

Leticia Braga:

[slide 6] Hi everyone. Thanks for being with us this, I think mostly afternoon for everyone at this point. I'm Leticia Braga, team lead for the Title III program, and this is one of our quarterly webinars for the Title III Data Quality Work. For those of you who maybe are joining us for the first time, welcome and for those who have attended many of these, welcome again and thanks for putting your information in the chat here so that we can see who's joining us today. For our agenda today, we're going to do a quick overview and introduction, and a very quick discussion about some common flags in the school year (SY) 2022–23 EDFacts submission based on the review that we've done so far.

What I'm really excited about today is a presentation from the Kansas team about their state data notes process to discuss how they develop the notes. And then we're going to have Keith from the data team give an overview of the SY 2022–23 EDFacts submissions this year since it's our first year within the EDPass system, talking a little bit about comparisons between this year and last, and then finally some wrap-ups. Next slide.

[slide 7] Overviews and introductions.

[slide 8] Goals of the Title III data quality effort, especially for those who may be new with us today are to provide technical assistance and support for SEA Title III and EDFacts coordinators to improve the quality of Title III-related data that states submit through EDFacts and their consolidated state performance reports or the CSPR. We want to encourage collaboration between SEA Title III and EDFacts coordinators and help us determine priorities for future state technical assistance work. Next slide.

[slide 9] And an overview of some of the activities we've completed include the guidance document on Title III data. We're working to provide some targeted updates, but the document that is posted for the most part is still a great resource for you all. We have these quarterly meetings between ED, SEA Title III staff and SEA EDFacts coordinators. We have a community of practice for SEA Title III coordinators and EDFacts coordinators around specific topics of interest and materials for new SEA Title III and EDFacts coordinators such as the infographics that we have posted on our website.

A process note—for this quarterly webinar, we decided to expand the list of invitees. Since this is more general information to include other people on the Title III listserv, please let us know if you think that was helpful or beneficial, so that it's easier to include other people on your end in participating. For now, we are going to keep the community of practice to the smaller groups that we tend to reach out to just because those are targeted discussions around the Title III data, but states should feel comfortable forwarding that invite to anyone in your SEA that you believe should be in attendance and would benefit from that participation as well. Next slide.

[slide 10] And the recap here of the Title III team. Now under the Office of English Language Acquisition, we have some more recent, I'm not going to say new anymore, but some more recent members. And we have an updated list of our FY 24 state assignments, just so everyone has these as a reference. You can always and are always encouraged to reach out to the Title III mailbox, but you should also think about the program specialist as your primary contact along with copying the mailbox to make sure that your questions are addressed as soon as possible. And so again, thanks to Maha, to Ivy, to Melissa, Liz and Fariba for their participation today and for all the work that they're doing to support the program. Next slide.

[slide 11] I also want to highlight some additional key staff for Title III. Of course, we have Montserrat Garibay, who is the Assistant Deputy Secretary and Director of OELA. We have Beatrice Ceja-Williams, who is the Deputy Assistant Secretary for OELA. And then on the OESE side, we continue to collaborate closely with our data colleagues and other colleagues in OESE. For this engagement, we've highlighted

Sarah Newman, who's the group lead for the OESE data team, as well as Keith McNamara, who is part of the OESE data team and will be presenting today. And Karen Armstrong, who has been providing some support on this engagement as well. As a preview, we'll be sharing some exciting updates on some exemplars to make better use of ED Data Express data at our next quarterly webinar in September. Next slide.

[slide 12] I want to highlight some common flags in the SY 2022–23 ED*Facts* submissions. These are really highlighted because they were the top flags in terms of the number of flags received. They're not necessarily ordered in terms of their importance or that they are more important than other flags, but we are simply highlighting the flags that we received most often.

[slide 13] And so first is EL-0050, which is related to file specification FS137. This error message occurs when the count of English learners not participating in English language proficiency tests was greater than zero. Now we know of course that there are instances where not every single student enrolled during the testing window is able to participate and complete the assessment or reach that threshold of completion. But since the statute does require the assessment of all English learners, this is the way that the flag is structured.

And what we ask of states is just to add a data note to be able to explain the reasons for why again, the participation is below that threshold. Previously, certainly there were disruptions due to COVID. At this point, we're expecting things to be more close to normal prior to pandemic levels, but that you would be able to provide an explanatory data note. For EL-0022, that's related to FS138 and that the count of English learners not participating in the Title III English language proficiency test was greater than zero. So you see a common theme here. Again, these files just vary depending on whether they only include Title III participating districts or not. But this is not surprising that these flags would be coming up the most often. And again, what we would ask is a data note accompanying your submission to explain why that's the case.

Next is EL-0033 associated with FS116. And this is when the sum of students in the Title III students served by grade level and LIEP type was less than the total Title III students served. And so here again, we're looking for those gaps between the information that you're providing on the number of students participating in the program, and the ones for which you have information on their grade level or the type of LIEP. Type of LIEP tends to be the one that's a little bit more challenging to collect and report. But again, we would of course encourage you to follow up with districts to make sure that you're collecting all of that information and to the extent that you have gaps that are flagged that you provide an explanatory data note to explain the extent of the issue, whether the issue is primarily due to a couple of districts or whether there's a more widespread issue that, for example, the state is working on. Those data notes really help us interpret the data that you are submitting and whether there should be any concerns about needing to suppress the data, for example, or to do additional follow-up and technical assistance.

For EL-0060, this compares across two file specifications, FS116 and 138. And this is when the sum of Title III English language proficiency test students was greater than the total Title III students served. Now in the past, this often occurred because FS116 was an October 1st count, and FS138 was a count during the testing window. And it may have been the case that there were more students present during the testing window than October 1st. Now, since FS116 has fully transitioned to a full year count, there would be an expectation that there is no reason that the number of students taking the test would be greater than the total Title III students served. And so often when this flag arose this year, this is something that we were flagging back to states to say, make sure that you're using the revised window under this current OMB package, which is over that full year. Some states noted that they're in the process of transitioning to be in compliance with the new window, and that is the reason for the

discrepancy. Any data notes that you add are really helpful for us, again, in understanding what the issue there may be.

And finally, EL-0065 is a comparison of 137 and 138. And this is the sum of students in the English language Proficiency results making progress and not making progress, not being similar to the count of students in the English language proficiency test participating minus the sum of those first assessed. And I will say this is something that came up for discussion a lot with when we were having our office hours and check-ins about this.

Part of the issue we know, for some of the states, depending on how they include students who are first assessed in their progress and no progress reporting, that's the reason for the discrepancy. And while we're considering other ways of being able to address this, for now, this year, for the SY 2022–23 submission, the feedback that we provided essentially was to please include that information in your data note so that we understand that that is the reason for this discrepancy. And thank you to many states that proactively did include that information. In that case, we did not need to follow up with any of the states about the data note because it was clear, again, that it was the reason why the flag was being elevated. Next slide.

[slide 14] We will take some questions about all of this once we're done with the portion from the Kansas team, but at this point I'm really excited to turn it over to the Kansas team. I'll defer to you all to do your introductions, which I know are on the next slide. But I'll just highlight for the group that part of the reason we asked Kansas to present is that we thought many of their data notes were very clear and explanatory as to the reason for why the flag was being elevated. We thought it would be great to get the collaborators on both the program and the data side to talk through their process a little bit. And so with that, I will turn it over to the Kansas team.

Stacey Noll:

[slide 15] I think I'm supposed to start. So, I'm Stacey Noll and I'm the Data Coordinator with Special Education and Title Services in Kansas. I am the data steward for approximately 75% of the EDFacts files that we submit every year. You can go to the next, unless did everybody else want to introduce themselves before I move on?

Twyla Sprouse:

Sure. My name is Twyla Sprouse, and I'm the Education Program Consultant on the Special Education and Title Services team, and my focus is Title III.

Doug Boline:

I'm Doug Boline. I'm an Assistant Director on the Special Education and Title Services team, and Twyla and Stacey work on my team.

Stacey Noll:

[slide 16] All right. So, the first, the couple of data notes they asked me to talk about was the sum of students in Title III Served by Grade Level and Language Instruction Education type was less than the total of Title III students served. In Kansas, we collect data in multiple collection periods. So, two of those times are around the end of September and then at the end of the school year. Because the language instruction type was originally an October 1 count date, we had it in that first collection. We haven't quite got it moved to the end of the year.

So although we collect the students at both the beginning and end of the year, we only collect the language instruction type at the beginning of the year, which leaves a discrepancy of anyone that changes schools or enrolls after September. We don't get an upload of their language instruction type. As well as our system only allows for them to choose one language instruction type for each student. It's just the only way we can set that up. So that is why that is what the data note is. Just saying that we have to take the count of students and the count of language instruction from two different data submissions and so they don't quite match up.

But, we are changing over to a new student information system in 2024–25, and it should collect all the data points at multiple times throughout the year. So we should be able to correct that at that time. We can move on to the next slide.

[slide 17] Here we're talking about either improbable languages or the undetermined language. Each year just when the file is pulled, I look to see what districts have got languages that we need to clean up. Part of it is knowing your state and knowing where things are.

So, I know that the district that had Osage as a language has an Indian college there, so it's very common for us to have Indian languages coming out of that city and LEA. As far as undetermined, we've had quite a problem with it over the years. People just not knowing what language to pick, not knowing the native language to choose. I've helped LEAs research that and tell them what to choose to get some of that cleared up. We also this year ran into with online enrollment and parents choosing at home, and that's where a lot of that was coming from because they did not know what language to choose.

So, reaching out to the Title III consultant and talking to them and having them reach out to the LEA, we can often clear up these. We've worked with them to work with their parents and make sure they're checking this after enrollment and getting back with them to clear any of these undetermined. So, we've made quite a difference in the number of undetermined over the last several years. That is about the process I use. I just try to make sure I put a lot of it back on the LEAs so that they know they're getting questioned about the data. The more they have to go in and clean it up, the more inclined they are to get it right the first time. Working with your Title III person on the different things is the way to go.

Doug Boline:

So, I might add that I think we're kind of lucky the way that our agency is set up that all of the Title programs are all on one team. Stacey's on that team, and like she said, she submits 75% of the data that goes to the Feds. But all those programs are housed within our team, and so she can go to those consultants and talk to them about the data that she's seeing. Where the problems appear to be. Then she's proactively gone about... She's collecting the data. She's trying to find out the reasons, and this and that. But when she sees it, something that's a problem, she spends kind of her downtime, when she's not actively filling out the reports, then she's trying to figure out, "Okay, what's the guidance that we can give to districts to the people that are filling this out so that they get it right?" Because a lot of times when we get data, it's too late for us to fix it. So, she's worked proactively to get them to get it right to start with. She mentioned the number of undetermined languages. We've gone from over 600 being reported down to less than 50 in the last five or six, seven years. So, that's just constantly getting on, making the phone calls, making the contacts. We've looked up languages for people to head them in the right direction because they just, they didn't want to do it. So, that constant communication has been helpful for us.

Twyla Sprouse:

I'll jump in and just share that I do appreciate the communication with Stacey and with Doug because it does allow me to reach out to LEAs that I'm working with as well. Then, as I'm doing my webinars with

my Title III groups on monthly webinars, I can talk to them about the accuracy of the data and making sure that they are choosing the right items. So, it's really working out well, and we encourage them to communicate with their families to make sure, like Stacey said at enrollment, that things are entered correctly then. Or they go back and visit with the family to make those corrections.

Leticia Braga:

[slide 18] Thank you. That was really great. Again, that tag teaming I think demonstrates how you all work so well together. So, a couple of themes that I heard from our prior discussion and here today, again, is that the structure, the bureaucracy can sometimes facilitate those communications. So, the ways in which we're structured can sometimes help, sometimes provide some barriers. But, even if we're not structured in a way that everyone is under the same division, how can we work to make sure that that flow of information is still happening, that those divisions don't cause silos?

Certainly for the Title III team, for example, now that we've moved at the federal level out of OESE into OELA, we want to make sure that we continue that relationship, that great relationship that we have with the OESE data team, because that's really integral to making sure that the data processes work well. So just because we're in a different office in the agency doesn't mean now that we're going to be siloed... Everything should be to the benefit of making sure that this works well.

The other piece of course, is the follow-up, which is not easy. But the follow-up that we heard is occurring with districts to make sure not only that the data is right, but that they are aware. Stacey, to your point, that you are going to be following up with them. So, it behooves them to try to get the information because they know that you're going to come knocking if it's not there. I think that that change in numbers from around 600 to 50 really demonstrates the effort that you've put in there. So, thank you. I know of course, different states are in different situations in terms of capacity, time, how time is divided across different programs, but would you say for Kansas, in terms of the size of your team, how do you feel about the number of staff working on this? My impression is not that you are doing a great job with the staffing that you have here.

Stacey Noll:

Yeah, we don't have a big team on the ED*Facts*. It's really just... I mean, it's me. I have an ED*Facts* Coordinator and a couple other people in IT that we work with. But, then it's just me reaching out to the different programs. Like Doug said, I've worked... Well, I've been here for 20 years and I've worked with Title programs almost that whole time. I haven't always been the data person. But, I go to all the meetings. I go to a lot of the out of state meetings. So, I hear what's going on in the programs. Having some knowledge about the programs just helps you know the data better. I don't really know any other way to explain it, but just knowing the ins and outs of the programs is a lot easier to understand what they're asking for in the data files.

Leticia Braga:

Thank you for all the effort that you all are putting in. It clearly shows. And again, for the good of the group, part of what we want to highlight is the level of detail in the data notes here.

[slide 17] I also did want to call out the specific data note that we have on the screen. We're talking about a very small n-size here to the point that as Stacey's highlighted here, some LEAs having less than two students in a particular category. There are times at which ED may make decisions to truncate the data notes from a state, and some of those reasons may include data privacy concerns. Just making sure that we're keeping it at a level that if we're not meant to identify a particular LEA, that the information there is not leading to that identification.

That being said, it's very helpful when you're submitting the information to ED, that we receive as much detail as possible. So that we understand the context of the data that you're submitting, even if what ends up in the public data notes is slightly truncated. We can go onto the next slide and we can take questions about either the initial data flags or anything that you all want to take the opportunity to raise to the Kansas team since they've made time for us today here. Happy to take some time.

[slide 18] I don't currently see any open questions in the Q&A. I'll give it another moment. We have a question here in the chat, I think directed to the Kansas team. What student data system are you moving to?

Stacey Noll:

I don't know what it's... I know what we're calling it. I don't know, I don't know anything more specific than that, but I do know that instead of data submissions throughout the year, it will be a running data. It will be all the time. Uploads.

Doug Boline:

Our IT department received a grant to develop this system, and so I think they've built a lot of it on their own. I don't know that we have any specific vendor that we could call out. Our IT is building it...

Stacey Noll:

Right.

Doug Boline:

And like Stacey said, basically, it's live all the time. So anytime a change occurs in a district student information system, that information will come to us. We don't have to wait for them to submit a file.

Leticia Braga:

Sounds like a prime presentation for a data coordinator meeting in the future, Doug. Put in your proposal already. Any other questions? All right. Well, again, I found it really helpful to hear from the Kansas team as we were putting this together. And appreciate your time today sharing this and I'm sure if folks have questions, want to follow up about anything, they know where to find you all. And apologies in advance if you're getting more emails on account of this, but I'm sure it's all for good reason. So thank you.

Twyla Sprouse:

Thank you.

Stacey Noll:

Thank you.

Leticia Braga:

Thanks all. Next slide.

[slide 19] So with that I'm going to turn it over to Keith from the OESE data team to talk a little bit about EDPass overview at a very high level in terms of the data submissions this year. Keith.

Keith McNamara:

Thanks, Leticia. Good afternoon, everyone. So as Leticia mentioned, I'm just going to provide a very brief, 10,000-foot overview of summative overview related to Title III-specific data submissions across the board this year in our first year of EDPass. Next slide, please.

[slide 20] So up here is a chart showing some descriptive statistics on both this year's 2022–23 data quality through EDPass with the prior year's data submission, the 2021–22 school year previously through the old EDFacts system. A few things to highlight, for last year's data, which is the top row here 2021–22, this represents the final data quality after the second round of resubmissions, whereas the school year 2022–23, the second row represents data submitted by the one due date we had in EDPass, I think it was January 24th of this year.

Overall, the data quality we're seeing is actually an improvement from the prior year. And I want to just go through some of these numbers to explain what we're really looking at because some of them look a little dramatic. But first, if you look in the first column, you'll notice there's a pretty substantial reduction in the number of missing files by the due date. From 25 to seven, this is a 72% drop. And this, of course, even when there was only one due date in 2022–23 with no scheduled resubmission date. So that's a very significant improvement. Second, the next two columns, you'll note here that although relatively the same number of states experienced rule failures, I think it was 51 and 52, not uncommon, there were actually a lot more rule failures that flagged in the new EDPass system than in the prior year. This was actually something that we saw across other programs. In fact, several programs other than Title III flagged considerably more.

But what you need to keep in mind is a lot of these rule failures were, in the prior system, the old EDFacts system, pre-submission checks that basically would've prevented your data from getting in in the first place at all, and we wouldn't normally be seeing those at all in the post-data quality. So that partly explains the larger number here. And I want to emphasize that this shouldn't be read as a decline in data quality. In fact, most of these were either corrected before submission or obviously, either they were corrected, or the data notes were submitted, and those data notes were substantial enough that they didn't warrant any post-submission outreach for requests for resubmission. And that's what you see, looking at the last column here. You'll notice that there's a decline in... And I'm comparing here sort of apples and oranges, but a decline in the resubmissions versus post-submission correction opportunities, which were a limited number that we did this year.

And although this year we didn't have a formal resubmission window as in years prior, we also saw fewer issues that really merited requests for corrections this year. So that's actually a really big improvement. And I think some of the data notes that you saw Kansas present, improvements in data note quality, I think, we did see across the board, and that we expect to continue to see improvements on. I do want to note, though, that this does not include longitudinal or year-to-year checks, which in this first year of EDPass couldn't be run in the system. We did provide some external state-executed workbooks. With these Excel workbooks where we ask states to submit their numbers, the workbooks would give you certain flags. And then we ask you to submit any anomalies you saw in the SSP comments.

And the reason I bring this up is in this upcoming year from 2023–24, EDFacts will be programming the year-to-year checks, the longitudinal checks into the system. And so you'll begin to see these pre-submission in the system much in the way as you saw all of the data quality rule checks in the system this year. And as I understand it, right now, these are currently under review. They'll be programmed in the system once finalized. So I think that's it. Next slide.

[slide 21] So as I said, this is a broad sort of 10,000-foot overview. For next year's EDPass, we will hopefully have more information as soon as we get more information from EDFacts. But I think the

general takeaway here is even though it was a lot more effort on your part—and I appreciate all of the work that those of you who were involved in this EDPass submissions made in terms of getting the data in on time, and in terms of providing very helpful data notes, and dealing with a system that had a lot of quirks this year, and it was very much a learning curve, but we did get better quality data and hopefully, this upcoming year, some of the issues that we dealt with, technically and otherwise, will have resolved. And so hopefully 2023–24, we'll see even better data quality and less hassles than we did.

So, with that said, any questions related to EDPass, this year's data quality, process related?

Leticia Braga:

Yes, Keith. None yet, but we can give it a minute.

Keith McNamara:

Okay.

Leticia Braga:

We always welcome questions here. Any question is welcome. If you're feeling a little shy, you can submit it anonymously. But feel free to raise any questions that you have about what was presented. We recognize that most of it is more of an overview of information today, but also want to just echo the thanks on all the work that I know went into submit the data in this way this year. We definitely saw the fruits of the labor and the marked improvement and just the data notes and the explanations that helped us better interpret the data. So thank you, as well.

I don't see any questions, yet. We can do a final check before we wrap up. So definitely encourage everyone to submit in the Q&A, and we'll also do a check of the chat in case anything comes up there. Great. Thank you so much, Keith. We can move on to the next section.

[slide 22] All right, so we are at wrap-up. Next slide.

[slide 23] We've got our Community of Practice series, for those of you who have been engaging. If you for some reason haven't been able to participate, the slides from the prior engagements are posted on our website. And you're welcome to join the final session, which is going to be on July 12th related to state planning for the teacher workforce and CSPR estimates.

So, again, as a reminder, this community of practice is focused on data related to teachers providing supports and Title III LIEP served districts. And one of the things that we want to focus on for that last session is, again, the CSPR question about the estimates for the additional teachers that may be needed over the next five years. That can be a challenging one to put together.

How is your state approaching that calculation? Is there something that you could learn from other states? So, we're hoping to have some good presenters from different states to talk about their approaches. And also, of course, welcome you to bring your own experience and thoughts on that to the discussion. During the COP, we definitely try to leave as much time as possible for discussion and engagement, peer-to-peer breakouts, that sort of thing.

So, you'll see the registration information come out shortly for that, again, to that smaller group of folks who have been participating in the community of practice. But feel free to forward that information to other people on your end who you think should attend. Next slide.

[slide 24] All right, and again, as a reminder, materials from past webinars and TA resources are available on our website. And so, if you want a refresher, if you want to catch up, please review the slides there. Next slide.



[slide 25] Here are some key email addresses. Again, the Title III mailbox is now OELA.titleiii-a@ed.gov. If you've got specific questions related to your state's EDFacts data, reach out to EDFactsPSC@aemcorp.com. And continue sending questions related to your state's CSPR data to CSPR@ed.gov. Thank you, Elizabeth, for posting that in the chat, as well. Next slide.

[slide 26] And, again, here we've got some links that I believe Elizabeth is also going to put in the chat and are available on the slide decks that are saved there. But a quick resource for you all in terms of where to find some information, especially for those who may be newer to this data work or newer to the work for Title III. Next slide.

All right, and so that's it. I'm going to pause and see again if there are any final questions. We've got a question here about showing the slide again of who is the program specialist for each of the states.

And so, if we want to go back to that, that would be great before we conclude. And then, Louise, thank you for your comment, as well, about knowing our thinking behind data notes and making them more useful. Absolutely. Again, it helps for ED's internal review and also to the extent that information is published, it certainly helps external stakeholders make use of the data.

[slide 10] So here we have the fiscal year 2024 assignments. I will note that I will be out for a period of time over the summer and in my absence, Elizabeth Judd will be the primary contact for my states. But, again, you can continue to reach out to the OELA Title III-A mailbox and that is the best way to make sure that your question is viewed in a timely manner in case someone is out.

All right. So with that, give it a pause. Okay, I see Elizabeth is flagging that there was maybe a question earlier. A system used to communicate with Title III staff that is different than 360 communities, EDPass PSC, and is there a way for state EDFacts coordinators to see who gets the Title III alerts in their state?

That's a good question that we have a few ways of reaching out. Essentially, in thinking about the EDFacts coordinators, we do send that out through PSC. So, anyone who's receiving the PSC updates is going to see information about the upcoming engagements.

On our end, we do maintain a listserv that's a little bit broader. It's specific to SEA contacts. And so, I would encourage you to ask your Title III coordinator who has been added to that. If you do have a question, you can ask them to reach out.

We do try to do periodic outreach to ask if these are the right people to have on the list. The last time we did this because of our transition to OELA, we did have a lot of revisions from states. And so, again, if you have questions about who's included, please reach out and ask us who we have on the list and let's make sure that it's the right people on your end that need to be getting these updates.

Again, for the Title III listserv, we try not to replicate all of the information, for example, in the NCELA Nexus, but we're trying to send out key information pertaining to the Title III program, whether it be related to allocations or upcoming TA engagements that are specific to Title III.

So let's go ahead and go all the way to the end again because we are going to ask you for that webinar feedback as usual.

[slide 27] This is just request for optional feedback if you would like to provide any regarding this engagement, any topics that you would like to see in future webinars, whether you found this useful, any constructive feedback that you'd like to provide.

And so, with that, we're going to give you some time back today and hopefully with that time back, you can take some time to give us that webinar feedback if you are willing and able. So there's going to be a popup and also an email as an option asking for feedback and any specific topics that you'd like to see covered in future webinars.

Seeing some thanks here in the chat. Thanks to you all for all that you're doing. Thanks for participating today. Be on the lookout for the invite to the third community of practice either tomorrow or the following day so that you can register. And we look forward to connecting with you again soon.