

Leticia Braga:

[slide 6] Hi, good afternoon or good morning to everyone who's joining us today. I'm Leticia Braga, Team Lead for the Title III program and happy to be convening again with you all for another quarterly webinar. And thanks to our American Institutes for Research partners as well, who are joining us today. I know that folks tend to be a congenial group here, so feel free in the chat to drop in your "hi's" and where you're joining from. And as we go along, if you have questions as well, as Elizabeth noted, please post those in the Q&A so that we can address them when we pause.

Today we're going to be doing an overview and introduction, talking about some common flags in the school year (SY) 2022–23 ED*Facts* and Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) submissions to date, key changes to English language proficiency (ELP) assessment guidelines and key changes to language code guidelines in the file specifications for SY 2023–24. And then we'll do a little bit of wrap-up and reminders of what's to come. Next slide.

[slide 7] All right, we can go to the next slide.

[slide 8] Sometimes we have new folks joining us, so this is a reminder for many, but again, the goals of this 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 their CSPRs, to encourage collaboration between SEA Title III and ED*Facts* coordinators, and to help us determine priorities for future state technical assistance work. Next slide.

[slide 9] And so some of the activities that we've covered to date include the guidance document on Title III data. We're currently in the process of doing some targeted updates to that document to cover the current Office of Management and Budget (OMB) package, but it's still overall a good resource for you all. Holding these quarterly meetings between SEA Title III staff and SEA ED*Facts* coordinators. Also communities of practice (COPs) for SEA Title III coordinators and ED*Facts* coordinators around specific topics of interest. We're currently in our second COP, which is related to teacher data, and we'll give you an update on that during our wrap-up. And also developing materials for new SEA Title III and ED*Facts* coordinators that may be useful, such as some of the infographics that we've posted. Next slide.

[slide 10] We've presented this in a couple of different locations, but since we have probably a bit of a different group today, including our data partners, we wanted to pause to talk about our new configuration. Now, as many of you know, Title III moved back to the Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA) in December of last year. And with that, we are very excited to be able to welcome some new team members who are onboarding and participating in the Title III program. And so I'm going to give everyone who is on the team and who was able to join today an opportunity just to come on camera for a little bit, introduce yourselves and a little bit about who you are, and how it relates to this work.

You can see the state assignments here. As a general matter, we're going to ask that you still contact us using the mailbox information that'll be at the end of the presentation, but you're welcome to copy your state contact as well when you're submitting a question to make sure that it gets addressed as soon as possible. So with that, I'm going to invite Maha to come on.

Maha Abdelkader:

Hi, good afternoon. My name is Maha Abdelkader. I'm an Education Specialist with the Office of English Language Acquisition. I've been with OELA for four years. Prior to that I was an English Learner (EL) program supervisor at the district level and had worked there for about 16 years before I joined OELA in 2020. I'm thrilled to be part of the Title III Formula team and it's very nice to meet you all virtually today. I hope I get an opportunity to meet you in person. Thank you.

Leticia Braga:

Thank you, Maha. Now Ivy.

Ivaree Baugh:

Hi, I'm Ivy Baugh, an Education Program Specialist on the Title III team. And I've been with OELA for about two years now, and I have a background in international education teaching English and elementary education. Excited to be working with you all.

Leticia Braga:

Thank you, Ivy. And again, I'm Letitia Braga, Team Lead for Title III. I've been with the Department of Education (ED) 13-plus years in different roles. Actually, my first role was with Title III and so I'm glad to be back with the group in this capacity for the past couple of years. Elizabeth.

Elizabeth Bucknor:

Thank you. I'm Elizabeth Bucknor, Education Program Specialist with the Title III team. I'm very glad to be here. I've been with ED for four and a half years and I have a background even as an OELA grantee, so thank you.

Leticia Braga:

Thank you. Melissa.

Melissa Escalante:

Hello everyone. My name is Melissa Escalante. I've been with OELA for about 13 years, and so relatively new to Title III, the inner workings and formula team. So welcome and thanks for having us.

Leticia Braga:

Thank you. And Liz Judd.

Elizabeth Judd:

Hi, my name is Elizabeth Judd. I've been with OELA for 24 years, and I am very glad to meet you all.

Leticia Braga:

Thank you, Liz. And Fariba is on leave today, but Fariba Hamedani has been with the Title III program and with ED for about four years and is an excellent colleague as well as very deeply knowledgeable about the data work and I'm very happy to have had her as a partner in this. Many of you have interacted with her or received responses from Fariba, so she will continue participating in this strand of work. All right, next slide.

[slide 11] For those who may not be familiar, additional key staff for Title III include Montserrat Garibay, who is our Assistant Deputy Secretary and Director of OELA, and Beatriz Ceja-Williams, Deputy Assistant Secretary for OELA. And I know those terms can get a little bit confusing. But essentially Montserrat is the equivalent of our Assistant Secretary, our political leader. And then Bea is our career leadership within OELA, to give you a sense of the difference there.

And then Sarah Newman, who many of you are familiar with, is the Group Lead for the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) Data Team. And we will continue partnering with the OESE

Data Team on this work strand. That may be a question that you have. They've been great collaborators and I know we'll continue to collaborate on all of this work. And Sarah is currently out, but we're happy to have Joe Murphy from the OESE Data Team joining us today to help address any questions specific to their strand of work that may come up. Next slide.

[slide 12] So first we wanted to cover some common flags in the SY 2022–23 ED*Facts* and CSPR submissions. This is just an overview of the flags that we reviewed and for which we asked for follow up. It's not a comprehensive list, but again, highlights a couple of the things that we were seeing in the submissions. Next slide.

[slide 13] I wanted to start by really thanking you for submitting high-quality data. Very happy to see that there were many fewer data quality flags in SY 2022–23 compared to the previous year. I know that EDPass has brought growing pains to everyone involved, but in the review of the data prior to submission from our end, I can pretty confidently say that we have seen an improvement in terms of the number of flags that presumably are addressed prior to submission and therefore result in many fewer data quality flags that are coming to us for review.

And then the data notes overall were certainly clearer in SY 2022–23 compared to the previous year. So we're also really appreciative that you've heard our request and our call to add additional context to those data notes. We certainly have still received some data notes that read to the effect of “the data is accurate.” And while we do appreciate receiving at least that confirmation rather than no response, we'll continue to ask for and emphasize how helpful it is to have more specific data notes when you do get those flags raised. Next slide.

[slide 14] In terms of some of the common flags raised using the Business Rules Single Inventory (BRSI) that we're all familiar with, one common flag pertained to language codes. And there are different flags pertaining to language codes, but I wanted to remind everyone that language codes are required for immigrant children and youth regardless of EL status. And if you do have students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth, you would be reporting them in FS045 regardless of their EL status. And within that, you would be reporting their native language as well. And we're going to cover updated guidelines for reporting language codes. That really came from a lot of feedback that we received from you all during the start of the 2022–23 data submissions. And we addressed some of this or most of this in the interim in 2022–23, but we fully incorporated those edits into the SY 2023–24 file specifications (FSs).

Also, in terms of assessment files, we do want to remind you that states are required to assess and report on the performance of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who take the alternate assessment. And that's required under both the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). We know that states are in different stages of rolling out their alternate ELP assessments, but as far as the requirement goes, there is no exception for including the students in both the accountability as well as the data reporting for the accountability. And so again, the extent that your data notes reflect the status of why that information may not be included, it's helpful for us to know that. But the requirement does stand.

And in terms of reporting windows, please ensure that the data reporting is consistent with a specified reporting window. And you can always find that in Table 2.2-1. For example, when we're thinking about the assessment files, it is all students present during the ELP testing window, not an October 1st count of students or students present at the end of the year. It would be any students present during the testing window that would be included in those files. And then also full academic year, especially given changes to FS116. That is a common flag that we saw. As you recall, under the current OMB package, FS116 Data Group (DG) 648 did change from an October 1st count to a full-year count. And so that's something that if the state hasn't fully updated and was the reason for the BRSI flag, we've asked states to resubmit or

to give us information about when they'll be able to make that change consistent with what the OMB package now requires. Next slide.

[slide 15] All right, so in terms of the CSPR, I know that we're still in the middle of this process, technically both, but for the CSPR, you all submitted information in the first submission window and now there's an opportunity for resubmission. Language of instruction by Language Instruction Educational Program (LIEP) type, the match essentially between the FS116 information in ED*Facts* and the information that's being populated in CSPR raises by far the most flags in the CSPR. And so it's really the inconsistencies between the student counts by LIEP type in FS116, and then the languages of instruction that you're reporting in CSPR. So sometimes we see student counts submitted in FS116 for an LIEP type, say you have 10 students in newcomer programs, but then there's no language of instruction reported for newcomer programs in the CSPR. So that's something that's going to be flagged. And that by and large, we've made a request for you to revisit and resubmit as needed.

And then also, if there are no student counts submitted in FS116 for an LIEP type, but there are languages of instruction reported in the CSPR, that's a situation where you may need to request correction for FS116 data to address those discrepancies. So when you're receiving those flags, check if the issue is only in the CSPR, in which case you can make that update during the resubmission window that's already open. Or if it's really an FS116 data issue, then you'll need to submit a request for a correction opportunity. There are also languages of instruction in LIEPs that are considered out of range. What that really means is that the format in which that was submitted wasn't consistent with what was required. As a reminder, what we're asking for there is a comma-separated list of the languages of instruction used. And so just make sure that you're submitting it in a format that lines up with the requirement of the file specification.

And then for state-level activities under 3111(b)(2)(D), if you answered no or the SEA answered no to all listed state-level activities, we do request a data note to clarify why. There can be perfectly reasonable answers for why that is the case, such as the SEA did not set aside funds to provide Title III-funded TA and other forms of assistance. But a blank does not provide sufficient information for us to understand why you've listed no to all of those activities. So please provide further detail if we've asked you to follow up during resubmissions. And then similarly, if you've selected "other" as a form of assistance, we've asked you to describe the activity under element 1.3.6.1. This all feeds into the biennial reports that are reported to Congress, so it's really important that we have as comprehensive and clear information as possible for us to be able to report as required. Next slide.

[slide 16] All right, so I'm going to pause there and see if there are any specific questions pertaining to, again, these clarifications that have been flagged so far. Why don't we go ahead and again, at any point if you think of a question and you want to add it to the Q&A, please do so. Right. Next slide.

[slide 17] As I mentioned, we are also going to be addressing some key changes to the ELP assessment guidelines as well as the language reporting.

To be very clear, there's no changes in information that needed to be cleared through the OMB package of course. These are just updates and clarifications to be able to better interpret what ED's expectations are in terms of these submissions. And many of these were made in response to feedback provided by states. Maybe there were changes that we made that were unclear or that were inconsistent with maybe what some states were approved to do. And we want to make sure that you're able to submit the data consistent with your practices to the extent that they are approved and not in conflict with any requirements on our end. Next slide.

[slide 18] This really pertains across all the four assessment data files, but for the purpose of presentation, we're going to be focusing on the Title III files because the information is the same. It's parallel across the Title III files as well as all EL proficiency and participation assessment files. So FS050,

in terms of data groups, provides information on how to report the unduplicated number of ELs who were assessed on the annual ELP assessment and who received services in an LIEP supported with Title III funds. But really when we think about FS050, it's about the results information, right? That's how I like to remember it. In terms of the edits, we can go to the next slide.

[slide 19] So this is, again, I'm not going to read everything line by line, and the file specifications for 2023–24 have been reposted with this information, so please rely on the posted file specifications for the final language. It'll also be much easier to read, but again, for the purpose of the presentation, we wanted to highlight the changes. And this is not necessarily a substantive change, but clarifying that students identified as ELs whose parents opted them out of participation in an LIEP, in an LEA receiving Title III funds, are not to be included in this data group. So when we're thinking about the all-EL files, any EL would be included. But when we're thinking about the Title III-served, which are students in LEAs receiving Title III funds, if their parent opted them out, we would not expect to see them reported in the Title III file specifications because essentially they're not being served by Title III.

And then this is information that was already captured elsewhere, but we're adding it here to this question to be consistent across our file specifications: exclude any pre-K English learners, even if they are receiving services under a Title III program. We know that students starting at age three technically can receive services under Title III, but the assessment requirement under the ESEA starts at kindergarten. If it is the case that you have a state that starts assessments for served populations at an earlier age, for the purpose of our reporting, we would only expect to see kindergarten and above. Next slide.

[slide 20] This is really the substantive change. We had previously included some information essentially saying that students who are reported as participated in FS138 should have their proficiency results reported here. However, there are small cases where that's not consistent with practice because of exceptions around first assessed students or how students taking the alternate assessment are included. So without getting into the specifics, and if you do have questions about reporting for your state, you can always submit a question. But the general point is that you should report EL progress towards proficiency consistent with your approved ESEA consolidated state plan. And again, this is something that we've seen in terms of some of the follow-up from states. It appears that some states have been excluding students from the reporting based on the partial attendance requirement. For the purpose of any of our files under Title III, when you're reporting on progress towards proficiency on a proficiency for FS050, you must include any students who were excluded for accountability purposes under the partial attendance requirements in Title I.

There is no partial attendance exception here: if these are EL students who were present during the assessment reporting window, even if they were there for a short period of time, the requirement is that they be assessed and the requirement is that they be included in the data reporting. And then again, the assessed first time language that we had previously talking about one data point is not necessarily consistent with the practice that states are using to report on progress and no progress. And so we removed that language to emphasize that what you should be doing is reporting consistent with your approved ESEA consolidated state plan. And if you have questions about what that implies for the reporting, again, please feel free to submit a Partner Support Center (PSC) ticket and follow up with us so that we can work through the specifics of your state since states are so different in terms of their accountability structure and how they've decided to do that reporting. Next slide.

[slide 21] And so here again, because of the clarification that I just noted, we removed the language that talked about excluding; students can be included in both making progress and attained proficiency. And for students who are assessed the first time, again, it depends on what your state is approved to do. And

so we removed the language that was confusing for some of those states who are approved to do something else. Next slide.

[slide 22] So FS138 is the unduplicated number of ELs who were enrolled during the time of the state ELP assessment and who received services in an LIEP supported with Title III funds. That's the general population of students captured under DG 675. Next slide.

[slide 23] Okay, so this is, again, it's just really a line edit. There's no substantive change here, and we're aligning the language that already existed in FS138 about pre-K students, as noted previously, that was added to FS050. Next slide.

[slide 24] For FS138, how are student counts reported as assessed first time? Again, given the feedback that we received and how states have very different methods of reporting progress based on what they're approved for in their accountability systems under Title I, we removed the language specific to assessed first time students, and we ask that you report consistent with your approved state plan. Next slide.

[slide 25] This is a pretty weedy area. I've got some Q&A here. New Hampshire, I see you have a question. We are working on that. There's just one clarification that we needed to touch base on with our Title I counterparts before replying. So we'll be following up with you shortly about that question specific to your state.

And then there's a question about students who took the annual ELP assessment, excluding ELs with disabilities (EL SWDs) whose disabilities preclude the assessment in one of four language domains. So there is no exception in terms of excluding any students who take fewer than the four domains in our Title III guidance. It does note that if a student is unable to take one of the domains on the assessment, they are allowed to take the remaining domains or must take the remaining domains. And that the state has to have a method of calculating a score to determine proficiency. Otherwise, the implication would be that if a student is being assigned a score of zero for not taking a domain, it's very unlikely that they would ever be eligible for exit. And so it's not meant to be punitive. If a student is unable to take a domain by virtue of their disability, there needs to be a method to validly and reliably calculate a proficiency score for that student on the remaining domain.

All right. Tim is noting a preference for the redlined file specifications. This is something that is managed by our ED*Facts* counterparts. They do have a table up front that notes the changes. I completely understand; that is one of the reasons why we try to present in the webinar the changes that were made. I can certainly pass along that feedback to them if there would be a way to be able to specifically highlight the changes. But I think that the key point is to please always use the most up-to-date version of the file specifications for any school year, so that you are clear on what the requirements are for that school year.

If any other questions come to mind, please go ahead and submit them and we'll catch them at the next pause for questions. Next slide.

[slide 26] So now we're going to talk about key changes to the language code guidelines in FS045 and FS141. These should generally be familiar to you because again, these are changes that we rolled out for SY 2022–23 in response to a lot of the questions that we received from you all, and were just incorporated into SY 2023–24, but we want to make sure to highlight them today.

[slide 27] So in terms of the definition of native language, it's the language normally used by students or normally used by the parents of the students. One thing to highlight here that we do talk about often, but I think important to continue highlighting because it's a concern that we continue to see, while there may be cases where English is appropriately reported for an English learner, generally speaking, we expect to see a language other than English reported as the native language. If your state, for example,

in your data system, allows districts to report more than one language, by virtue of what they've filled out in the home language survey, you should be opting for the language that is not English to be reported for the purpose of these file specifications.

If there are more languages other than English, I know that's the question that's come up currently. As I understand it, we're only able to have one language submitted in the way that the data is submitted. And so that is a limitation, but you can have your own business rules as to how the language is reported there. The key piece is that again, if you have English and another language reported there, that we would expect to see that other language.

And so, the language code spreadsheet, one concern that had been raised is this information is located in different places, some people maybe weren't familiar with the spreadsheet, or how to access the spreadsheet because it's in the Community of Practice site in ED*Facts*. This is just a configuration of how the ED*Facts* page is, but we thought it would be helpful to incorporate this information into the file specification to be able to point you to it more easily in one place. And the spreadsheet includes both the subset of 639-2 codes that may be used, as well as the subset that EDPass will now not accept.

In order to view the subset of language codes that may be used, you can filter by the Not Used in EDPass column, to only show rows that have a blank, and then of course, if you want to see the Not Used in EDPass columns, then you can filter by the ones that are marked off there.

And then, also important to emphasize that EDPass uses the (B) codes and not the (T) codes, if these designations are present for a particular language. So if you're trying to crosswalk what family submitted, and there are two different codes for that language, make sure that you're using the (B) codes.

And then, also, as we've discussed previously, there are some exceptions in terms of 639-3, which is a much more comprehensive list. We're not able to transition to that list. However, in cases where there is a substantial population of students speaking a language that is better represented by a 639-3 code, we are willing to consider those on a case-by-case basis and add those to the system as an allowable code. And here are the languages to date that have been requested and approved for inclusion in the list of language codes that are accepted in EDPass.

[slide 28] Okay, and so again, this is just an update to clarify that the languages that are considered improbable languages are not accepted in EDPass at this point. You can refer to the spreadsheet to determine which languages will not be accepted, and there are reasons why the language could be flagged as improbable, and therefore would not be accepted in the system.

And we've received some questions about whether ED is going to yet again make changes to this, given that we are well into the 2023–24 school year. Again, the SY 2023–24 document has been posted, and we don't have any intention of changing our policy, in terms of the codes that are able to be used for this submission. And it is not significantly different than the updates that we made for SY 2022–23, midyear. So hopefully that offers some consistency, which I understand was a concern, in terms of which languages should be given to districts as possible selection. Next slide.

[slide 29] Okay. And so here again, we're emphasizing that only the (B) or bibliographic entries are able to be used in EDPass, and that is also included in the spreadsheet that's referenced and linked in the file specification. It includes a crosswalk between the (B) and the (T) entries to make that work a little bit easier.

[slide 30] There's no substantive change here, but it's an extensive question. And this is about if a student has a native language that is unknown or not in the ISO 639-2 list. The emphasis here is that the SEA should follow up with LEAs to help address questions about what language code is appropriate, and support them in following up on the missing codes. And so, for a student where you've gone through

that process and the native language remains undetermined, we request that you use the language code “und”, representing undetermined. Those are cases where we know that it's not an issue of not being able to crosswalk the language, but that you have not been able to determine the correct language, either because it's blank in your system, though presumably the student has a language if they were identified as an EL, or because they submitted a language, such as Latin, which is no longer allowed in the system, and is unlikely to have been the correct language. So please select undetermined if you don't know the language.

[slide 31] And then there's a question of if the student has a native language that is unknown; the example given here is a student who speaks the Maay language. It is included in the 639-3 language list, but it's not included in 639-2, so this isn't a case of not knowing the language. It's knowing the language, but there isn't that option in 639-2 and the options that you're offered in EDPass. And so, looking at the Ethnologue website, we can see that this is a Cushitic language. And there is a value of Cushitic (Other) in 639-2. So you would report Maay-speaking students under Cushitic (Other), and then the state should provide a data note in its ED*Facts* state submission plan for FS045 and FS141 to explain that students in this category speak the Maay language, to the extent that you're using these different categorizations, so that it's clear which languages are being reported.

And it's helpful to know, in terms of thinking about the growth of different languages in the United States. This isn't just a data reporting exercise, but it really does influence policy and understanding of what the prevalent languages are in the country, and how those languages are shifting over time.

In the limited cases where student's native language is known, but the language code is not among those accepted by ED*Facts* and does not map to another code that is part of the accepted language code list, it wouldn't be a language like Maay; it's another language that doesn't have any equivalent mapping. Then you should use the code “mis,” which is really more of a miscellaneous, not a misidentified, which when you first look at it, you might think of it that way, but it's really the languages that are uncoded in ISO 639-2.

If you don't know the language, use “und.” But if you do know the language, but it doesn't code to any option in 639-2, use the code “mis.” And the state should provide a data note for FS045 or FS141 to explain the use of that code, because often that code may contain more than one language. So an example here could be “student languages include X, Y, and so forth. Those languages do not have a code in 639-2, which is why they're being included under that code.”

[slide 32] And then, there have been questions about sign language, including American Sign Language (ASL). And there are slight differences between FS045 and FS141 that I think are important to cover here. But there were questions about whether we would be eliminating that code altogether. And so again, upon further discussion and consideration, the 639-2 sign language code, “sgn,” is available for reporting Category Set B, student count by native language, and can be used in FS045 to report the count of student identified with any sign language, including ASL, listed as their native language.

And so you should add a data note for FS045 in the State Submission Plan to clarify the use of this language code. For example, it could include the list of sign languages subsumed under the “sgn” code, including ASL, as well as other languages that use sign, so Japanese sign language or others.

And then this is because some immigrant students may have English as their primary home language, and other immigrant students may be found to be English proficient, based on their results on the EL screener. But students that meet the definition of immigrant children youth, with ASL listed as a native language, may be included in the student count for “sgn,” for reporting Category Set B, student count by native language for FS045, because they're not necessarily English learners. Next slide.

[slide 33] Okay, so now for FS141, the code is available for reporting Category Set B, but the acceptability depends on the sign language. For non-English sign languages, the counts for non-English sign languages listed as their native language may be combined and reported using the “sgn” language code when reporting Category Set B. Again, you should add a data note in FS141, in this case, when you're getting a flag raised, to clarify the use of “sgn” there. It could include the list of non-English sign languages subsumed under “sgn.” However, students with ASL listed as the native language must not be included in the student count reported for FS141.

And for any questions about that, we tend to direct folks back to the July 2015 letter that we call the Larson Letter, concerning whether users of ASL could qualify for Title III services. The letter reaffirms the Department's longstanding interpretation that the use of ASL would not in and of itself be a basis for determining that a student is an EL and eligible for services funded by Title III. Next slide.

[slide 34] Okay. And so, because this is a complex area, and one that's raised a lot of questions, we're pursuing an additional language coding resource to support SEAs and LEAs in making language coding decisions that adhere to the ED*Facts* reporting requirements and that also accurately represent the languages other than English that are present in the participating student population.

And our ask today is that if you're willing to provide feedback to help develop this resource, if you have thoughts about what would be helpful to clarify beyond what's in the guidelines, thinking about is this related to how you set up your data systems to be able to pull up that information, starting with the home language survey? Is it about addressing discrepancies? What are the things that would be helpful to know more about? If you're willing to provide feedback on that initial stage, please indicate your interest in the feedback form at the end of the webinar. And our team will be following up with you.

And we'd definitely appreciate feedback from both Title III and ED*Facts* coordinators, because again, you're bringing different lenses to this work. The Title III folks may be looking at it more from the perspective of Title III policy, as well as the language communities in their population, whereas the ED*Facts* coordinators may be bringing some of those questions about how to set up a system, and the timelines, the back mapping, that you have to do in a timely manner to be able to capture that accurately. And we want to hear both perspectives there. So again, if you're willing to volunteer, I ask, please include your information at the end of the webinar. Next slide.

[slide 35] Okay, so again, that was a lot. I don't see any open questions, but I'm going to pause just for a moment to see if there are any related to the language guideline updates or this language coding resource. All right, we're seeing none. Again, if any questions come to mind, feel free to include them in the Q&A as we go. We can go to the next slide.

[slide 36] So, we are getting close to the end here in our wrap-up. We can move ahead.

[slide 37] So we want to remind you of our ongoing Community of Practice series, supporting SEAs and LEAs, and improving EL and Title III data quality. Again, our series for this year is related to the teacher data, and Session One, which occurred in March, was an overview of teacher certification and preparation data to inform Title III CSPR and ED*Facts* reporting.

Our upcoming session, Session Two, is on state data collection related to licensing and certification. I'm really excited about this one, because we'll be hearing more from our SEA partners, and I think that's always a good opportunity for us, and it's a great opportunity for you all to hear how other states may be addressing their reporting, especially given the variations in the requirements around certification and endorsement for teachers of EL. And then in Session Three, we'll be talking about state planning for the teacher workforce and CSPR estimates. I know that can be a tricky area, but thinking about how your state may be going about making those estimates for submission. Next slide.

[slide 38] Reminder that materials... I think we're a little bit behind in the posting, but for the most part, materials from the past webinars and TA resources are available at the linked site. And a reminder that the CSPR resubmission closed window is fast approaching. It is Wednesday, April 17th. And so again, if you have any questions about that, feel free to submit a question to the team, but I know that states are busy doing that work at this time. Next slide.

[slide 39] Okay. And again, a reminder where you should direct your questions. You are always welcome to copy me or your state contact, the list that we went through at the beginning of the webinar. But please use these email addresses to make sure that your question is received by the right team in a timely manner. Next slide.

And Joe, thank you for dropping this in the chat as a reminder, because it's a little bit different than ED*Facts*, that the deadline is 5:00 PM Eastern for those CSPR resubmissions.

[slide 40] We've got a list of resources here that we always like to point folks back to. Looking here at the chat again, Elizabeth kindly has dropped in the registration link for that May 7th COP. I will also be sending out an email with the information, but you're the first to hear, you're able to click on that registration link and go ahead and register to make sure that you've got it on your calendar.

[slide 41] Just want folks to look out for a pop-up and email after the webinar. It's an optional survey, but we always appreciate your feedback. Feedback on the webinar in general that you'd like to provide, challenges that you want to flag, including specific topics you'd like to see covered in future webinars pertaining to data quality. And then if you're interested in providing feedback to the language coding resource, there's going to be a specific field there for you to provide your contact information so that we can follow up with you because otherwise the survey is anonymous and so we wouldn't have a way of following up otherwise. So please, if you're interested, we don't expect it to be a very burdensome process, but we'd appreciate your input. Okay, so with that, I'm going to go back to the Q&A.

So, Fawn's asking, "The file specifications for FS045 and FS141 allow some counts for languages to be less than the total of students. Is that going to change?" So generally, Fawn, are you talking about the threshold for the BRSI? Or are you talking about the specific table and whether zero counts are required? I just want to clarify the question. But in general, I'll answer by saying we don't have any specific plans to change that file specification other than the changes that we highlighted here for 2023–24 or 2024–25. There are flags that, again, if the information is not being included, we're asking you essentially to submit a data note to that respect. And so if you hit a threshold where that is coming up, then we're requesting that you submit a data note explaining why the counts for the languages are less than the total counts of students. Because generally speaking, we would expect that if you have a student reported, that you would have an equivalent native language captured there. And the biggest place where that's come up is for the immigrant file, for states that may not have been collecting that information for students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth.

Fawn Dunbar:

Okay, so thank you. So based on the guidance that had been issued in December, when we were submitting the file specs FS045 and FS141, we decided at the time that we got that to begin notifying our districts that they can no longer report those languages, the "sgn," "mis," and "und." And I just wanted to share that as far as Michigan goes, we don't have a mechanism in our collection system for the districts to explain and give us a comment on those. So the only option that we would see is to just not accept those, but still report the students in the total student count, they just won't have a language in our data stats.

Leticia Braga:

Yeah, I mean I think we could certainly follow up on if we want to have a conversation about the specific setup for your state. I would say that as a general matter, because of all of the feedback, I think this is where we landed in the revised SYs 2022–23 and 2023–24, where these are now options and we're not planning to do away with them. There's a question of, you know, whether the district is self-selecting that or if it's really the SEA who is making that determination.

Fawn Dunbar:

No, we don't make that determination, that's the district.

Leticia Braga:

Okay. So that would be a question, I think, to speak with the Title III counterpart. Because if a district is reporting undetermined, that may be the case especially for districts that haven't been collecting that for students meeting the definition of immigrant children and youth. But certainly if they're English learners, there should be a language reported there.

Fawn Dunbar:

That's what we figured. So there wasn't a reason for them to not submit a language other than one of those, so we're just taking them away.

Leticia Braga:

Okay. What I'll say is it remains an option in the system. And so if you're taking it away and there is some discrepancy, because we do want districts to be able to report the information to you, if for some reason they're following up with you and they're saying that they don't have that information, then the expectation from our end in terms of rolling it up would be that you are reporting those counts either under undetermined, if it's really not possible to track down that information, or using the "mis" if there's a code that doesn't match up. I think a general practice of having those options opens up those opportunities, especially for the "mis," if there are those languages being reported at the districts that don't roll up due to the issue with 639-2 not being as comprehensive. But we're not going to dictate in terms of the state how you want to address that. If that's something that you're going to take on a case-by-case basis, then that's a decision that the state can make. But for the purpose of what the file specification allows for at the SEA and LEA level, those codes are going to be allowable codes.

Fawn Dunbar:

Okay. Thank you.

Leticia Braga:

Thank you. All right. And then, Raphael, that's a question we often get because ED doesn't have an official site that contains all of that information, but it's really the linked Ethnologue website within the file specification that has just been generally the recommendation as a reference source that is seen as a relatively reliable, available to all, resource that you can look at.

Any other questions?

All right, well, it's Friday. We don't want to keep you any longer than absolutely necessary and so appreciate you taking the time to join us today. As always, please feel free to follow up through our mailbox contacts if you have any specific questions because, again, every state's a little bit different, so it sometimes helps to get that additional context for us to be able to provide a response. And know that

we are receiving your correction opportunity requests, we're reviewing them as quickly as possible, trying to answer those as we can to be able to assist you with any resubmissions in a timely manner and appreciate all the work. I know it's a big, big list and we have a lot of file specifications just on our end. Thank you and have a great weekend when it comes.