Transcript of CSPR SY20-21 Part I Webinar

Sarah Newman: Just a couple of housekeeping items before we get started today. We will be using the Q&A box for questions. As you have questions, please use that box and we will type out the answers. I'm sure that there'll be questions that other people may want the answers to. I know there've been already a couple of questions about whether or not this is being recorded, whether or not the slides will be shared. The answer is yes to all of those things. But if you wouldn't mind using the Q&A, that would be great. The chat functionality will be only seen by the panelist. If you have something you want to say in there, just know that, that's where those messages will go. Let's get started. Next slide.

Sarah Newman: All right. We have a pretty full agenda. Hopefully, we'll be able to make a little bit of time for Q&A, though, we'll do our best to answer questions as they come up, especially if they're relevant to whatever we're talking about at the time.

Sarah Newman: We'll start with some introductions so you know who is here and talking to you today. Give you some general updates and improvements that we've made to the CSPR tool, updates on the 2021 CSPR Part I collections as there are definitely some differences between where we were at last year and where we're at this year, in terms of the collection with COVID.

Sarah Newman: Some information on the timeline and key dates, preview of the tool, data quality. We've included some information provided to us from some of our program offices within the office of elementary and secondary education. We'll share some of the major issues or the most common issues we're still experiencing with some of the data. Go over next steps, and then again, hopefully leave some time for Q&A. Next slide.

Sarah Newman: All righty. My name is Sarah Newman. I work in the front office of our Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. I oversee all things data related for the office, and hopefully, I am somewhat of a familiar face by now. I will turn it over to my colleague, who's on my team, Keith Mcnamara.

Keith Mcnamara: Hi everyone. My name's Keith Mcnamara, as Sarah said. I'm working also on the data team in OESC. While the webinar is continuing, I'm going to be checking out the Q&A, so please submit your questions during the webinar, but also we're going to have some time at the end, hopefully for some more in-depth questions.

Keith Mcnamara: We've invited a few folks from the program offices who might be able to answer some more detailed questions as they come up towards the end. Looking forward to hearing your questions and I'm sure you'll hear a lot more from me in the days and weeks ahead.

Kathryn Barr: Hi, everyone. I'm Kathryn Barr. I am assisting with the data collection for the CSPR, and I'll be answering probably if you have any questions about the tool throughout the collection, I will be answering those for you.

Sarah Newman: Right. Next slide please. All right. Some general updates and improvements. Overall, the process is going to be pretty similar to last year. We are again, using the Illume tool with features very similar to what you saw for CSPR Part II. There were some advancements made between Part I and Part II of last year, like the ability to jump around to sections.

Sarah Newman: That is still the same for this year. Again, the process, as far as the tool itself will include manual entry fields only. That is what you'll actually see through Illume. The EDFacts data will continue to only be submitted through the EDFacts submission system and not appear within the tool itself, but rather be available as extracts provided at request.

Sarah Newman: The timeline continued to be aligned to when the December and February EDFacts data are due. That will certainly be how it works again this year. I do have to give the disclaimer that we are anxiously awaiting OMB approval for this collection. I'm sure most of you are hopefully aware that we have been attempting to update this collection package to include additional elements related to the American Rescue Plan, the particular funding related to the homeless children and youths program.

Sarah Newman: We should be getting that approval today or tomorrow, and at that point, this information can be considered final, but until we actually have that official approval, unfortunately, this information is considered tentative. Next slide.

Sarah Newman: I just wanted to start, I know there's been some questions around the relationship between CSPR and EDFacts, and some feedback that it's been confusing to tell the difference now that the tool itself only includes manual entry.

Sarah Newman: I have, over the next couple of slides, I won't go through this entire list, but an example, slides showing the relationship between the two that we still have the CSPR related sections that populate within the report that pulls in that EDFacts data. That's what you can see over the next, I think it's three slides. Quite a bit of data that's pulled into the CSPR as you all know.

Sarah Newman: Again, that tool will only include manual entry, but when we go to create reports, it will include both. We will be publishing this CSPR-EDFacts Crosswalk. It's actually a bit more detailed. It's aligned with what the EDFacts team used to publish on their website, showing what category sets and levels are being used in each section.

Sarah Newman: That will be published, hopefully, tomorrow, as well as CSPR documents that actually include the full CSPR, including the EDFacts section. You'll see a couple
of different versions. You'll see the official OMB approved version that has only the manual entry. Then you'll see a version, in case you actually want to see the full report, including both. Next slide.

Sarah Newman: Maybe sit here for a moment in case anybody is taking a picture of it. I've seen people do that in the past. Here, we're just listing all of the data files due. Just a note towards the end of that slide, that the dropout data is actually due on the February timeline. We'll see that there. Next slide.

Sarah Newman: That is just the rest. This is just Part I, what is populated into Part I? The Crosswalk that we publish tomorrow will include both Part I and Part II. Next slide. All right. I see a question from Rick about 103. We will get into that immediately on the slide where we are talking about updates. Last year, assessment data were waived due to COVID. They are now required this year. So, you will see section 1.2 in the CSPR tool. You will see the manual entry sections that you've submitted in the past. When we go to provide you with an EDFacts extract or the report, you will see the data that you've submitted there.

Sarah Newman: Section 1.3.4 is optional. The program office has decided to make File Spec 103 that has been collecting those poverty quartiles at the school level, that is made optional and will be retired for this year. It is optional. You can still choose to submit it. That does mean that section 1.3.4, that is the poverty quartile break table is not required. Though, if you do choose to submit 103, we would request that you still fill out 1.3.4. But if you choose not to submit 103, then you'd do not need to fill out that table.

Sarah Newman: The prior tables that pull in 203. 203 is still required. But the difference would be that we wouldn't have that breakdown by low poverty and high poverty. Instead, we would only have the breakdowns showing, for those categories sets, the inexperienced teachers, the out of field, emergency provisional credential, you'll see just the total of teachers because we'll only be able to pull in 203. But that is still required.

Sarah Newman: Then there are these sections that we are trying to get that final approval for; 1.6.3, 1.6.4 and 1.6.5, that relate to ARP-Homeless I and II funds. You'll see those in the tool. Then the other change we made in this information collection package is to move the education of migratory children section from Part II to Part I. That was formally 2.4, it is now in CSPR Part I as section 1.7. Next slide.

Sarah Newman: All right. The timelines and key dates. We are pretty much at the opening. Crossing my fingers that we get that approval in the next couple of hours. The initial open date is scheduled for Thursday. We will not be opening unless we have approval, but I do expect us to get approval in the next couple of days. Assuming that happens, you all, like last year, will get that email, letting you know how to access the tool. That would be Thursday for CSPR Part II, excuse me. The data is scheduled for the 28th. You can see the rest of the dates, very similar to the years prior. Next slide.
Sarah Newman: All right. I will actually kick it over to Kathryn who’s going to show us bit of the tool.

Kathryn Barr: Hi everyone. Hopefully this is a quick overview of how the tool appears in Illume. For those of you that submitted through the Illume tool, last year, there have not been many major changes, but as Sarah indicated, compared to the CSPR Part I, initial open for school year 1920, there is now this skip functionality, and we'll see that in a few slides.

Kathryn Barr: If you could go to the next slide, please, Paul. These are the six sections that are in the CSPR Part I. The only ones that are brand new for this year is 1.7, as Sarah said, it moved from Part II to Part I. Section 1.6, the Homeless Children and Youth Program has a few new questions, and section 1.2 wasn't collected last year, like Sarah already said, but it is being collected this year. You will see it in there. Next slide.

Kathryn Barr: The next couple of slides are just screenshots of what the tool actually looks like. Hopefully, if you submitted last year, this doesn't look very different and hopefully is something that you are accustomed to at this point. You'll see that there are radio optioned questions that you'll see in the CSPR Part I. This is just an example of section 1.2. Other sections also have radio button response options. It's just a quick screenshot of that. Next slide, please.

Kathryn Barr: We wanted to give you a preview of what section 1.6 would look like. This is the initial question for section 1.6, is you'll see you're entering numbers and it will auto sum on the screen for you, as long as you're entering numbers only. If you do not, you'll get an error message, and it'll pop up in red text when you try and click next or previous. Then most questions also have a comment section. Just be aware that the sections are limited to 8,000 characters for those comments. Next slide, please.

Kathryn Barr: As Sarah and I both said already, section 1.7 is new for Part I. It was section 2.4 in Part II. It is the exact same questions, they've just all been pulled over from Part II. The same, the numbering is just different on the question parts. The next slide.

Kathryn Barr: This is an additional question from section 1.3. This is about ARP-Homelessness I. 1.6.4 also looks very similar, it's just the same layout. It asks you for the number of LEAs that are doing the sub grants, and you'll report that there. Next slide.

Kathryn Barr: For those of you who submitted in Part II last year, this should look kind of familiar. For this last part of 1.6, you will need to submit an Excel file to the OESC email inbox. You will click the CSPR link there for the 1.6.5 ARP-Homelessness Excel file. You report the information that is requested for this question in that Excel file. Then you will email the completed Excel file to the oese.cspr@ed.gov email. All right. Next slide.
Kathryn Barr: As previously indicated, there is a skipping functionality in the CSPR Part I. It'll look like this. You just click the dropdown menu, select the section you would like to skip ahead to, or skip back to. Once you click that or select that section, click the next button, and you will be taken to that section.

Kathryn Barr: If you do not wish to jump to a section on these pages, just click the next button and you'll be taken to the next subsequent section, and not be jumped around. All right. Next slide. As the same as last year, if you want to save your progress, there's a save and continue later button in the survey. You can click that. The system will save your current progress and you have the option of emailing yourself a copy of the link that you would use to access the survey again, or you can copy the link provided on the page and save it somewhere. Or you can just use the initial email or the URL that you were sent in your invite email, that will also take you to the last spot that you were.

Kathryn Barr: There are several options for you to get back into the tool where you had left off. I believe that's it for the tool preview. If you want to click the next side, Paul. We'll turn it back over to Sarah.

Sarah Newman: All right. Thank you. Trying to answer questions. I should just maybe wait till the end. Trying to do too many things at once. Thank you for that. We wanted to take a little bit of time to just talk data quality. We continue to try to evolve this process to make it easier, less burdensome, while also being as thorough as we can.

Sarah Newman: That can be a little bit of a conundrum there. But did want to just share some, where we're at, some things that we're still wrestling with on our end. We have made a lot of changes to the business rules, as I'm sure you've seen. Always open to feedback on those. I know that the most recent business rule single inventory is now live.

Sarah Newman: I know that the goal of EDFacts is to get that posted as soon as possible so that you all can see those business rules. We've been really trying to focus on standardizing those rules, so that we're as consistent in the language as possible. So that, that isn't adding any confusion for you all. Next slide, please.

Sarah Newman: As you've, I'm sure, been able to see through the business rule, single inventory, we really break down our data quality rules into three overall buckets; looking at accuracy, completeness, and timeliness. There is definitely a spectrum here of error and known errors versus anomalies. Luckily, we do see less timeliness issues, major completeness issues, and more on the accuracy front.

Sarah Newman: We are still trying to strike the right balance with the year-to-year checks. Still working through some of those thresholds, trying to look at longitudinal, across the years, our data do some internal analysis to really strike the right balance. Not all the same thresholds work across the states. Just trying to figure out how
involved and dynamic we can be so that we're not over flagging, but really just isolating where there probably is a true issue with the data.

Sarah Newman: Still a bit of a work in progress there. I imagine that you all in the states probably deal with similar issues. Always happy to learn how others are trying to do data quality and learn from each other as best as we can. Next slide.

Sarah Newman: Right. Just a little bit about where we’re seeing most of the types of rules being flagged. I will say, this is part where we have issues. Then that other part where, again, there are still some issues with thresholds and things. We do recognize there's multiple takeaways to get out of what we're seeing in the data. We are doing things like putting them in visualizations to see things that might not be readily apparent in those lovely spreadsheets with hundreds of rows that don't make learning super easy.

Sarah Newman: We are seeing quite a bit of across file issues. This was actually a lot by some of the mismatches we were seeing, particularly in the Title III section of the CSPR. That is a future slide. We'll go over that a little bit more in an effort to maybe cut down on what we're seeing there. Otherwise, accuracy, the largest bucket and then less completeness types of issues. Less accuracy conflicting permitted value issues. Again, I think those rules are pretty cut and dry. I do think, that's not necessarily where we're seeing the issues, which is great. It's more around where the data are probably anomaly. Next slide.

Sarah Newman: All right. Looking at EDFacts, going back to that conversation about those longitudinal checks, still seeing that those are predominantly the ones that are flagging the most by quite a bit here, as you can see on the slide, we sent about 328 comments related to just things that we were seeing across time. There, we're seeing other types of accuracy issues. After longitudinal, seeing some things across files, as we try to understand and interpret the differences that we're seeing in related populations of data. Next slide.

Sarah Newman: All right. Now, this graph is showing which rules were actually resolved. Where there was actually resubmission of data that we received, in which it actually wiped away the issue. You can see that first bucket of accuracy, longitudinal, where not a lot is being resolved. To me, this does tell me that, to some extent, these are anomalies, that they are not wrong, there is contextual information to know about the data, and then there's other types of rules where that completion or the resolution rate is so much higher. Going down a few; completeness, incomplete data, where the majority are being resolved.

Sarah Newman: This has been just a helpful way of looking at our business roles on our end, and really trying to figure out where there's maybe changes we need to make, or maybe conversations we need to have with you all about how, we just get to a better and better place overall with the quality of our data. Next slide, please.
Sarah Newman: All right. Next slide. We have some slides on particular topic areas. This one being assessment, with the waivers related to COVID. While we’re still collecting the data, we do recognize that there is a lot going on, and we are all facing lots of different challenges, and that a lot of states did receive waivers of some sort this past year.

Sarah Newman: We really do recognize that assessment participation rates overall were impacted certainly by just disruptions in in-person education. We are expecting that. We are aware that, there’s also just a difference out there between some states that we’ve heard are really experiencing more of a normal state around the rate of assessment participation, whereas others are very, very impacted, even down to 10% of students being assessed.

Sarah Newman: Then we are expecting the variability from district-to-district to also be the very significant. With all this being said, we do recognize this impacts data quality. We have been taking that into account and looking at our own internal procedures to see where we need to make some changes. There are known approvals to waivers, and how does that translate to our business rules? We’re looking at that. There are also some decisions already made around some business rules, just not to run that, we will get into on the next slide. Next slide, please.

Sarah Newman: The assessment business rules related to looking at proficiency, particularly proficiency over time. We are not running those files. You may know, some of our business rules are run across the achievement files, 175, 178, 179 and 185, 188 and 189. I do want to clarify, you will see, in the business rules, single inventory, two rows for that particular business role that shows you what it was, so you can see what we’ve suspended for 2021. Then you’ll see the version that actually is being run, where we are still taking a look at some of the participation data in 185, 188 and 189.

Sarah Newman: You see, similarly for the next rule for DQR-Assess-010, similar we’re not going to be looking at the achievement files for that. Then that last rule is only looking at proficiency. We are just not going to be running that one at all in 2021. Next slide.

Sarah Newman: All right. I am actually joined by Meredith Miceli, in the Office of Special Education Programs, and they have a little bit of information that we wanted to share as well since we co-steward these data files. I will be sharing some slides on their behalf, and she is available for questions, if anything comes up.

Sarah Newman: The Office of Special Education Program, reviews, evaluates and uses the participation in achievement data for math and reading language arts for the children with disability subgroup. They use the data to pre-populate indicators in their IDEA Part B state performance plan and annual performance reports, the SPP APR and the results matrix for the determination process for IDEA Part B formula grants. They also evaluate the data looking at timeliness, completeness,
and accuracy on the children with disabilities, which is also factored into the
determination process for IDEA Part B formula grants.

Sarah Newman: IDEA also identifies specific technical assistance or enforcement actions that the
department must take under special consideration for states that are not
determined to meet requirements through this determination process,
including grant conditions, and even the withholding of IDEA formula funds, in
some cases.

Sarah Newman: Due to this high stakes nature of the assessment data for the IDEA Part B
programs, OSEP does conduct a separate review of the assessment data on
children with disabilities submitted by states. I’m sure you’re familiar with
receiving business rules or flags from OESE, and then another set from OSAP.
This year, OSEP is implementing a few changes as well to their business rules
used to evaluate the quality of the assessment data on children with disabilities.

Sarah Newman: They will be applying a one percentage point threshold to the accuracy edit, and
there will be a little bit more information on this change in a couple of slides.
They have added an edit check to determine if zeros have been submitted for an
entire file. They are suspending year-to-year business rules for the assessment
data, since there are no of 2019/20 assessment data to compare to.

Sarah Newman: Since the assessment data are no longer reported by individual performance
level, references to data reported by individual performance level have been
removed from the business rules. You’ll see that reflected in the business rule,
single inventory. Then all the business rules OSEP applies to the assessment
data submitted for children with disabilities are available.

Sarah Newman: If you haven’t checked that out, that is on the EDFacts webpage. I haven’t been
looking at the Q&A, not sure if there have been questions around where that is,
but it is on the EDFacts webpage, and we’d be happy to provide a direct link
there. Next slide, please.

Sarah Newman: All right. As I mentioned, OSEP has revised their accuracy check for the
assessment data related to children with disabilities. Previously, they had the
expectation that the count of children with disabilities who were reported as
participants would exactly match the count of children with disabilities reported
in the achievement data.

Sarah Newman: However, this year, OSEP will be applying a one percentage point threshold to
this edit. This edit will be triggered if the percent proficient for children with
disabilities calculated using participants as the denominator differs by more
than one percentage point, from the percent proficient for children with
disabilities calculated using the sum of children with disabilities reported as
proficient and not proficient in the achievement data as the denominator. That
was a mouthful. Please note that this edit is applied for each of the assessment
types that are reported in those data files, as well as the grade levels reported. This is at the state level data file. Next slide, please.

Sarah Newman: Great. This slide is an illustration of how the edit check works. If you report 200 children with disabilities reported as participating in an assessment in a particular grade, but you only reported 150 children with disabilities as proficient and 30 as not proficient, then there would be a difference of 20 children with disabilities reported as participants, but not reported in the achievement data.

Sarah Newman: Since there is a difference between the count of children with disabilities reported as participants and the count reported in the achievement data, we would calculate that percentage proficient using the participation counts as the denominator and calculate the percentage proficient using the sum of proficient and not proficient counts as the denominator, and then compare the two percentages.

Sarah Newman: As you can see here, using the participation data as the denominator, you get 75% proficient using the sum of proficient and not proficient from the achievement data as the denominator, you get the 83% proficient. When you compare the two percentages, you see that this would differ by eight percentage points and thus would trigger this business rule for them.

Sarah Newman: Right. Next, slide. All right. What does this mean if this business rule is triggered for you? If the difference between the two percentages for children with disabilities is greater than one percentage point, the state will be sent a comment to resubmit the data or provide an explanation for this discrepancy. Additionally, the data may lose a point under the category of accuracy for OSEP’s IDEA section 618 Data Quality Review Rubric, which is factored into the IDEA Part B determinations.

Sarah Newman: If the discrepancy is not resolved to within the threshold by the freeze or close date, OSEP may suppress those assessment data for children with disabilities, from their public release, which may then impact the use of these data in things like the results matrix and the SPP/APR indicator 3, also used in the IDEA Part B determinations process.

Sarah Newman: Please note that if there is a discrepancy between the count of participants reported for children with disabilities and the count reported in the achievement data, but it is within the one percentage point threshold, states will still receive a comment regarding the discrepancy, but will not be asked to resubmit, provide a data note, may not lose a point for accuracy and may not be considered for suppression from the public release data. I said, Meredith Miceli is with us today, if there are any questions related to that. Please feel free to use that Q&A. Next slide.
Sarah Newman: All right. Now we will talk a little bit specifically about Title III. Next slide. All right. This is one of the rules that was really contributing to a lot of comments that we were seeing in the CSPR related to across file data. This section looks at the data that's submitted in File Spec 116, the Title III served data, where you all are providing breakdowns by the number of English learners that are being served in those particular LIEP types.

Sarah Newman: Then in the CSPR tool, in that manual entry section, we're asking for the language of instruction. In the prior year, we recognized our instructions weren't very clear, and we were asking for a check. That isn't actually what we're needing. We've tried to clarify that what we actually are asking for here is a list of languages, the actual language that was used for that instruction in that LIEP type. Next slide, please.

Sarah Newman: Here, you can just see an example. Hopefully, this is one area where we can cut down on the comments that we had to send out. This isn't necessarily a, we don't want check marks, we don't want the counts. We have those counts already from 116. Instead, we really want to see those languages. We are looking for that consistency across the two. If you report that you use transitional bilingual in 116, and you don't give us anything in there, you will receive a comment. Also, important to make sure that there is the alignment between the two. Next, slide.

Sarah Newman: All right, we have received quite a few questions related to 210 and 211. This has been causing a lot of internal discussion on our part to make sure that we are creating the data file, this collection the right way. Wanted to provide some clarity, particularly because this is the first year in which we are collecting these particular data files related to Title III English learners, not proficient within five years, and those English learners that are exiting.

Sarah Newman: This is the first year we're collecting them as these two separate data files. You may recall that these were previously submitted in File Spec 204, and there were a couple of different data groups in there collecting really just the numerator, and we're also needing a percentage. These files were revised to make sure that we could use that file to actually get both that number and that percentage that we needed aligned with the statute.

Sarah Newman: There's a little bit of information on this slide that we've been providing to states that have been asking around how do we actually calculate this File Spec 210 data? File Spec 210 is the not proficient within five years, that particular statutory reporting requirement. We are suggesting that, one way to calculate this data is to identify students who were in that English learner status, and in LIEPs and LEAs receiving Title III funds back in school year 2016/'17, five years ago.

Sarah Newman: Using that particular English learners as that cohort to then see who attained proficiency on the English language proficiency assessment, by the end of either that year '17/'18, '18/'19, '19/'20 or 2021. Then the number of students who had
not attained proficiency in any of those years would be the students reported as not attained proficiency in that File Spec 210.

Sarah Newman: Next slide, please. All right. Another common question we've gotten is what really is the difference between 210 and 211? One of the major differences between 210 and 211 is the time span. 210 collects data spanning from the current reporting year to the previous four school years, as we just went over in the previous slide.

Sarah Newman: It has that five year component. Whereas, File Spec 211, focusing on exiting, it's more of a current school year snapshot of time. Another difference between the two is how proficiency is measured. For 210, English language proficiency is measured by the annual ELP assessment. While for 211, ELP measures exit from an LIEP. File Spec 210 represents English learners who have, or have not attained proficiency on the annual ELP assessment within five years of identification as an English learner and first enrollment in the district. Then 211 is measuring that exit from EL status.

Sarah Newman: If an SEA has requirements for exit, in addition to the annual ELP assessment, File Spec 211 counts would include only those students who met SEA's exit requirements in the reporting year. Recognize this is probably a lot and can get complicated. Please feel free to keep adding in that Q&A, or reaching out to PSE with questions. Next slide, please. All right. Now, we are going to get into a little bit of data quality focused on McKinney-Vento, the homeless program. Next slide, please.

Sarah Newman: All right. Some information about changes for 2021. States received funding for sub grants to LEAs under the Homeless Provisions included in the American Rescue Plan Act, ARP. As we've already talked about, we added 1.6.3, 1.6.4 and 1.6.5 into the CSPR for the 2021 school year. States will be required to upload that list of LEAs that receive ARP-Homeless I and II in the amount of each award, as Kathryn had shown. The tool's going to take you to a link and that information will need to come to the OESE CSPR inbox.

Sarah Newman: We've received a couple of questions related to participating in a consortium. All districts participating in a consortium must be included. This is a public response that you will be able to see, related to the information collection clearance process, and with the consortium on the... The award amount will be assigned to the lead. Next slide, please.

Sarah Newman: All right. For the homeless program, some of the common data quality issues that they're seeing, there's still some kind of discrepancies between those categories, comparisons with education unit total. We've heard from the states about some of the difficulties with collecting or always having data on primary nighttime residents, for example. There are about 21 states where we were seeing some discrepancies in what states were reporting in 13 states for the particular category sets related to G and F that were not equaling where they were expected to.
Sarah Newman: Related to File Spec 118 and 195, I know that there was a question about chronic absenteeism in the CSPR. It doesn't actually populate any table in the current version of the CSPR, but that is a data file that is co-steward by our homeless office with the Office of Civil Rights. They do do comparisons looking at that homeless enrolled population there, and what is being reported as the homeless population that is chronically absent.

Sarah Newman: Quite a bit of mismatch between state submitting chronically [inaudible 00:45:16] students, but then not reporting any homeless enrolled students in 118. Some differences between the LEA to the SEA level. As you may recall from the file specification, it does ask for students to be reported in each Lea in which they enroll and then for an unduplicated count in SEA level. We do look to see, and don't actually expect the two to align. But for about 18 states, we are still seeing that and seeing some issues with being able to report duplicated versus unduplicated counts.

Sarah Newman: Then lastly, some kind of mismatches between File Spec 170, which is reporting on the sub grant status of each LEA and File Spec 118, the homeless enrolled file, where we are seeing 17 states submitted data that indicated sub grantees with membership, but did not enroll any homeless students.

Sarah Newman: Next slide, please. All right. Now onto our migrant education program. Go to the next slide. This is just a visual representation of the data files that are collected for that migrant education program. Another note that you'll see that File Spec 32, that is an NCES stewarded data collection, that is still February, that data will not be in any data extracts provided. It will not be in any first versions of the CSPR. That will not penalize any of the states. That is a due date difference on our end. Once we have those data in February, those would be pulled into the extracts and the report on that second timeline. Next slide, please.

Sarah Newman: Okay. This chart is looking at some of the results for 1.7.3.1. It's the methods used to count children. That particular question in which there were quite a few states for the migrant program, where they were seeing incomplete responses for the narrative that was provided from states on how to calculate, or the methods used to count children. Not all of the components were there.

Sarah Newman: You'll see that about 15 states at that first due date did not meet what was expected. Then that did get down to five by that second submission, but one of the more common issues that they are seeing in their CSPR section. Next slide, please.

Sarah Newman: In here, you can see another visual representation of what's being flagged. Here, you see that the large majority was that one particular question, that rule 11 there, where 15 did flag and most of their other rules were quite a bit less than that. Next slide, please.
Okay. Next steps. Hopefully, you're all still with me. I will wrap up in the next two minutes, so we can at least take the last five for questions. We said the window is set to open on Thursday, in which you will receive an email with the link to the Illume tool, and then that due date for CSPR Part I, assuming we get that approval from OMB is the 16th of December. That's two weeks after the tool opens.

For submission questions, particularly with EDFacts, please continue to reach out to the EDFacts Partner Support Center. Then with those tool questions, please reach out to the OESE CSPR inbox. Next slide, please. Resource, we talked a little bit about this, but as I said, we will be sure to work on clarifying all of the questions that have been coming up about the connection to CSPR and EDFacts. Hopefully, tomorrow you will be able to see both those versions of CSPR Part I and II documents, those official versions that only include what's actually being collected through the tool and then versions that include all of the EDFacts data, as well as those CSPR EDFacts Crosswalk documents for Part I and Part II.

You can see exactly what's being pulled in, including the specific category sets or sub totals or education unit totals. There will be a CSPR user guide. Then like last year, if you do want to see the EDFacts data that you've submitted to make sure that you're not seeing any issues on your end, you can reach out, as you did last year to the partner support center. They let us know that you would like to see an EDFacts extract run for your data, and we will go ahead and provide that.

Please remember the load process, the data do take for SEA level, overnight before, we can actually get those data. Then the LEA in the school are loaded over the weekend. We may not always be able to get that most recent submission if it's before those dates, before the time when it loads. Then post-submission, you can expect to receive the CSPR reports as well as, of course, your favorite, the DQ feedback in the form of spreadsheets. That you'll keep getting from us.

Next slide. All right. I know that was a lot that we had to share this time around. Hopefully, it was helpful. Please keep using that Q&A box. I will be taking a look at the questions that were coming in, at this point, to see what we may be able to answer. It looks like we've answered quite a few questions already.

There is a question related to can manual sections of CSPR be certified if some EDFacts files are delayed? Yes, you can certify the CSPR as long as the CSPR is complete. You can go ahead and complete that certification of what is complete as of that December 16th due date. If you are delayed on submitting EDFacts files, but do expect them to come in by their due date on December 15th, wait on certifying, just certify what you have by those required due dates.

We will type out that answer. It looks like there are quite a bit of questions, so, can also pull together a Q&A to post as a resource as well. How do you handle students move to another LEA for 210? Is another question related to that data file. That is probably best asked through a partner support center question. I
know we have some of the program office folks on the line. If they're able to give a quick answer. I don't want to misspeak and lead anybody astray. We'd be happy to answer that question after this webinar.

Sarah Newman: Then the other question also on 210, if we calculate from those who enrolled in '16/'17, does it matter how long they were in EL prior to that year? That is another great question for the program office. If we're not able to get that answer now, we will always recommend reaching out to PSE, those do come back to us. But we will take a look at getting those answered. We know there have been a lot of questions on File Spec 210, and 211. They're fairly complicated reporting requirements for us as well.

Sarah Newman: I'm not seeing anything else in the Q&A box. We're about a minute. I can try to answer another question or two, if they come up. I also do see some questions that are coming up in the chat as well, that I don't think everybody can see, they're just going to the panelists. But we'll be sure to look at those as well. Again, it may make the most sense to just pull together a Q&A that we make available as a resource. I think the last question we received was related to ARP, so I imagine the request came in for that list of questions. We are doing our best to get resources out as quickly as possible.

Sarah Newman: Again, I do apologize for the situation we are in with the information collection. As soon as we receive that approval, the resources will be there. Please, as always, get your questions in. You're welcome to email the OESE CSPR inbox as well. I know I haven't always been the quickest to respond, but we are doing our best to get through those as quickly as possible.

Sarah Newman: Thank you so much for today. I hope this information was helpful. I see one question about the PowerPoint. We will post the PowerPoint. This will be made available along with that list of resources. So, you'll be able to see this and reference this information as well. But really appreciate your time and attention today. Apologize for any delays in getting information over to you all. We are a work in progress, but always do appreciate your all's support and collaboration and feedback.

Sarah Newman: Thank you so much for being here and look forward to a busy few months ahead of us all. Thank you.