

Deirdre Magnan:

[slide 2] Thank you, Leticia. So, today we are recording the meeting. My name's Deirdre Magnan and I am with AIR, I'll be assisting with technology. Just a note on recording, the American Institutes for Research (AIR) allows for the recording of audio, visuals, participants, and other information sent, verbalized, or utilized during business related meetings. By joining a meeting, you automatically consent to such recordings. Any participant who prefers to participate via audio only should disable their video camera so only their audio will be captured. Video and/or audio recordings of any AIR session shall not be transmitted to an external third party without the permission of AIR.

Deirdre Magnan:

[slide 3] So to cover a little bit of housekeeping here, there is a Zoom control panel at the bottom of your screen. You may need to hover your mouse there to see it. We have the chat enabled. If you need to submit any technical issues, you can do so there. I'll be happy to help you. And you can also contact us in the Q&A window, which you can access there as well by clicking on that icon. You can also use the reactions icons to let us know how we're doing, or just let us know what you're thinking. So you can use the reactions button at the bottom there too. This is also where, if you need to leave the webinar at any point, you'll see the button in red over to the right hand side, and apologies, I skipped on the left hand side, the audio settings. If you're having trouble hearing or need to adjust the audio settings, please click there on the little up arrow or caret mark, and you'll see some additional settings there to adjust things.

Deirdre Magnan:

[slide 4] So to dig in a little bit deeper with the chat and Q&A functions, you can use that Q&A button to submit questions directly to our presenters to ED, to ask anything that you need to ask about the content. And then the chat function, this is where you can provide any follow up. You can share your state's context for the implementation or challenges with reporting. And again, you can also ask technical questions here in the chat. Please make sure that you do change the "to" field there in the chat as to who it's going to. You can choose from hosts and panelists, or rather all panelists, and then everyone; that includes attendees as well, if you want everyone to see your message in the chat. So make sure to take a look there before hitting enter or send on your message.

Deirdre Magnan:

[slide 5] We do have transcription enabled today. This is computer-generated transcription, and you can access this by clicking the CC live transcript button at the bottom of the screen. You should also see this in the control panel after hovering your mouse down there. If you have any issues with this or need assistance, again, please feel free to put your question in the chat. I can also put my email in the chat there if you have any issues staying connected to the meeting and want to jot that down to reach out at any point. Okay. And I think we're ready to get started. So I'm going to hand things back over to Leticia.

Leticia Braga:

[slide 6] Thank you so much, Deirdre, for all your help and for the AIR team for helping put this together today. So welcome again, everyone. I'm so happy to see everyone taking advantage of the chat there, giving you that opportunity to interact today. We do have a lot to get through on our agenda and there is frankly some quite weedy material today. So we plan to provide a copy of the slides and a transcript of the presentation after the webinar. So please don't feel like you need to capture notes on everything we discuss today. I think that's going to be quite challenging. We want to use this time to cover some fundamental information about specific files and offer you the opportunity to ask questions through the

Q&A, or elaborate on implementation and challenges with your colleagues through the chat function. But this won't be the last opportunity for us to talk about these file specifications (file specs or FS), so please don't worry, again, if you're not able to capture everything right away in our conversation today.

Leticia Braga:

[slide 7] We went through these in the last webinar, but for the good of the group, I'll cycle through these quickly today. We have an Introduction to our Title III Team.

[slide 8] And here we have some key program staff listed. We have Deborah Spitz, who is our group leader over TLSP, which is where the Title III Program is housed. That's Teachers, Leaders and Special Populations. Myself, I'm the Title III Team Lead, Leticia Braga. And then we have a great group of staff that works with our program: Fariba Hamedani, who you'll be hearing today going through a lot of our file specs, Sophie Hart, and Scott Richardson. And then we have our honorary team member who is not technically part of the Title III Program, but who we rely on greatly and that is Sarah Newman, who is the group leader for the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) Data Team. And so, in the same way that we want to use these webinars to encourage collaboration across our program and data teams, that's the same thing that we are doing internally here at ED.

Leticia Braga:

[slide 9] Overview of the Title III Data Quality (DQ) Effort, we can go forward.

[slide 10] Again, this was covered previously, but for those who may not have been able to attend, we have some goals for this effort, including providing technical assistance (TA) and support for state educational agency (SEA) Title III and *EDFacts* coordinators to improve the quality of Title III-related data that states submit, encouraging collaboration between the two groups, and determining priorities for future state TA work.

[slide 11] In terms of planned activities, we are developing a guidance document on Title III data that includes a lot of the information we'll be going over today, establishing quarterly meetings of which this one is a part, and also starting a Community of Practice for SEA Title III coordinators and *EDFacts* coordinators around specific topics of interest, which I'll mention a little bit later, and developing training for new SEA Title III and *EDFacts* coordinators. I just want to mention that the first quarterly webinar's transcript and the slides are available on our site, and there is a link to that at the end of our presentation.

Leticia Braga:

[slide 12] So today we're going to focus on *EDFacts* file specifications, clarifications, and common data errors for some of our files.

[slide 13] I know it's a little bit small, but we have an overview of the file specifications pertaining to English Learners (ELs) that the Title III team generally reviews as part of our data quality work in conjunction with the OESE Data Team. And so out of these files, FS141, the number of English Learners, received the largest numbers of DQ comments by itself, certainly in this past cycle, and also when reviewed against other file specs. Aside from FS141, FS045 and FS116 received the most DQ comments by themselves. And if we take across-file comparisons into account, FS137 and FS138 are also flagged frequently in the data quality review.

Leticia Braga:

[slide 14] So based on this, in today's session, we will be covering the four file specs noted here. And as noted on the previous slide, the first three were selected because of the high number of data quality comments they generate, whereas FS067 was included to highlight some points of clarification that we will be addressing in the upcoming Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) clearance. In terms of additional file specifications that elicit common questions or data errors, some of the assessment files and some of the files that consider longitudinal data we think are better suited for discussion among states during a future Community of Practice session, so we'll plan to tackle those through that format.

You can see here that each file specification we'll be discussing covers a different population of interest. It's listed there, I won't read through all of them. Though please note that for FS045, the Immigrant file, the overall reporting is for all immigrant students, though as we'll cover later, for Category C states should only report students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) under Title III Section 3114(b)(1), using funds reserved for the immigrant education program and activities.

Leticia Braga:

And as we go through today's presentation for each file spec, you're going to see a common format. You'll first see an overview of the reporting requirements, followed by common questions and finally, a list of common data issues, if applicable. We will pause for questions at the end of each file spec, but please submit your questions through the Q&A function as your questions come to mind. And if we don't have time or are unable to address certain questions today, please know that we are taking all of your questions and feedback into consideration as we plan for additional guidance and future webinars. So now I'll turn the presentation over to Fariba to lead us through the details of each file spec. Thanks.

Fariba Hamedani:

Thanks, Leticia. And thank you to all of our participants joining us for this webinar. Let's move to the next slide, please.

[slide 15] So here, we'll start looking more closely at FS141. And as I'm presenting, as Leticia mentioned, if you do have any questions that come to mind about this file spec, please type them into the Q&A tool of the Zoom meeting. And after I go through the next few slides, we'll spend a few minutes going over some of the questions that have come in. File spec FS141 collects the unduplicated count of all ELs enrolled in elementary and secondary schools on October 1 or the closest school day to October 1. So it's a one-day snapshot of all ELs enrolled, which means that it includes ELs regardless of whether or not their parents opted them out of Language Instruction Educational Program (LIEP) services. And the file spec collects the EL enrollment counts disaggregated by grade level, by native language, and by race and ethnicity. And it also collects a count of ELs with disabilities as defined by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

Fariba Hamedani:

Now, we've gotten some questions about which students actually fall under the definition of an EL, so on the next slide, we'll take a look at the ESEA definition of an EL.

[slide 16] And so this definition is from ESEA section 8101(20), with the addition of some additional clarification provided in parentheses. And some things to note in this definition of ELs are, first of all, the criteria in subsections (A), (B), (C), and (D) must be met for students to meet the ESEA definition of an EL. In other words, based on the criteria in subsection (A), the student must be aged 3 through 21. And based on the subsection (B) criteria, the student must be enrolled or preparing to enroll in an

elementary or secondary school. And one of the conditions in subsection (C) must be met. So looking more closely at subsection (C), which is broken down into romanettes (i), (ii), and (iii), please note the "or" between romanette (ii) and (iii). This means that the criteria in just one of the romanettes in subsection (C) must be met for the student to meet the criteria for subsection (C).

So looking at romanette (i) of subsection (C) again, note the "Or" in this sentence. So if a student is either someone who is not born in the U.S., or is someone whose native language is not English, then that satisfies the criteria in subsection (C). And looking at the criteria in romanette (ii), if a student is a Native American or Alaska Native, or a native resident of an outlying area, and the student comes from an environment where a language other than English has had a significant influence and impact on the student's level of English language proficiency, then that would satisfy the criteria in subsection (C). Or looking at the criteria in romanette (iii) under subsection (C), if a student is migratory and their native language is not English, and they come from an environment where a language other than English is dominant, then that would satisfy the criteria in subsection (C).

Now, looking at subsection (D), the student's difficulties in speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language must be such that they deny the student either the ability to meet the challenging state academic standards, or the ability to successfully achieve in classrooms where English is the language of instruction, or the opportunity to participate fully in society. So for subsection (D), because of the use of the "or", at least one of these conditions must exist, but not all of them. And please also note that the concept of "understanding" the English language is interpreted synonymously with the domain of listening. So for those of you who are new to your positions as Title III coordinators, we do recognize that this can take some time to get familiar with all of the nuances of this definition of ELs.

Fariba Hamedani:

[slide 17] Now, let's move to slide 17 and go over the definition of native language. ESEA section 3201(10) defines "native language" to be the language normally used by the individual, or in the case of a child or youth, the language normally used by the parents of the child or youth. So please note that you do need to consider the language normally used by the parents as well.

Fariba Hamedani:

[slide 16] And now we're going to go over some questions we've received on FS141, and for the first couple of questions, it'll be helpful for you to have the definition of ELs in front of you. So let's go back to slide 16 as we discuss a couple of questions.

One common question is, can an EL's native language be English? And the answer to this is that based on the ESEA definition of an EL, we don't anticipate an EL's native language to be English as a general occurrence. However, there may be occasional circumstances where the criteria in subsection (C) would allow for a student to be identified as an EL, even though their native language is English, as long as the student also meets the criteria in the other subsections, including subsection (D). In other words, the student's difficulties in speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language must deny the student the ability to participate effectively in school or in society.

Another common question is whether an EL can be born in the U.S. As we can see on this slide 16 definition, according to the criteria of subsection (C), a student can potentially be an EL even if the child was born in the U.S. For example, looking at subsection (C) romanette (i) again, even if a student was born in the U.S. but their native language is not English, then they could still be an EL.

Fariba Hamedani:

As a specific example of this scenario, a student enrolling in kindergarten in Texas may come from a home where the parents normally use Spanish.

As another example, based on subsection (C) romanette (ii), the student may be Native American and come from an environment where a language other than English has had a significant impact on the student's level of English language proficiency.

So these are example scenarios where a student can be born in the U.S. and still be an EL. However, please do remember that the criteria in subsection (D) must also apply in that the student's difficulties in speaking, reading, writing or understanding the English language must be denying the student the ability to participate effectively in school or society, as stated in subsection (D).

Fariba Hamedani:

[slide 18] Now let's move forward two slides to slide 18. And here we'd like you to volunteer a response to a poll question related to what we just discussed. Are you aware of circumstances where English has been reported as an EL's native language? And if so, please describe.

We'll keep this poll open for you for about 20 seconds. So please volunteer your responses if you wish to do so and we'll stay put for about 20 seconds until we get your responses.

Fariba Hamedani:

So let's go ahead and close the poll out now and look at the results, and for those of you who didn't get a chance to complete your results, please feel free to continue responding in the chat.

And Deirdre, are you able to present the results from the poll very briefly?

It seems like we may be having some technical difficulties showing the results from the poll. So in the interest of time, because we do have a lot to get through, we can keep going. Deirdre, did you want to mention anything?

Deirdre Magnan:

Yes. Hi. So I am sharing but unfortunately it's just showing the percentage that've answered. Let me try one other option here to view details.

Fariba Hamedani:

That's okay, Deirdre.

Deirdre Magnan:

Okay.

Fariba Hamedani:

Yeah, don't worry about it. Thank you so much. Yeah. In the interest of time, because we do have a lot to get through, as Leticia mentioned, let's just keep going and we definitely can share anything we find in the results with our participants and future webinar sessions that we have or in the Community of Practice.

Deirdre Magnan:

Great. I'll send these to you in the chat as well, Fariba.

Fariba Hamedani:

Thank you so much.

Fariba Hamedani:

[slide 19] So let's move on to slide 19 and look at other questions that we've gotten on FS141. We've already discussed the first two questions on this slide. The other common questions we've gotten are about languages missing from the ISO 639-2 list of language codes.

So first, we're happy to share with all of you that the three languages listed on this slide will be added to ED*Facts* for reporting school year 2021-22 data. The languages being added are: the Afghan language Dari; K'iche', Quiché; and Kabuverdianu. Many thanks to those of you who did submit requests for these languages to be added to ED*Facts*.

And with regard to other languages missing from the ISO 639-2 list, if a language is not in the list, then it should be reported to the extent possible under its language family, with a comment added in the explanation field indicating the specific language that the student speaks.

And in the very rare cases where a language does not map to any of the codes in ISO 639-2, students speaking these languages should be left out of accounts for the category set related to native language, but you still need to include those students in the education unit total for FS141.

We also encourage you to notify us of any additional languages that are missing.

Fariba Hamedani:

[slide 20] Now we'll move to slide 20 and cover some of the common data issues associated with FS141. As a reminder, please continue to type any questions you have about FS141 into the Q&A tool of this meeting.

So as Leticia mentioned, FS141 has raised the largest number of data quality flags by itself and also when its data are compared against other file specs.

The most common issues are listed on this slide and among them are data issues related to the native language reported. For example, we sometimes see languages that are no longer used around the world, like Latin, and we also see some improbable languages reported, like Esperanto, included in the data.

We also do not expect English to be one of the top 10 native languages reported. As I mentioned earlier, there may be occasional circumstances where an EL's native language is English, but we still don't expect English to be among the top 10 native languages. And as a reminder, for any student whose native language is undetermined, please use the language code UND, which represents undetermined.

Fariba Hamedani:

Another common data issue is tied to longitudinal checks where we see the student count for a specific language reported at the SEA level changed by more than 20% compared to the previous reporting year. And at the LEA level, it's common to see a data flag raised because the total count of ELs enrolled in an LEA changed by more than 50% compared to the previous reporting year.

We also see data flags raised when adding up the student counts for the different categories which don't equal the education unit total at the SEA level or the LEA or school level.

Finally, other common data issues are tied to comparing FS141 data with other file specs and we'll cover one of those on a future slide, and then also we'll cover them on future calls, as well.

Fariba Hamedani:

[slide 21] Now, let's move to slide 21 and we'll take a look at the Q&A tool questions you've been submitting for FS141. In the interest of time, we will keep this Q&A discussion to about three minutes.

So I'll turn it over to Leticia to look at what questions we've gotten in so far.

Leticia Braga:

Great. Thank you, Fariba. So we did have a few questions through the Q&A and I did see maybe a couple in the chat but I will start with the Q&A.

Leticia Braga:

So we had a question about the definition and how it overlaps with exchange students and those programs. That's a good question. That's a question that we receive quite a bit and I think that in summary, screening is under the purview of the civil rights requirements and a little bit outside of Title III, other than the standardized entrance criteria that are required. We actually discussed this during a conversation yesterday, but nothing precludes states from having criteria specifically outlining how they will work with foreign exchange students in terms of their standardized entrance criteria. Different states have different requirements in terms of the expectations around levels of English language proficiency for those students.

So, that's a bit outside the Title III purview. However, if a student is found to have needs and is screened and identified as an English Learner, then we would say that they would be treated just as any other student for the purpose of services. They could potentially qualify under the definition of immigrant. If they are identified, then they would be an EL student just as any other EL student.

So, that is generally the feedback on foreign exchange students.

Leticia Braga:

I lost the Q&A box. So let me try to bring that back up. There was a note about mapping the recommended home language survey questions to the definition of EL. I think that's a good idea. The Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA) manages the toolkit, so we will pass along that information and that suggestion to them.

Leticia Braga:

There was a question about Jamaican Patois being considered a language other than English and I think there was also a question in the chat about Hawaiian Pidgin, I think. Essentially, if you recall, going back to the definition of an English Learner, if the language is a language other than English and you can look to the ISO codes to look at how those languages might be coded and the student would meet the rest of the definition of English Learner, then that student should qualify as an English Learner under the definition, with the caveat of however your standardized entrance procedures are being run. In terms of the definition, those students would qualify if they met the different components of the definition. Those could be considered languages other than English, looking again at the ISO codes and how those are coded.

Leticia Braga:

There's a comment, I think, a response to something we said, I'm not quite sure if it's a question so I don't know if you want to clarify but I will leave that one for now.

Leticia Braga:

And then yes, thank you for clarifying [in posted comment] that in Puerto Rico, English is the dominant language because it is Spanish language proficiency there. So, that is a case where, of course, we would expect to see English as a dominant language. I think Fariba was speaking as a general manner. In most states we would not expect to generally see English as one of the top languages reported and we do see that in the reporting. So again, that's one thing that we wanted to go through and make sure that we clarified.

Fariba Hamedani:

Thank you so much, Leticia. So let's stop at this point with the Q&A for FS141 and move on to the next slide where we'll talk about—

Leticia Braga:

I'll just—

Fariba Hamedani:

Go ahead, Leticia.

Leticia Braga:

Sorry, Fariba. I just want to note quickly. There was a question about the slides and for anyone who joined a little later, the slides and the transcript will be provided after the webinar. So please don't feel you have to jot all of this down at this time. So turning it back over to you, Fariba. Thank you.

Fariba Hamedani:

[slide 22] Thank you, Leticia. So now let's go on and look at FS116 and this file spec controls enrollment information on Title III ELs served and it actually collects data for two different data groups, which are data group (DG) 648 and DG849.

Fariba Hamedani:

So, first let's look at DG648, which collects the unduplicated count of Title III ELs enrolled on October 1 or the closest school day, and the data group asks for the count disaggregated by grade level.

So, FS116 DG 648 is similar to what FS141 collects, with the difference that while FS141 collects the October 1 count of all ELs enrolled, FS116 DG648 collects the October 1 count of only those ELs enrolled in LIEPs in LEAs receiving Title III funds.

This means that if any parents have opted their child out of LIEP services, that EL would not be included in the DG648 count.

Another difference between FS116 DG648 and FS141 is that FS141 collects this student count disaggregated by other categories besides just grade level.

One thing I want to pause to point out here are the changes we're proposing to FS116 DG648 for the ED*Facts* Office of Management & Budget (OMB) submission package that will impact data collection starting in reporting school year 2022-23. We are proposing changing the reporting period for DG648 to be the full school year, rather than the October 1 snapshot, to match the reporting period for other Title III data groups. And we're also proposing collecting the student count disaggregated by race and ethnicity as well.

And the final 30-day public comment period has closed for that ED*Facts* OMB submission package. So please stay tuned for more information about that, but for the purposes of this webinar, we're sticking to how you'll need to report data for DG648 for reporting school year 2021-22 ED*Facts* data. Before I go on, just a reminder that if you have questions about what I've mentioned so far for FS116, please type them into the Q&A tool, again.

Fariba Hamedani:

Now let's look at the other data group included in FS116, which is DG849. DG849 collects the count of ELs served by each type of LIEP and further disaggregates the data by grade level. And the data group collects the counts for throughout the entire school year.

Fariba Hamedani:

So if we look at the difference between the two data groups, DG648 looks at Title III ELs from the lens of the entire SEA and each LEA and collects an unduplicated count of those Title III ELs enrolled on October 1. On the other hand, DG849 looks at Title III ELs from the lens of each LIEP type and collects counts for the entire school year. So for the SEA level reporting, DG849 looks at each LIEP type offered across the SEA and collects the count of ELs served by each of those LIEP types throughout the school year. And for the LEA level reporting, DG849 looks at each type of LIEP offered at the LEA and collects the count of ELs served by each of those LIEP types throughout the school year.

So, because DG849 collects the count of students in each LIEP type throughout the entire school year, chances are that the counts reported for DG849 will be much larger than for DG648, which collects an unduplicated count on just one day of school, which is October 1.

Fariba Hamedani:

[slide 23] Now let's move to Slide 23 and go over some common questions which we've received for FS116. One common question is how to report the number of students served in multiple LIEPs for DG648. And as I mentioned on the previous slide, DG648 collects an unduplicated count of Title III ELs enrolled on October 1, so for this data group it is not relevant if a student was served in multiple LIEPs, because the data group just looks at students from the lens of the entire SEA, or the entire LEA, and counts each student just once at each of those levels.

Fariba Hamedani:

Another common question is how to report the number of students served in multiple LIEPs for DG849. And again, as I mentioned on the previous slide, DG849 collects EL counts through the entire school year and collects the counts from the lens of each LIEP type. So looking at examples on how to report at both the SEA and LEA level data. First, for reporting SEA level data and looking through the lens of all the different LIEP types offered across the SEA... if, for example, the student moves in the middle of the school year from one LEA within the state to another LEA within the state, but in both LEAs the student still received services in a transitional bilingual LIEP type, then for the SEA level data reporting, the student would only be counted once, included in the transitional bilingual LIEP type at the SEA level.

As another example of reporting for SEA level data and looking through the lens of the different LIEP types across the SEA, if another student moves in the middle of the school year from one LEA within the state to another LEA within the state, but in the first LEA the student was in a newcomer LIEP, and in the second LEA the student was in a transitional bilingual LIEP, then for this SEA level data reporting, the student would be counted once under the newcomer LIEP type and also counted again under the transitional bilingual LIEP type for the SEA level data. And the same logic would apply for reporting the

LEA level data as well, except that for the LEA level data, you are looking just through the lens of the different LIEP types provided within that particular LEA.

Fariba Hamedani:

Another question we've received is whether the counts in DG648 should align with the counts in DG849. And the answer is no. As we've discussed already, the DG648 collects an October 1 snapshot and expects an unduplicated count of ELs, while DG849 collects EL counts throughout the school year. And so as ELs transfer into the state, or into each different district through the school year, this will cause the counts reported for DG849 to be higher than for DG648, and duplicate counts are to be expected for DG849.

Fariba Hamedani:

Another question we get is whether ELs whose parents have declined LIEP services for their child should be included in the counts for FS116. And the answer here is also no. As Leticia discussed previously, FS116 only collects counts of ELs that are in LIEPs in LEAs receiving Title III funds. So if a parent has opted their child out of LIEP services, then that EL should not be included in the counts for FS116.

Fariba Hamedani:

[slide 24] Now we'll move to Slide 24 and look at a few more questions about FS116, and these are questions that we received from you via the Menti survey during the first Title III Data Quality webinar back in March. One question you submitted was how to report services in FS116 for ELs in rural and low incidence schools. And the answer is that, as you know, schools have civil rights obligations to provide support for ELs. So assuming ELs are receiving some support, the LEA needs to consider whether the LIEPs are appropriately classified as content classes with integrated ESL support, or another type of LIEP. And if the LIEP type offered in the rural or low incidence schools doesn't fit in any of the specified categories in FS116, then they should be reported under the category "other", with an explanation of what those LIEP types are.

Fariba Hamedani:

Another question you submitted was whether there are reporting differences between state-funded LIEPs versus federally-funded LIEPs, and for the purposes of reporting data for FS116, if an EL is in an LIEP in an LEA that receives Title III funds, then that EL should be included in the data for FS116. Any LEAs that don't receive Title III funds would not report data for FS116.

Fariba Hamedani:

Finally, another question you submitted during the last webinar was whether there are common definitions of the LIEP types. We don't actually have specific definitions for the LIEP types and the ESEA does not provide common definitions for them. However, we provided links to some common definitions on this slide. For example, the first link is to the Department's Office of Civil Rights' glossary that includes common definitions for those LIEP types.

Fariba Hamedani:

[slide 25] Now, let's turn to Slide 25 and look at some of the common data issues we've found in your data reporting for FS116. Some of the most data issues were triggered when FS116's data was compared with other file spec data. So as a specific example, we have one business rule that compares the count

of all ELs enrolled on October 1, which is collected in FS141, with the count of Title III ELs enrolled on October 1, which is collected in FS116.

And this data check raises a flag if the count of Title III ELs enrolled on October 1 is greater than the count of all ELs enrolled on October 1. And this data clearly would be flawed since the count of Title III ELs enrolled is a subset of all ELs enrolled and should therefore be a smaller number.

Fariba Hamedani:

And an example of a data flag that's raised related to the issue of completeness is when the number of LEAs reporting data for FS116 has changed by 20% or more compared to the prior reporting year. If you do receive this type of data flag, please double check the data. And if there was indeed some discrepancy in the data, please correct it, and resubmit the data. But if you confirm that the data was accurate as you reported it, please add a data note explaining why the data was accurate.

Fariba Hamedani:

[slide 26] Now in the interest of time, let's move to slide 26 and take just a few minutes to go over some questions you've submitted in the Q&A.

Leticia Braga:

Thank you, Fariba, and I think we'll be pretty quick here. I think we've just got a few questions. One about whether a student can have more than one LIEP type. I think you addressed that, but essentially we think it would not necessarily be a common occurrence, but we do see multiple LIEPs, especially if a student is going from school to school within a reporting period, or from LEA to LEA. So that's something to keep in mind, but it probably wouldn't be the common reporting that we would see. It would be more the exception, though it depends on student mobility and other factors.

Leticia Braga:

And then there was a comment about the difficulty in preparing complete and accurate data when the counts vary among data groups in the same file. We agree. And that is the reason why we propose the change in ED*Facts*. So thank you for reinforcing the fact that hopefully that should make consistency across those data groups easier. I don't see any additional questions on this, Fariba, so I think we can keep going.

Fariba Hamedani:

[slide 27] Thank you so much, Leticia. So let's move on to Slide 27 and start looking at FS045. File spec FS045 collects the unduplicated count of immigrant children and youth that are enrolled in public elementary and secondary schools. The file spec collects this data disaggregated by whether or not each child is an EL and also disaggregated by native language. The file spec also collects the count of immigrant students who participated in immigrant programs funded specifically by ESEA Section 3114(d)(1) during the reporting school year.

Fariba Hamedani:

[slide 28] And now let's move to Slide 28 and review the relevant definitions from the ESEA. ESEA Section 3201(5) defines "immigrant children and youth" as individuals who are three years old through 21 years old and were not born in any state and have not been attending one or more schools in any one or more states for more than three full academic years.

So please note that all three criteria (A), (B), and (C) must be met for a student to meet the definition of an immigrant child or youth. And the term “state” in the context of this definition includes the 50 states as well as DC and Puerto Rico. So with regards to the criteria in subsection (C), that immigrant students have not been attending schools in any state for more than three full academic years, please note that the months of attendance used to calculate those three full academic years don't need to be consecutive months and can be summed across multiple school years.

So, for example, let's say a student attended a U.S. school for one full year, then moved back to their home country for a year, then came back to the U.S. and has been attending a U.S. school for another two full school years... so in total, that student has now been attending U.S. schools for three full academic years and has met that three year threshold where the child will no longer be considered an immigrant student.

Fariba Hamedani:

Now with the key definitions on this slide in mind, and in front of us, we'll discuss a couple of common questions we've gotten about FS045.

The first is, can a child born outside the U.S. to parents who are U.S. citizens be considered an immigrant student? And the answer to this question is that if that child is aged three through 21 and has not been attending school in the U.S. for more than three full academic years, then yes, that child would be considered an immigrant student. Looking at the definition of immigrant students on this slide, you'll see that there's nothing in the definition about the citizenship status of the child's parents. So as long as the child was not born in one of the 50 states or DC or Puerto Rico, then they would satisfy the criteria in section (B). And as long as they also satisfy the criteria in subsections (A) and (C) as well, then they would be defined as an immigrant student.

Fariba Hamedani:

Other common questions we get are whether all immigrant students are ELs and vice versa, whether all ELs are immigrant students. And while some immigrant students are also ELs and some ELs are also immigrant students, it is not correct to say that all immigrant students are ELs. So let's take a look at a few specific examples.

For example, let's say a child is 12 years old, so they meet that first sub-criteria (A) in the immigrant definition, and the child was born in England and English is her native language, so she meets the sub-criteria (B) in the immigrant student definition. And the child moved with her family to DC last year. So the child meets the subsection (C) criteria in the immigrant student definition. Therefore, the child is an immigrant student. However, she is not an EL because English is her native language, and she did not need to be screened for EL status when she first enrolled in DC schools. Her parents were also English native speakers, so there was nothing in her home language survey that would indicate that she would need to be assessed for EL status.

Now, let's look at a scenario where a student is an EL but not an immigrant student. Let's say a child was born in another country and their native language isn't English, and the child was screened and identified as an EL when she first enrolled in a school in Texas. But at this point in time now, the child has been attending school in Texas for four full academic years, which exceeds the three year threshold for an immigrant student. So this child can no longer at this point be considered an immigrant student, but the child hasn't yet met the EL exit criteria for Texas, so she remains an EL. So that's a scenario where a child is an EL but no longer an immigrant student.

Fariba Hamedani:

[slide 29] Now, let's go to slide 29 and go over another common question we've received about FS045. We've already discussed the first two questions on this slide. The last question on this slide is, "Which students should be reported as participating in immigrant programs?", which is category set C in FS045. So, the counts for students participating in immigrant programs in this file should only include immigrant students who are in LEAs receiving funds specifically under ESEA Section 3114(d)(1), which are reserved for immigrant programs and activities.

So category set C must not include immigrant students who received services in Title III LIEPs, if their LEA did not also receive a sub grant under Section 3114(d) reserved for immigrant programs.

Fariba Hamedani:

[slide 30] Now, we'll move to slide 30 and look at some common data issues for FS045, and if you have questions about FS045, remember to type them into the Q&A. The most common data flags raised for FS045 are due to incomplete data at the LEA level where the data was not reported for a required category set. And please note that it's not required for every LEA to report counts for category set C since not every LEA receives funds under ESEA Section 3114(d)(1) for immigrant subgrants. However, please also note that each SEA is required to award at least one immigrant subgrant.

We've also seen data flags raised both at the SEA and LEA level when the data counts for all students across native language categories doesn't equal the education unit total at that level.

Fariba Hamedani:

[slide 31] Now, let's turn to slide 31 and take a look at the questions that have come in.

Leticia Braga:

All right, thank you, Fariba. I will go through some of the questions from the Q&A fairly quickly. There's a question about why only Puerto Rico is called out in the definition and not, for example, Virgin Islands. That's a good question. I think there's political, historical reasons. Puerto Rico is mostly treated as a state for the purpose of the formula grant program, whereas outlying areas receive funds in a different way. So there are historical reasons for the breakout, but I wouldn't be able to answer that very specifically, but that is an interesting question.

Leticia Braga:

In terms of a minimum amount to serve immigrant students, that is defined by the state. There must be at least one immigrant subgrant awarded or money set aside in the case of a unitary system. But we do not have a floor in terms of the amount of funding. There's only the ceiling in terms of the "up to".

Leticia Braga:

There was a question about immigrant students including students born on military bases. The answer to that is yes, if they meet the definition of immigrants. So if they were born on a military base in the U.S., born in a state, then they would not, but they could potentially meet the definition if they were born outside of the definition of state and met the other criteria.

Leticia Braga:

And then yeah, noting in Puerto Rico, the official language is Spanish.

So I think that is it for us. We will check the chat as well, but appreciate your questions and in the interests of time, let's keep going. Thanks, Fariba.

Fariba Hamedani:

Thanks so much, Leticia, and for all those attendees who submitted those questions.

[slide 32] So let's move on to slide 32 now and discuss FS067. So FS067 collects the unduplicated head count of teachers who taught ELs in any LIEP in an LEA that received Title III funds. You'll need to include all teachers who meet this description, regardless of whether or not their salaries were actually paid with Title III funds. The file spec needs this data disaggregated by the teacher's certification status.

Fariba Hamedani:

[slide 33] Now, let's go to slide 33 and go over some common questions we've received. One question we've gotten is, "What is a fully certified or licensed teacher?" And a fully certified or licensed teacher is a teacher who meets the state qualification and licensing criteria for the grade levels and subject areas in which they're providing instruction.

So in the context of Title III data, we're looking for data on teachers with specific certification or licensure to work with ELs in LIEPs. However, we do recognize that the determination of certification status for each teacher is based on each state's own requirements for certification of teachers in LIEPs. Paraprofessionals must not be included in this reporting. The ESEA has a separate distinct definition for paraprofessionals and so we are specifically focused on only teachers here.

Fariba Hamedani:

Another question we've gotten is "How should this file be reported if the state does not require certification for teachers in LIEPs?" And again, we recognize the determination of certification status for teachers is based on each state's own requirements for certification of teachers in LIEPs. And there may be states that don't require specific certification or licensure for teachers of ELs and LIEPs.

Fariba Hamedani:

I do want to point out at this point that in the coming days, the Department will be posting the 60-day public comment period for the CSPR OMB package that will impact data collection starting with school year 2022-23 reporting. And within that OMB package, you'll see that we are proposing some edits to the language for this reporting requirement to clarify the expectation that in the context of Title III data, we are actually looking for data on teachers with specific EL certification or licensure to work with ELs in LIEPs.

And in the OMB package, you'll see a directed question specifically about the challenges of reporting data under FS067 and the CSPR for teachers and LIEPs. We'll welcome your feedback during that 60-day public comment period, since it will be invaluable to take your challenges into consideration, as we further refine our guidance.

We will definitely alert you when that CSPR OMB package gets released. It will kick off the 60-day public comment period. That covers the common questions we've received on FS067, and the good news is that the data reported for this file spec hasn't raised many data flags so there's no common data issues to go over.

Fariba Hamedani:

[slide 34] And in the interest of time, I don't think we'll have time to cover Q&A for FS067, but I'll turn it over to Leticia to wrap this meeting up.

Leticia Braga:

[slide 35] Thank you, Fariba, and I actually didn't see any questions come through, so that makes it easier. But again, we would really welcome your feedback on this file spec once the CSPR 60-day comment period is posted.

Leticia Braga:

[slide 36] So in terms of wrap up, we just wanted to update you and remind you that the materials from the first webinar are now available, posted to the Title III website. So, please, do review the slides and the transcript there. We'll be doing the same with this webinar. And the CSPR package we've already mentioned, the 60-day comment period should be opening soon and running through around early August. So, please, do take some time to review and provide your feedback there.

And for those of you that are our Title III contacts, I wanted to remind you that we have the Grantee Satisfaction Survey open. It is closing on June 15. I believe at last check, we were just below 60% response rate, and we really want to get as high as possible as close to 100% to make sure that your voices are heard. To hear if efforts such as these are helpful, or what else you might be looking for from the department. And so, please, if you haven't had an opportunity to answer, please do so by the deadline.

Leticia Braga:

[slide 37] With the Community of Practice, just noting that that's something that we are hoping to get started. That there are specific files such as the assessment files and some of the longitudinal data files that we thought would be better served through an opportunity where you would have more of a chance to interact with each other and provide some feedback to us on your challenges and practices in your state. So we hope to be able to address those through that format.

Let's see, in terms of questions. As always, if you have additional questions, please continue to send questions about the data quality effort or policy under Title III to the OESE.titleiii-a@ed.gov address. And then specific questions related to your state data, as always, to EDFacts@ed.gov. We do collaborate closely with the Data Team on that.

Leticia Braga:

[slide 38] So for the next quarterly webinar, we're anticipating it will be late summer, early fall. Look out for an email after the webinar that'll contain a quick survey with the weeks that you think might work best for you to attend the next webinar. We want to make sure that we get as much participation as possible. You can always review after, but the live participation we find is helpful because we get that chance to hear your questions and feedback as we go.

And then additional considerations regarding scheduling or a more blanket question about any feedback on this webinar that you would like to provide. So please, again, do provide your feedback when you see that come through.

Leticia Braga:

[slide 39] We'll leave you with a list of ED*Facts* and CSPR resources. This was also in the first webinar, but these are some links that you can go to, to get information about file specifications, due dates, BRSI rules and the CSPR resources. So, thank you, again for attending today. I'm just checking the chat quickly. Seeing some kudos and appreciate that. Appreciate everyone's participation. We're always open to feedback by email or through the link that will be provided to you after this. So, please, do take the time to respond.

Wishing you all a wonderful rest of your day and your week, and we look forward to speaking with you and continuing this effort soon. So, thank you, everyone.