funds and whether that applies to the immigrant subgrant as well. That is a really good question. We have had that discussion, and I think, I'm trying to look here if we have highlighted that. But essentially if an LEA is a recipient of Title III funds, then these data reporting requirements would apply. So if they are receiving an immigrant subgrant and that is the only subgrant that they are receiving, they are still receiving Title III funds. So we would expect that they'd be included in this reporting. That tends to be a very small subset of LEAs that don't have the overlap. If you do have questions or concerns about that, again, we're happy to get a question through the mailbox and think that through with you. But as a general matter, and this is something that we have talked about internally in terms of interpreting the language in the statute around the reporting requirements, it does not differentiate there. I think the general expectation would be that if this is an LEA receiving Title III funds, and that's why we speak to Title III funds generally and not specifically to the big grant, if you will, then they would be responsible for meeting the reporting requirements.

I will pause to see if there are any additional questions. Okay, a couple more are coming through.

So, resetting the clock in the district. There could be a misunderstanding in the districts on the requirement of students to participate for recently arrived ELs. It does create an additional need for clarification between SEAs and LEAs. I take your point. I think that the definition of a recently arrived EL is specific and we would direct folks to that definition. If the student meets that definition, it's not LEA-specific, right? It's enrollment in any of the states and the District of Columbia, then they would be considered recently arrived.

Perhaps less of an implication there, but I could see where this might get confusing and that's why, again, I don't think that we're advocating necessarily for the reset, and that states should have a good understanding of what the policy is in your state and be able to speak to it in the State Submission Plan, on how ED should be interpreting the data that's being provided there. But we went in this direction originally, especially because this is a complex reporting requirement, as we understood that there were cases where it was very challenging to be able to track those students. So we're giving options in that case, but you can speak within your state to how you would like to address those requirements with your LEAs.

I'll stop and see, Fariba or Melissa, if there's anything that you'd like to add on any of these points or additional points on FS210.

Fariba Hamedani:

Thank you, Leticia. No, and nothing beyond just trying to say that I know we have answered questions about how to report for FS210 last year, and those of you who did submit questions last year or participated in webinars last year will know that we are proposing a change in how to report the calculations for FS210 for school year 2022–23. And we really are doing that to be mindful of making the reporting as easy on SEAs as possible. So we hope that the guidelines will help you in alleviating the workload associated with reporting data for FS210. And as Leticia said, we are really happy to hear from you if you have any suggestions or additional feedback on reporting for FS210. Thank you.

Leticia Braga:

Thank you, Fariba. And we received an additional question here about if a state can track an EL through all LEAs within the state, then whether that would address the reset issue. And I think for the most part, yes. I think again, the point to highlight there is that if a student is first enrolling in a new LEA, then per the statutory language around the reporting requirements, and this is something that we went over with our legal counsel and this is where it landed, this has to do with first enrollment in an LEA to think about the accountability of the LEA towards that student.

So if a student transferred from one LEA in the state and they went to a new LEA, that would reset the clock. However, the moving in and out of a particular LEA would not necessarily have to reset the clock for that LEA. Again, perhaps not ideal as mentioned in terms of the question of tracking the student, but I think that the purpose of this data reporting guideline, as it was crafted in the statute, really speaks to the accountability of any particular LEA towards that student and helping them attain proficiency within five years. So we are just following the intent of the statutory language there.

If you think of any additional questions, feel free to add them in the Q&A and we can catch them as we go. But with that, we can move on to the next slide.

[slide 37] I am going to turn it over to Melissa Wilks from the OESE Data Team to speak to ED*Facts* Modernization and ED Data Express. So with that, over to you Melissa.

Melissa Wilks:

[slide 38] Thank you, Leticia. My name is Melissa Wilks. I work on the Management Support Office (MSO) Data Team, working with the Title III team specifically on their data quality issues and getting the data after the due dates, crafting business rules, and putting these data out to the public on ED Data Express. I wanted to quickly talk a little bit about how the EDFacts Modernization work is going and also then provide you with some updates on ED Data Express.

So currently, many of you are familiar with the system in place where SEAs are submitting the data to the EDFacts Submission System (ESS). During that submission, there are some critical business rules that are applied that prevent some of the data from coming in, but after the due date, we pull the data, we do the data quality review, and then all of these data quality results are sent to you all, to EDFacts coordinators, and CSPR coordinators for their review. And I'm sure Title III coordinators received some of these business rules and comments to provide data notes on. Then after this review, SEAs are given the opportunity to resubmit these data files or to just respond to the data quality findings and say, "Oh, actually this big change from last year is exactly what we expected," and that's it, right? Or, "Yeah, we corrected this in our system because we noticed we accidentally duplicated some data."

There's kind of a long timeline. The data are first due in December and then we don't start putting out the data and using the data publicly until that summer, that next summer. So as you might expect, EDFacts has been working toward the goal of this next slide with the new modernized EDFacts cycle.

[slide 39] And this is EDPass, what you all have been hearing about. Business rules are applied during the pre-submission for this. To make adjustments to the fact that this is brand new and we don't really know how it's going to go, the due dates for the data files are mostly later than we have expected from prior years.

All of the Title III data, for example, for school year 2022–23 are due on January 24, 2024. So all of the file specs that Fariba and Leticia were talking about are posted, and those data are expected to come in by January 24, 2024. States are able to upload their data, run their data through the business rules, and whatever fails, they can leave data notes or they can adjust their data if it has actually flagged a real issue with the quality of the data. Then at the due date, we anticipate that the data are usable, that we are able to start the process of using these data for evaluations, programs, monitoring, and then to start creating the data for public use as well. So there should be no post-submission data quality review, though for school year 2022–23, we are anticipating doing some of the kind of longitudinal checks outside of EDPass, and more information on that is to come. It should be a very limited review in scope, but we do expect to send out to the SEAs some data quality notes and comments that we would ask folks to review. And let's see if there are any questions.

Oh, and I will put in the chat the link to the EDFacts community site, it's the data submission organizer [<https://edfacts.communities.ed.gov/#program/data-submission-organizer>]. It's just a good way to see all of the due dates for all of the EDFacts data that are due, and it'll take you directly to the file specifications as well. It's a tool that I use a lot to communicate with folks about all of the EDFacts data, not just the Title III data. Okay. No questions about modernization. We'll take that as a good sign hopefully, but we're always happy to get your questions and work with you through all of the bumps in the road when submitting the data into EDPass. If there are, we'll be there for you.

[slide 40] ED Data Express is the tool that we are using to put out all of OESE's programmatic data. Next slide.

[slide 41] We have updated it recently, and we have updated it even further from this screenshot. We have added a data spotlight on the homepage just to say what's changed. Right now, if you go to the ED Data Express site, you'll see that we've added science assessment files and we have also added a data

library. In the section that is the data download tool, you will no longer see just the tool, but you'll actually have an option to either use the data download tool or to go to a data library where you're able to download entire files, like CSV files. So there's no building of a file necessary. There is a file created for you, and that is for all the data that is on ED Data Express. And when you download them, they're zip files.

When you unzip the file, you'll see the data file in CSV form. If it's a really large file, like the school level chronic absenteeism file, there is a whole file if you're just kind of importing it into SAS or Stata or SPSS. But if you're looking at it through Excel, we have also broken them down into smaller CSVs so that they are able to be opened in Excel without too many issues. Also the data notes are included in this zip file, so hopefully that is useful to you all.

[slide 42] This is what we see when we look at the data download tool. And right now I think the most recent updates to ED Data Express related to Title III, we have FS045 immigrant data posted for school year 2020–21. These data for 2021–22, we'll be expecting this coming summer. But since this is the first year that we're posting it, we went through the process of privacy protecting the data and all of that. These are available at the state and district level.

[slide 43] FS210 and 211 are both available at the state and district levels, so also new for this year.

[slide 44] And again, we anticipate school year 2021–22 to be released in late summer 2023 as opposed to now, which is what we've done for school year 2020–21. And the next slide.

[slide 45] If there are any questions? ED Data Express has been used pretty successfully amongst a lot of groups at ED to provide visualizations to folks who don't normally use visualizations. And there is a Title III visualization and dashboard on ED Data Express that we encourage you to check out. Okay. No questions.

Leticia Braga:

Melissa, thank you for all the work on this. I know I was excited to see FS045 posted because we've received some stakeholder questions about it. And it's nice to be able to point people towards ED Data Express and say, "Here, now the data is available and you can go ahead and use that for downloading and looking at state reporting." So thank you again. If people think of questions, you can keep putting them into the Q&A. And if not, we can go ahead to the next slide.

[slide 46] So we will move on to our wrap-up. Next slide.

[slide 47] As I noted early on, we have our Community of Practice series on supporting districts to improve EL and Title III data quality, specific to LIEPs. And we are heading into session three, which is going to be talking about changes in data infrastructure and professional development that are being or could be implemented at the state or LEA level to address some of the reporting challenges discussed so far. I will say that, especially for the Community of Practice, we really rely on you, the participants, to share what's going on with your state. AIR plays more of a lead role in those discussions, and they've put out some requests for any resources that you may have posted on your websites or shared with your LEAs relating to data reporting requirements that include these Title III requirements. Please share those for the purpose of helping your fellow Title III colleagues understand what might be useful to the field.

We are not using this as a monitoring or compliance exercise. This really is an opportunity for you to share. Of course, if any questions come up about requirements that need clarification, we're happy to work with you to help address those. But don't feel shy about sharing your resources, talking about your resources because that's what makes the Community of Practice the most useful. So we hope you can join next week, and then the final session is currently scheduled for June 14.

[slide 48] Thank you for putting in the registration link as well. That just recently went out by email to the same group of folks who received the registration for this engagement. Hopefully you've seen that come through, and you can be available for that discussion. And I will say ideally the Community of Practice works best for folks who have participated in prior sessions. But if for any reason you haven't been able to participate, we still encourage you to join in on the upcoming session. Next slide.

[slide 49] Updates, noting that there was some lag time, but we did get the materials from past webinars posted. We've got the TA resources referenced, and we've got the slides from the first two Community of Practice engagements posted to our Performance page. So please go there and take a look if you have any questions about what's been presented previously. And I wanted to take a moment to plug the Grantee Satisfaction Survey that has been launched. We really do value your input. I think that the engagement around the data quality feedback that we received last time has been really important in considering whether this is a workstream that should be continued into the next year. So we do really take your feedback to heart. Sometimes the feedback isn't connected to things that we can change in the immediate future, but we do take into consideration all of the feedback that you provide. We have meetings internally to discuss the feedback and think about things that we can do, moving forward.

So please, this is the best way that you have to share feedback with the Department about stakeholder engagement and grantee satisfaction, you being the grantees with the program. So please use that opportunity. Next slide.

[slide 50] And as always, if you have questions, we have a couple of different mailboxes. Of course, we do collaborate internally if a question comes to one group that is better addressed elsewhere. But in general, send questions about this data quality effort or program questions to the Title III mailbox listed here. If you have specific questions about your state's ED*Facts* data, send those to EDFacts@ed.gov. And then questions related to your state's CSPR data, you can send those to CSPR@ed.gov. I'm always happy to be copied and have our team be copied on those CSPR or ED*Facts* questions by copying the mailbox. But the lead offices for those are the first entry point in case there are things that they can answer without engaging the program office. So continue to use these mailboxes to get in touch with us. Next slide.

[slide 51] And here is, again, a list of resources for your reference. We have the CSPR page, the ED*Facts* 2022–23 file specifications. And I will note, with the file specifications, that we do periodically update them if there are things that we need to tweak. Certainly not as a general matter, a big overhaul in the middle of a cycle, but we encourage you to periodically look at that link to see if there's a revised version of the file specification that you should be using for the purpose of reporting. We've also included links for the due dates, the business rules, and information about ED*Facts* modernization, which includes links to previous webinars by the Partner Support Center specific to modernization and goes into a lot more detail about what's to come with that. Next slide.

[slide 52] Okay. So before I go on, I see a question about the Grantee Satisfaction Survey and who is sending that information out. That is a great question because it is coming. We do send out an email from our Title III mailbox encouraging you to fill out the survey, but the survey is administered by a contractor. So you may be seeing a different mail address come through from that.

But unless you have specific concerns about the email that you received, if it references the Grantee Satisfaction Survey in Title III and you are the Title III contact, you should feel comfortable assuming that that is legitimate. I know that some of you have also been receiving outreach from the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) regarding the Title III survey, which is an independent and separate engagement.

So the Grantee Satisfaction Survey is not the kind of big program survey. It is speaking to your experience with the Title III program over the past year. But if you feel like you didn't get the survey link

and you should have received it, please just email the Title III mailbox and we'll make sure to get that to you. Specifically, it's coming from the CFI Group, so the email subject line is there and the contractor is the CFI Group. Thanks for pulling that in. All right. We've got some time so I will pause to see if there are any additional questions that came to mind before we wrap up.

Okay. Great. And yes, the survey from IES is to SEAs as well as a subset of LEAs. So LEAs may be receiving that as well and questioning, is this legitimate? What is this? It is legitimate, and we highly encourage you to participate because that really is going to be the national survey on implementation of Title III. But it really speaks to supports for English learners, I would say, even more broadly. And so to get that national picture is not something that we can do often. The more that states and LEAs engage, the more comprehensive that picture is going to be.

And Adam's asking about the survey with AIR. I don't know if our AIR colleagues... I believe again there are some different engagements going on.

I would only speak specifically to the emails that have Tracy Rimdzius as the ED contact. That would be the Title III national implementation study. We know you all get quite a few asks for participation, but I'm going to be selfish and ask you to prioritize the Grantee Satisfaction Survey and the national survey here because those are the ones that we use for national decision making about the program. Any other questions, last minute thoughts before we wrap up?

Seeing none, you're always welcome to reach out to us in the mailbox. I want to thank Fariba and Melissa for their engagement. I also want to thank all of our partners at AIR who play a key role in putting together these presentations and who will be leading the engagement next week for the Community of Practice. We hope you can join us then, and look forward to connecting soon.