

Deirdre Magnan:

[slide 4] Okay, we should be all set. So a little bit of information about Zoom in case you're not familiar, you can submit questions, and we're asking that you submit technical questions that you may have and need assistance with using the Q&A function. You can also use the chat, but that's located in the control bar at the bottom of the Zoom window. We can move on to the next slide.

[slide 5] So you can use that Q&A button also to submit questions directly to Department of Education (ED) presenters here today about information that's being covered in the webinar. The chat function, if you can, we'd like that to be designated more for follow-up to any questions that you may have asked, any side conversations to share your state's context for implementation, or challenges with reporting. So if you can ask your content questions in the Q&A, that would be great.

Any follow up that's necessary, we'd love to see that in the chat. Also, any technical questions can go in the chat and we will follow up with you. And there's an image there of how to do that. To submit in the chat you just click on chat in the bottom control bar, that should open up a window or panel on the side, and then you can choose who that message goes to: all panelists, panelists and hosts, attendees. So you can see what's there and then choose who you'd like to ask that question of. Okay, next slide.

[slide 6] We've also enabled transcription. So this is computer-generated captions that we have. If you're not seeing that on the screen, take a look again in that control bar at the bottom, you may see a button that says CC on it, for closed caption, and then live transcript under that. If you don't see that button, go ahead and click on the button that says more with three dots, and then you should see the option there for the transcript.

There's a couple different ways to view the transcript. You can try them all out, but there's some information here on the screen about how to do that. And again, we're happy to assist if you run into any issues, just let us know in the chat and we'll follow up with you on that. Okay, next slide.

Great. So that's it for our intro on Zoom. I'm going to hand things over to Leticia Braga with the Department to get started.

Leticia Braga:

[slide 7] All right, Deirdre, thank you so much for that introduction. And hi, everyone. I love seeing everyone joining here saying hi to each other. I think Andrew started us off with a "yay", so I'm happy when people are happy to be joining for a data and policy information webinar at the end of the day, or maybe for some of you it's not quite the end of the day yet, but it's getting close to for us. So we'll see how much we can cover and maybe let you free with a few extra minutes. We did extend the webinar today because we have a lot to cover, so welcome again. I am going to cover some material that we have covered before, but some of you may be joining us for the first time. So with that, we'll go to the next slide.

[slide 8] So we have some Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) key staff for Title III with us. We have Deborah Spitz, who is the group leader for our group, which is Teachers, Leaders, and Special Populations. Title III is within that group. Myself, Leticia Braga, I'm the Title III Team Lead. We also have Fariba Hamedani, who is a Title III program officer and will be presenting today. We also have Sophie Hart and Scott Richardson, who are Title III program officers. And we have an honorary member of our group, Sarah Newman, who is a group leader for the OESE Data Team, and we're so happy to have her with us today as well. Next slide.

[slide 9] So overview of the Title III Data Quality effort, we've gone through this before, but again, just quickly. Next slide.

[slide 10] As a reminder, the goals of this effort are to provide technical assistance (TA) and support for state educational agency (SEA) Title III and ED*Facts* coordinators to improve the quality of Title III-related data that states submit through ED*Facts* and their Consolidated State Performance Reports (CSPR). And I know that we've been focusing on ED*Facts* coordinators as our partners, but today we're covering the CSPR, and we know that in some of your states, the CSPR coordinator may be someone different. And so we hope that we were able to get that message out and have you join us today. And also anytime that you do want to join, please feel free to do so. We're also trying to encourage collaboration between SEA Title III and ED*Facts* coordinators and determine priorities for future state technical assistance work. Next slide.

[slide 11] So an overview of planned activities, we are developing a guidance document on Title III data, establishing quarterly meetings between ED, SEA Title III staff, and SEA ED*Facts* coordinators, and this is our third of those in the series. Starting a Community of Practice (COP) for SEA Title III coordinators and ED*Facts* coordinators around specific topics of interest, and you'll be hearing more about that at the end of today, which is exciting. And developing training for new SEA Title III and ED*Facts* coordinators. Next slide.

[slide 12] So with that, I'm going to turn it over to Fariba, and we are going to be focusing on CSPR Part I manual entry today. It'll follow a similar format to our last webinar, where Fariba will go through some of the details of each of those elements. And then we will be pausing for Q&A. So you will have an opportunity to, as Deirdre noted, put questions in the Q&A. So please, as you think of them, go ahead and populate them. And then we will take those questions during the Q&A slide. With that I'll turn it over to Fariba.

Fariba Hamedani:

Thanks so much, Leticia, and hello everyone. It's great to be with all of you today. So let's move to slide 13.

[slide 13] This slide lists all of the CSPR manual entry reporting requirements that are related to Title III. And as a reminder, all the Title III-related manual entry sections are in the CSPR Part I manual entry, which is generally due to ED in December of each year. There aren't any Title III-related sections in the CSPR Part II manual entry. Now we're not going to go over all of the sections in this list today. We're going to focus on the CSPR sections that we've commonly received questions about, or have commonly raised data issues, or that you identified as needing further clarification based on the Menti poll that you completed during our first Title III data quality webinar back on March 24. And after I present on each CSPR section, as Leticia mentioned, we'll spend a few minutes going over your questions that you type into the Q&A function.

So with that overview, on the next slide, we'll start by looking at CSPR manual entry, section 1.4.2. So let's please move to slide 14.

[slide 14] CSPR manual entry section 1.4.2 was identified as a section of high interest by many of you, according to the Menti poll results from our March webinar. And it also has had several common data quality issues come up. This CSPR section collection collects information on language instruction educational programs, or LIEPs for short. And this section is closely related to the ED*Facts* file specification (file spec) 116, with its two data groups. And for those of you who were able to join us on the June 8<sup>th</sup> webinar, you'll recall that we covered them at that time. This CSPR manual entry section is specifically tied to file spec 116 data group 849, which collects the count of English Learners (ELs) that participated in each type of LIEP supported with Title III funds.

And as a quick side note here, the transcript and slide deck from the last two quarterly webinars are available on our Title III website. And the link is provided at the end of today's presentation, and was

also included in the registration email that you received for today's webinar. So going back to the CSPR section, this section 1.4.2 asks for a comma-separated list of the languages used in each type of LIEP that is implemented in the SEA. Let's move to slide 15 and take a look at the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) definition of LIEP first.

[slide 15] ESEA Section 3201(7) is the section that provides the definition of an LIEP as an instruction course in which an English Learner is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while also meeting challenging state academic standards. And the LIEP may make instructional use of both English and the child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency, and may also include the participation of English proficient children, if such a course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English and a second language.

[slide 16] With that, let's move to slide 16 and take a look at what the CSPR section 1.4.2 actually looks like. So here's a screenshot of this section and the table in this section lists five different LIEP types, as well as a row for the "Other" category, for cases where an SEA offered an LIEP type that doesn't fit any of the five listed LIEP types. So for each LIEP type that was offered in the SEA, you need to enter a comma-separated list of the languages that were offered and used by each of those LIEP types. So let's look at a sample SEA and let's say that some of the local educational agencies (LEAs) in that SEA provided transitional bilingual LIEPs, and they provided these transitional bilingual LIEPs in the languages of English, Spanish, and Chinese.

So in the first row for "transitional bilingual", the SEA would type in English, comma, Spanish, comma, Chinese. Now let's say that some LEAs in the SEA offer dual language immersion programs in the languages of English and Spanish. So in the second row for "dual language or two-way immersion", the SEA would type in English, comma, Spanish. And the SEA would just leave blank the rows for LIEP types that were not offered in the SEA. If an LIEP type was provided in the SEA that doesn't fit any of the first five rows in the table, then the state would describe in the comment box that's below the table what the other LIEP types were, and also in the table's last row, which is marked "Other", would type in a comma-separated list of the languages of instruction used by those other LIEP types. With that, let's move to slide 17 and go over a common question we receive about this section.

[slide 17] The most common question we've gotten is whether there are common definitions for the different LIEP types. And for those of you who were able to join the June 8<sup>th</sup> webinar, you'll recall that we touched on this at that time. We don't actually have specific definitions for the LIEP types, and the ESEA doesn't provide definitions for them. However, on this slide, we've provided links to some common definitions for the different LIEP types. For example, the first link is to the Department's Office of Civil Rights glossary, which includes common definitions for the different types. And please note that a deeper discussion of the LIEPs is planned for the first Community of Practice that we're planning to provide, and we'll talk more about the Community of Practice later on in this presentation. At this point, I just remind you to please type any questions you have so far about CSPR section 1.4.2 into the Q&A tool, and we will go over them after the next slide. With that, let's move to slide 18 and go over some of the common data issues we've seen for this CSPR section.

[slide 18] So, as I mentioned before, CSPR manual entry section 1.4.2 is closely tied to the ED*Facts* file spec 116 data group 849, which collects the count of ELs that participated in each type of LIEP supported with Title III funds. So one of the most common data issues we see is inconsistency between what's reported for CSPR section 1.4.2 and what's reported for ED*Facts* file spec 116 data group 849. For example, there are cases where one or more languages of instruction were reported in CSPR section 1.4.2 for a particular LIEP type, but no students were reported in ED*Facts* file spec 116 data group 849 as being served in that LIEP type.

And also vice versa, we see cases where no language of instruction was reported in CSPR section 1.4.2 for a particular LIEP type, but students were reported in file spec 116 data group 849 as being served in that LIEP type. So we ask that you please check for these inconsistencies before submitting your data for both CSPR manual entry section 1.4.2 and for EDFacts file spec 116. And when you find inconsistencies, please do look to track where the root cause of those inconsistencies lies, and resolve them at the root.

Another common data issue we see is when a language of instruction was reported in the LIEP type "Other", indicating that another LIEP type was offered in the SEA, but no text was entered in the comment box to explain what the other LIEP type was.

[slide 19] Now let's move to slide 19 and go over questions you've submitted into the Q&A feature of the Zoom meeting around CSPR section 1.4.2. And if you haven't had a chance to type in your question yet, please feel free to do so at this time.

Leticia Braga:

Thank you, Fariba. And I'm seeing here one question, which is whether a student can have more than one LIEP type assigned to them. So I think when we're thinking about this one at the student level, it goes back to the information that we presented from the EDFacts file specs. And so when you're thinking about the unduplicated count, you would have one student assigned to one LIEP type, but it is possible that a student moves and is present in more than one LIEP, say, in an LEA. And in that case, you would be reporting on them, in terms of the LEA reporting, in file spec 116. When you're not talking about the unduplicated count, you might be able to count that student twice, once in each LIEP program. So I think that factors in more, in terms of the information that's coming into that file spec 116, but then that information will populate into the CSPR.

And the key thing about the CSPR is really the languages of instructions that need to be manually entered there. And I think, as Fariba noted, the main concern or flag that comes up is if you have a count of students that is populating from file spec 116, but then you're not seeing any languages reported in the CSPR, or vice versa, you might have a zero for a particular LIEP type, but then you're entering languages manually. That's something to make sure to reconcile before your submission.

Okay. We also are receiving, I see, for Puerto Rico, using the space to explain that the language of instruction is Spanish. I just want to acknowledge that whenever we're going through all of these questions, when we're speaking of English language development, in Puerto Rico, it would be Spanish language development. I think, and Sarah, I'll bring it over to you, if you want to elaborate on this. But to my understanding, in terms of that, wherever we are saying English language development, for Puerto Rico, we're interpreting that to mean Spanish language development, but I just want to make sure that that guidance is aligned with how it's been viewed by the data team. So I'm going to turn it over to Sarah to elaborate.

Sarah Newman:

That's correct. And I do appreciate the mention of the comment fields. Definitely do appreciate when Puerto Rico does leave comments like that. But yes, that is our understanding as well, that while the language speaks to English, that we do understand that it is Spanish for Puerto Rico.

Leticia Braga:

So in such cases, for example, we wouldn't expect you to be reporting zero under a row, just because it's English language development. You could interpret it as Spanish language development, and just add the clarification in your notes, which is always appreciated. But always happy to discuss further with you, because I know it does bring up unique circumstances for you.

We have another question about whether the LIEP types and languages reported in manual entry 1.4.2 should only be LIEPs that are Title III-A funded, not state-funded LIEPs. Correct?

Sarah Newman:

Yeah.

Leticia Braga:

So I don't know if we have that actually in the slide. I want to make sure if we're bringing up the document here, just for clarity for everyone. I think that is an important point because as you know, and we discussed with the EDFacts, there are places where we're talking about general language, and then there are places where we are specifying, essentially, whether there are things that are within Title III. So this section in CSPR is about accountability data on the implementation of Title III programs. So in this case, you would be reporting on the LIEPs that are in LEAs funded through Title III.

I'm just, again, searching. I just, again, want to make sure that I'm crossing my *t*'s and dotting my *i*'s on everything here. Just to note that file spec 116 is also for Title III students served. So there shouldn't be any confusion there, that the data that is feeding into the CSPR is also specific to LEAs receiving Title III funds.

All right. And Elianna, acknowledging your point, we are happy to follow up.

So Margaret, great question. You're asking about whether it's LEAs that receive Title III, or a Title III-funded LIEP. We recognize that there are challenges in tracking, specifically, the dollars, in terms of an LIEP being Title III-funded, especially because Title III is never the base program, it's supplemental. That can vary. And so the way that we talk about it, and this is actually a proposed revision of the CSPR that's currently undergoing Office of Management and Budget (OMB) clearance.

Just to clarify that the language really is not Title III LIEPs, but it's LIEPs in LEAs receiving Title III funds. So, you don't have to worry about going to that level of differentiation. If you have an LEA that is a subgrantee recipient of Title III, you can consider any LIEP within that LEA. So, I hope that's helpful. And great. So, I don't see any other questions, Fariba. So, with that, I think we can keep going and again, feel free to keep adding your questions here as we go, and we'll be happy to try to address them. With that, I'll turn it over to you again, Fariba. Thanks.

Fariba Hamedani:

Thanks so much, Leticia.

[slide 20] So, let's move to slide 20 and go over CSPR manual entry section 1.4.4, which covers Teacher Information and Professional Development. So, CSPR section 1.4.4 was also identified as a section of high interest by many of you according to the Menti poll results from our March webinar. And it also has had common data quality issues come up. This CSPR section is associated with EDFacts file spec 067, and it requires the manual entry of the number of English as a Second Language (ESL) or bilingual education-endorsed teachers that will be needed for the next five fiscal years within the SEA. So, please note that this number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next five years, not the number needed for each year.

And also please don't include the number of teachers currently working in Title III LIEPs; rather, include the number of additional teachers that will be needed in the next five years. Now, let's move to slide 21 and take a look at a screenshot of this section.

[slide 21] As you'll see in this screenshot, CSPR section 1.4.4 has a footnote that covers the two important points that I just went over with you. And with that, let's move to slide 22 and go over a couple of common questions that we've received related to this section.

[slide 22] One question we've received is how do schools predict how many ESL or bilingual ed-endorsed teachers will be needed for the next five fiscal years? And the answer to this question is that SEAs have discretion in determining how they estimate the number of ESL or bilingual ed-endorsed teachers that will be needed for the succeeding five fiscal years. So, we do defer to states in how they determine this calculation. And we encourage you to discuss with your colleagues and other SEAs regarding how they estimate this number.

Another question we've gotten is whether the CSPR section is asking about teachers who are EL-licensed, as opposed to teachers with a general or other certification or license, or is it asking instead about teachers who are licensed as opposed to those who are unlicensed, such as paraprofessionals? So, in response to this question, let's first look at the related ED*Facts* file spec, which is file spec 067.

So, for file spec 067, the determination of whether a teacher is fully certified or licensed is based on whether the teacher holds the certification or licensure required by their assignment based on the state's requirements for certification of teachers in LIEPs. And in file spec 067, paraprofessionals must be counted in the category of not fully certified.

On the other hand, looking at CSPR manual entry section 1.4.4, this CSPR section is intended to count only teachers with an ESL or bilingual ed endorsement and states that don't require teachers to have an ESL or bilingual ed endorsement should report the estimated number of teachers needed in the next five years having the highest level of certification or licensure required by the state in order to teach ELs in LIEPs. And you would not include paraprofessionals in the estimated count for CSPR manual entry section 1.4.4. At this point, just another quick reminder to please submit any questions you have about this section into the Q&A feature. And let's move to slide 23 and go over a common data issue related to this section.

[slide 23] The most common data issue with this CSPR section has been that the number of ESL or bilingual ed-endorsed teachers needed in the next five years was reported as zero or just left blank. And this may be due to confusion by states that don't require teachers to have an ESL or bilingual ed endorsement in order to teach in LIEPs. And as I mentioned on the previous slide, such states that don't require teachers to have an ESL or bilingual ed endorsement should report the estimated number of teachers needed in the next five years having the highest level of certification or licensure required by the state in order to teach ELs in LIEPs. Now let's move to slide 24 and go over the questions you've submitted into the Q&A feature for CSPR section 1.4.4.

Leticia Braga:

[slide 24] Thanks, Fariba. I don't see any questions yet. We can pause for a moment and see if people think of any. I think you were just so clear that no questions are coming up. I think also this is one where we did address some questions in the ED*Facts*, and we've taken your feedback. And as Fariba mentioned, we are trying to clarify this through the revised CSPR OMB package that is going through review, to make it a little bit clearer what information specifically we do plan to collect here for the purpose of file spec 067, as well as CSPR section 1.4.4. So again, thanks to all of the states who did respond to the 60-day comment period on the CSPR package and look forward to any additional feedback on the 30-day comment period. I think Sarah will be mentioning that a little bit later, but hopefully we'll be putting that out again soon. So, let's see, additional questions.

Let's see. So, all right. "We received clarification in Spring, as did at least one other state, that the file spec asking about the number of licensed versus not licensed was to be addressing those with and

without an ESL endorsement, even if not specifically required. Has this changed?" So, Trisha, this is part of what we were trying to address through the CSPR clearance process and getting feedback from states on how this might be addressed. And in doing so, we believe that the cleanest response to this is that we are looking to get information on teachers that are specifically licensed or certified, and that's the language that you'll see again in the new package. So, for the purpose of the package that we're talking about currently, we're still talking about that ESL or bilingual endorsement. And then we clarified that for states that don't require that, we're asking for you to report on the teachers with the highest level of certification that is necessary to teach English Learners in an LIEP. This is a clarification that's in the new package.

We recognize that the current language is not as clear as it might be. And so, I think that reasonable people can interpret the language and try to do their best to respond to the data element that's there. But I will say that, for the most part, what we're looking for when we're thinking about this element, we've got the information that comes in from file spec 067. We've got the general pool of teachers that are teaching in LIEPs, irrespective of that specific certification to be able to teach English learners. And then the questions that follow from that are in terms of the certification. We'd really like to see the teachers that have a specific certification or licensure to work with English learners, to differentiate from teachers that may not have that training.

And then that is the type of population that we're looking at when you're reporting on how many of those teachers will be needed for the succeeding five fiscal years. But again, we recognize that not all states require this. And so, just to reiterate, if you're not a state that requires this, we would just ask that you report on the number of teachers based on your highest level of certification or licensure necessary to teach English learners in LIEPs, those are the number of teachers that you would be reporting. The reason we're asking for that is that if you don't have that requirement, we don't want you necessarily to be reporting zero in that field. If you actually do have a need for additional teachers, we don't feel like that would be the most accurate portrayal of your needs in your state.

So, what we're really trying to get at with that CSPR responses, are you needing additional teachers in the next five years? And if so, give us an estimate of those teachers. So again, hope that's helpful. We're hoping that the CSPR package will help put this to rest a little bit, but recognize again, that with the current language we have, there is some gray area there. So, if you do have additional questions and follow up from the original feedback that you received, again, we're happy to revisit that and just send us an email and we'll go from there.

And we have an additional question submitted in the Q&A feature. When we submit 1.4.4, do we calculate the number of ESL teachers that will be needed to serve in Title III-funded LIEPs or in general to serve ELs in all state-funded and federally-funded LIEPs? So, if we bring it up, and again, I'm trying to refer to our new package where we are trying to make that as clear as possible. We did have lead-in language previously, but we are asking about teachers who are working in LIEPs as defined under ESEA 3201(7) and reported in CSPR section 1.4.2 and so, those would be the Title III LIEPs.

So, it's the teachers that would be working in those. However, we are asking you to include all teachers who meet the description, whether or not they are paid with those Title III funds. So, this gets back to the issue of it being hard to track the specific funding source, not from a fiscal perspective of tracking the specific dollars, but from the data reporting level of information. And so, what we're really trying to get is the teachers who are in LIEPs in LEAs receiving Title III funds. Again, hope that helps and happy to clarify further as needed. With that, I don't see any additional questions, Fariba, so I will turn it back over to you and please let's keep the questions coming.

Fariba Hamedani:

[slide 25] Thanks, Leticia, and thanks everyone for the great questions you're submitting, which is the whole point of these webinars, so we greatly appreciate it. So, now we're going to move to CSPR section 1.4.5. This CSPR section collects the count of LEAs in the state that conducted each type of LEA activity supporting the education of ELs with Title III funds. And the list of activities is associated with the required and authorized activities listed in ESEA section 3115. And please note that data must be reported for the three mandatory activities as required by ESEA section 3115. And these three mandatory or required activities are: supporting the development and implementation of LIEPs, providing professional development to teachers and other personnel serving ELs, and providing parents and community engagement activities. Now let's move to slide 26 and look at a screenshot of this section.

[slide 26] You'll notice that the three required activities that I mentioned on the previous slide, which are supporting the development and implementation of LIEPs, providing professional development, and providing parents and community engagement, are found in rows one, four and five of this table respectively. And as a side note, for the CSPR package that is currently in the OMB review process and will be relevant to the three reporting school years starting in school year 2022–23, we have also proposed revisions to this CSPR section to better align with the ESEA language and to make the required activities clearer. And please note that the changes are only proposed changes at this time, pending consideration of public comments and other steps, and any changes will only be in effect starting in reporting school year 2022–23, and that CSPR OMB package will be available for the 30-day public comment period soon. And ED will notify the field when the 30-day public comment period opens.

So, what you see on this slide is what you'll have to report on for school year 2021–22. Now we haven't received any common questions related to CSPR section 1.4.5, but it was indicated as another area of interest based on your responses to the Menti poll from the March webinar. So, I encourage you to type any clarification questions you have about this section into the Q&A feature. And while you do type your questions in, we'll move to slide 27 and cover a common data issue related to this section.

[slide 27] The most common data issue related to CSPR section 1.4.5 is when no LEAs were reported for one of the three required activities of: supporting LIEPs, providing professional development, and providing parent and community engagement. With that, let's move to slide 28 and go over questions you've submitted in the Q&A function for CSPR section 1.4.5.

Leticia Braga:

[slide 28] Thanks, Fariba. There is one general question, no specific questions so far. Oh, one did just come in, but I'll address the general one first, which is about whether and when we'll receive a comparison or specification of the changes between the current reporting package and the final changes, given the need to update system requirements. So again, for the manual entry for the CSPR, hopefully that'll be a little less problematic given that a lot of what we're discussing is the manual entry, but there are going to be some fields that are going to look different from the input end. And so, Sarah, I know that the documents that we have posted for the OMB documentation have tracked changes in them, but of course, that's not the final, and states may need to make changes on their end to update the documents for LEAs to feed in some of the data that they may be inputting there. So, I don't know if you have anything else to add to this, but I will turn it over to you.

Sarah Newman:

Sure. Yeah. So, we are going to be posting the 30-day package in the next week or so. And so, like Leticia said, the 60-day package is available to look at on [federalregister.gov](https://www.federalregister.gov). I think that's the URL. I'd be happy

to find it and share it in the chat or in the Q&A as the answer, so that you can actually go directly to see what's been proposed in the 60-days, so you can get an understanding of what our thinking is in terms of the changes. We do try to minimize change as much as possible, understanding that it is burdensome. I can't speak to what is going into the 30-day package, but there aren't a lot of proposed changes in between, and we will be posting our responses to the public comments that we did receive. So, in the next week or so, there should be another posting that triggers that 30-day comment. So definitely do be on the lookout for that and we'll make sure that we get the communication out to all of the relevant channels. But in the meantime, I will share that URL for the 60-day package so that you can see what's in there so far.

Leticia Braga:

Thank you, Sarah. I appreciate that. We have a question about how we define "supporting the development and implementation of LIEPs". That's a good question. I think when Fariba went over these categories, they are meant to mirror the statutory required subgrantee activities. And so, we do have one required activity, which is about increasing the language proficiency of ELs by providing effective LIEPs that meet the needs of ELs and demonstrate success, so forth, in increasing English language proficiency (ELP) and academic achievement. Part of our concern with the current language is that it does not mirror the statute exactly. And so, you will see again, and the challenge with the timing of this presentation is that we are talking about the school year 21–22 submission and the current language, but I'm also referring to the package that's posted for school year 22–23. We've tried to clean that up in the new package so that it very clearly aligned with the statute. We think that's going to be much more helpful to states and LEAs in terms of tracking the activities.

But for now, you can interpret that field as being one of the required subgrantee activities, which is to support the implementation of LIEPs. We don't have a definition beyond essentially what is required statutorily there, so I'll leave it at that.

There's a question about using other funds for Title III professional development (PD) to support teachers in supporting ELs, how do we want this reported? So, that is a good question and of course, there are definitely instances of blending and braiding funds and Title I school-wide programs and other ways that this can be implemented.

So, I think what we're talking about though, is some of the activities specific to ESEA section 3115, which is our activities funded out of Title III. And so for this, we really do want the activities that are funded out of Title III Part A. And again, if there's a portion of those, we are not going to get into that level of detail here, but same as discussed before in terms of LEAs receiving Title III funds, if this is an activity in an LEA receiving those funds, and some of those funds are Title III funds, then I think it would be reasonable to consider that a PD activity funded out of Title III.

Is it as expectation that Title III districts use funds in all three of the required areas or are they allowed to use all funds in one required area? Great question. The three areas are required areas. I will say that if a state or a LEA can reasonably demonstrate that they have conducted activities in all of the areas, I know that in the past that has come up and there's been some sort of allowance for that. But I will say that the cleanest option is really to demonstrate that you are engaging in activities in all three of the required areas since they are required, rather than having to go through an extra step of showing how those are being covered through other funds.

So there's not a percentage that you have to spend towards each of those, but I would strongly recommend that the guidance that you give to your districts is that Title III funds should be used in all three of the required areas.

How do we expect consortia to fund all three required activities? Do all members in the consortia have to participate? So consortia is a very tricky area. It always has been. Part of it depends on the consortium agreement. I think if you have specific questions about consortia, which again go, I think, more into policy and beyond the scope of the data requirements, please go ahead and submit an email request to ED, and we'd be happy to work through that question with you.

Fariba Hamedani:

Just a quick time check. We are past five minutes, but you can assess whether we want to continue with Q&A.

Leticia Braga:

Thank you, Fariba. I think we're getting to the end here. I appreciate the time check. And then here, Dustin is noting that in Montana, many native schools transfer their Title III funds to Title I programs like literacy. Do these need to be reported as Title III programs as well? So Dustin, again, I think this does get into a little bit of kind of the policy and fiscal question, but I would say that for the purpose of data reporting, we really are looking at activities funded out of Title III.

But again, if you have these sort of unique circumstances, always helpful for us to receive them because there may be things that we haven't considered or that we need to work through with our legal counsel to better understand. And it builds up our database of answers that we can provide to states. So I'd really encourage you to follow up with us and specify a little bit more kind of what's happening there so that we can provide the best response that may help both with the data side as well as with the implementation side. So we'll look forward to hearing from you on that. Thank you.

And then another, again, question about the consortium. Again, yes, I think that if we do, again, receive questions about consortia, we're always happy to share those out. We've been trying to do those through some of the NELPA and CCSSO meetings, questions that we're receiving from states that are kind of broadly applicable and can also think about other ways to share those out as well. It might also be something that we can dig in into a future Community of Practice.

And then just the note that in some small states with small allocations, the grants cannot support the three activities substantively. So this is an issue that we get into also with the immigrant subgrant and the size of the subgrant. So again, we recognize that there are LEAs that receive a small amount of funds. I would say that there is a reason why we have that \$10,000 base for receipt of the EL subgrant, because the expectation is that you might be able to engage in something at least somewhat substantive. Wendy, again, happy to follow up with your state if this is something that seems to be recurring, to talk through it a little bit and give you a little bit more specific guidance.

But again, what I would reiterate is that there is not a specific dollar amount requirement and that the language, I think, is fairly broad in the statute in terms of how you may be able to fulfill the different activities. So I would try to, again, interpret that as broadly as possible in terms of doing something in all three areas. It does not mean that you need to equally engage in all three of the required activities at the LEA level.

Okay. So with that given time, I don't see any additional questions. I'm going to turn it back over to you Fariba, but again, please keep submitting your questions. Thank you.

Fariba Hamedani:

Thanks, Letitia. There is a question about how to tackle the required activities in states that are unitary systems, but maybe we can hold off and see if there's time at the end to cover it. And if not, we can definitely cover it offline or on a future webinar.

So with that, let's move to the next slide. And the next few slides focus on CSPR section 1.4.8, which actually consists of two subsections.

[slide 29] So CSPR section 1.4.8.1 collects three pieces of data related to the allocation of Title III funds. It asks for: the date when the SEA receives its Title III allocation from ED, the date when the SEA made Title III funds available to approved subgrantees, and the average number of days it took the SEA to make the Title III funds available to subgrantees. Now let's move to slide 30 and look at a screenshot of this section.

[slide 30] You'll see that the table 1.4.8.1 definitions are shown here. And for the second column in the table, which is the date funds are available to subgrantees, we do want to acknowledge that in many cases, SEAs distribute Title III funds to subgrantees over a period of time rather than on one single day. So in that case, please do report the average date that Title III funds were made available for obligation to subgrantees.

And the last column, number of days by funds distribution, is meant to capture the number of days between the date the state received its Title III allocations from ED and the average date the state made the funds available for obligation to its subgrantees. In the CSPR OMB package that ED recently posted for public comment, you'll see that we tried to clarify these questions. And let's move to slide 31 now and go over a common question we've received for this section.

[slide 31] A question we've received is how should an SEA calculate the number of days by funds distribution if Title III funds are distributed over a range of dates rather than a single date. And as I explain on the previous slide, in such a case, you would use the average date that funds were distributed to subgrantees rather than the first date funds were available. And then the number of days of distribution would be calculated based on the number of days between the first two columns or the first two fields. For example, if a state received its school year 2021–22 funds from ED on July 1, 2021 and made these funds available to subgrantees on average on August 1, 2021, then for school year 2021–22's reporting, the number of days by funds distribution value would be 30 days.

And please note that we will be turning this "number of days by funds distribution" field into an auto-calculated field for reporting school year 2022–23 data. So you won't have to worry about manually calculating that field, but for reporting school year 2021–22 data, please do plan on counting and manually reporting this number. So starting with school year 2022–23 data, that field will become auto-calculated.

[slide 32] Now let's move to slide 32 and go over some common data issues related to this section. One of the most common data issues related to this CSPR section is that the dates reported are out of range for the reported school year. So for reporting CSPR manual entry data for school year 2021–22, the dates reported should fall within the range of July 1, 2021 and June 30, 2022. And if you have run into scenarios where the dates you reported have fallen outside of such a range, we would love for you to enter the scenarios into the Q&A tool of this meeting, and we can go over them in a few minutes.

Another common data issue we see is that the number of days reported in the column for number of days by funds distribution conflicts with that calculated number of days between the first two fields. And again, this will become a non-issue starting with reporting school year 2022–23, but we do ask that you please double-check this manually entered value for school year 2021–22 data reporting.

Now let's move to slide 33 and look at CSPR section 1.4.8.2.

[slide 33] This CSPR section asks each SEA to describe in the comment box how the SEA can shorten the process for distributing Title III funds to its subgrantees. And let's move to slide 34 please.

[slide 34] Here is the screenshot of this CSPR section with the comment box where each SEA would describe how they can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to sub-grantees. We know that there are states that go through a pre-review process to get things in order before distributing Title III funds to subgrantees. And perhaps there are opportunities for streamlining that process. And if any of you have identified effective ways to shorten the process for distributing Title III funds to your subgrantees, we encourage you also to type your ideas into the Q&A tool for the benefit of your colleagues, and we'll go over your ideas shortly.

Now, we haven't received any common questions related to CSPR section 1.4.8.2, but many of you did express interest in getting further clarification on this question based on the March Menti poll. So we do encourage you to type your clarification questions into the Q&A tool at this time.

With that, let's go to slide 35 and go over the questions you've submitted. And also the ideas you shared with us regarding the points I mentioned on the previous slides.

Leticia Braga:

[slide 35] Thanks, Fariba. So a couple questions came in and I want to be cognizant of time because I do want to make sure we have time for the remaining items here. So there was a clarification on the \$10,000 grant baseline, and I did just want to make sure it was clear that the \$10,000 minimum only applies to the big, if you will, the EL formula grant amount, not the immigrant subgrant. Part of that is that it might be an opportunity for a smaller LEA that's experienced significant increase to be able to actually receive some funding. So the \$10,000 minimum is only for the big formula grant.

There's a question about the mean or median for the average number of days, which is a great question. Sarah, I'm going to put you on the spot. I don't think we specify that. We do say average. And I think usually when we say average, we mean the mean, and I think part of the reason there is that if a state has some pretty egregious actors who are outliers, I think part of it is really including that in the calculation and sort of seeing what could be done there to try to shorten the timeline for distribution for those. And the more there are that are kind of outliers, the more it would skew that number. So I'm going to say mean, but Sarah, I'm going to defer to you if you have another interpretation of that.

Sarah Newman:

No, I agree. And that's a great question, but I do think mean is what I assumed and I know we haven't been explicit, so it's a great point to be explicit. And I do think mean over median.

Leticia Braga:

Thank you. There's a question of the timeline expected there. There isn't a specific timeline, but I know that in the past in looking at programs, we do want the money to be available as soon as possible for LEAs to start spending down those funds and to be able to make use of them. There are LEAs that get the funds year over year and they use the carryover, but there are some that may fall in and out and they need to be able to make use of those funds. So if we see a timeline that starts spending way into the fall, that may bring up questions about why it's taking so long to get the funding out. There may be, again, a reason for a couple of outliers there, but again, it's all just sort of information to inform where you may want to focus your gaze as an SEA.

Is "made available" the same as having an approved application? So that's a good question. Part of the consolidated application, the funds would not be available until the consolidated application has been

submitted and approved. So that is a great question, Marshall. That's something that we've tried to also clarify again in the new package. So it's encouraging that we are getting these questions, because hopefully it means that we've anticipated and addressed some of these questions in what we are updating.

And so this is about having the funds available for obligation for subgrantees with approved local plans. So however that factors into your process in your state, it would be a subgrantee with an approved plan that has funds available for obligation. So again, if you want to speak more about how that factors into your consolidated application process, reach out, and we'd be happy to do so.

And again, length of time. I think we dug into that a little bit, but if you have concerns again about your state that you want to discuss, please feel free to reach out.

And then a question about whether 1.4.8.1 applies just to the formula grant. Yes. That is what we are collecting there. It is just the formula grant, not the immigrant subgrant. Good question.

So with that, I don't see any other questions unless there's something in the chat that I'm not seeing. I'm going to turn it back over to you, Fariba; I think we want to get moving on our next section. But again, please keep submitting questions.

Fariba Hamedani:

Yes. Thank you so much, Letitia, and for everyone who submitted those questions. With that, that concludes our presentation section for CSPR and I will turn it over to our colleague, Sarah Newman, now to present on the topic of ED*Facts* Business Rules Single Inventory (BRSI).

Sarah Newman:

[slide 36] All right. Hello everybody. Another favorite topic. Hopefully the questions will keep coming. Really, really appreciate the level of engagement today. It's really great. And not that this is about the ED*Facts* Business Rules Single Inventory, but just want to stress the importance of providing public comments through that public comment process. The 30 day, as I mentioned, the 30 day public comment process is coming up and we are, lucky for everyone in the public, required to respond. We take those very seriously. And so with all of these questions on the CSPR, please do not hesitate to use that process that exists for you all. So please don't hesitate to use that to submit questions. Next slide.

[slide 37] All right. So the ED*Facts* Business Rules Single Inventory, I'm hoping this isn't new to anybody, but feel free to mention if it is. This is kind of an effort that's been around for a few years, with the goal of really documenting all of the different data quality rules that we are applying to ED*Facts* data throughout our data quality lifecycle.

What we're speaking to today is primarily about the upcoming reporting year 21–22. We are hoping that this increases the transparency of the way in which ED is running its data quality processes. Part of this is really in response to feedback in prior years that this has not been very clear, and it's also not necessarily been consistent. And so this is definitely part of an overall effort to kind of play our part in improving data quality. And hopefully this is also giving states an opportunity to check data ultimately prior to submission, prior to that initial due date.

The Business Rules Single Inventory is composed of two documents. So there is a user guide to explain the layout of the BRSI spreadsheet. It also provides FAQs and commonly used filters. The spreadsheet does have a lot of columns and it is a bit of a technical document. So it can be a lot to look at, so really do encourage folks to check out that user guide to get a better understanding of what you're looking at. And then the other document is of course, the spreadsheet that is providing a detailed description of each business rule. In most cases, there's fairly detailed logic. We've worked pretty hard to be able to

really go step by step explaining exactly how we're taking states' EDFacts data and running it against certain logic checks.

Just a note at the bottom of the slide that we're focused on school year 21–22 data, but we'd be remiss if we do not mention that the business rule process is moving to pre-submission for school year 22–23 data. So as states are reporting their data, those business rules are actually going to fire at that stage and have to be resolved at that stage. Next slide. All right.

[slide 38] So if you have taken a look at the business rules or definitely have been involved in our data quality review process, you know that we include descriptors of rule type. So we are looking at rules that we define as accuracy, timeliness, completeness, and some that don't fit quite as well in the other buckets, but that are sort of describing out of range fields.

With these types, on our end, we often think about where they land on the error versus anomaly spectrum. And so that is something that we're trying to really acknowledge in the way that we do data quality, that there is sort of a built-in hierarchy to these issues, especially because they're being triggered on the same data file oftentimes. So some of our data quality issues, we acknowledge are more anomalies and can be "resolved" with a comment, while others are much more expected to actually result in the resubmission. Next slide.

[slide 39] All right. So one thing that we've been trying to do, particularly in my team, is to really use the power of visualization to better understand the data quality process. On our end, and I'm sure on your end, it's a pretty time-intensive process, so really trying to learn as much as possible about the way that we do this work and so that we are also part of the solution in terms of improved data quality. So we thought it would be helpful to show you all kind of what we're seeing. Actually, for a lot of different programs, the highest flagging area is our year-to-year checks. But for the Title III program, it is actually conflicting permitted values. This is heavily driven by file spec 141 and the languages reported. So there's kind of a couple different business rules in particular that are triggering this. I'm going to really sort of nerd out here and speak to different business rule numbers. EL-30 is looking at languages that we consider to be improbable.

So we're getting some reporting of Latin and Sanskrit and certain languages that are not considered to be spoken languages, and so this is generating quite a lot of errors. This is also our errors around reporting English as one of the top spoken languages. So that's kind of really what's contributing to that left-hand side conflicting kind of permitted values bucket. And even the longitudinal bucket that is actually another sort of flag that's looking at languages across time, seeing quite a bit of a variation, and that's leading to a lot of different data quality flags being generated. Next slide.

[slide 40] All right. So which data lead to resubmission? So this is resubmission of a data file. And I should sort of preface this by saying that I understand this is not one-to-one. Again, a lot of these data quality flags, these business rules, are run on the same file. It is not to say that a particular business rule led to a resubmission per se, but this is just generally helpful for us to see kind of the relationship between these things and the trends. So, I think there's quite a bit of variation in Title III. There's some business rules that really... we are getting new data by the time that second due date rolls around, and others where it's a little less common.

See the accuracy outer range bucket, relatively low. Timeliness, though, super high. And that's great. And that goes kind of back to that error versus anomaly spectrum, where some of our errors are things that are much more black-and-white. We are seeing resolution. That's wonderful. We're seeing resubmissions. And then with some of our... As we get towards that anomaly bucket, we're not seeing as much change in the data. Next slide.

[slide 41] All right. And then we kind of went a step further, and so when we re-review all of the data after that second due date, we are looking at whether or not what we were seeing just goes away. If we were flagging 20% change, maybe we no longer see that. Or we flagged a particular language, maybe it's no longer present in that data file after that resubmission. And so this is showing just by resubmission alone, do we no longer see that kind of flag? So here again, a lot of variation. Timeliness is fairly simple to turn off. If we do get resubmitted data, even if it has other data quality issues in it, that is enough to at least say we have solved the timeliness issue. But some of the other flags, again, not a whole lot of resolution rates, not by resubmission, longitudinal checks. And we're seeing this across our programs. We have found this to be really, really helpful on our end to learn from. Next slide.

[slide 42] So jumping into 21–22 data reporting, really focusing on what's coming up. So the open date, for the EDFacts data files, the open date is actually very soon. States are going to be able to go in and start reporting their data. The system opens October 7<sup>th</sup>, 2022. So we're just a couple weeks away from that. And then the EDFacts data files are due officially, they will be locked down, as of the 21<sup>st</sup> of December. That's about a week later calendar-wise than typical. And that is almost always at 11:59 Eastern Standard Time. And then on the CSPR side of things, the collection generally opens a couple weeks before. We're looking at a date around the 5<sup>th</sup> of December, with that closing down the day after the EDFacts initial due date, so the 22<sup>nd</sup> of December, 5:00 PM Eastern Standard Time. That is a hard deadline. We do close the system at 5:00 P.M.

And then with reopen period, the EDFacts system stays open, and so that is irrelevant, the reopen date. But then the CSPR Part 1 tool will close down, and then that will reopen on March 23<sup>rd</sup>. And then we reach the end of 21–22 data reporting, and the second due date is April 5<sup>th</sup> for the Title III data files, 11:59 PM Eastern Time. And then the very next day, that is when the CSPR Part I is due for the final time at 5:00 PM Eastern Time. So those are our kind of timeline coming up. That will be much more broadcast once the dates have been locked down, to make sure that everybody is aware of that timeline. Next slide.

[slide 43] All right. At this time, I will see if we have any questions. No, we do not.

Leticia Braga:

I don't actually see any, Sarah. You've been so clear.

Sarah Newman:

Or... Or no one wants to talk about the BRSI. I don't know. Someone give me one question please. My Title III friends got all the questions left.

Leticia Braga:

We love it. Well, again, people are more than welcome to submit questions, and we'll have all the mail boxes at the end here, if questions come up as you're thinking about it. But again, given the time I do want to go ahead and turn it over to... And you are getting a thanks there, Sarah, for the charts. We love the charts too. I'm going to go ahead and turn it over to Brenda, I think, next, our colleague from the American Institutes for Research (AIR), to talk about something very exciting, which is the launch of our first Community of Practice. So let's take it away, Brenda.

Brenda:

[slide 44] Yes. Thanks, Leticia. Hi, everybody. My name is Brenda Arellano, and I'm a senior researcher at American Institutes for Research to talk to you about the upcoming Community of Practice. Okay, let's go to the next slide.

[slide 45] So at the March SEA Title III and EDFacts coordinator webinar, it was mentioned that we were going to be starting a Community of Practice (COP). And the purpose of this COP is to support SEA Title III and EDFacts coordinators to improve the data quality of Title III EDFacts and CSPR submissions. And we want to facilitate this data quality process by creating a space where you can meet with your peers in a COP to share challenges and best practices. So we want to kick off the COP with a series of four sessions on supporting districts to improve EL and Title III data quality, since this was a topic that emerged as the number one choice in the poll in the March webinar. Next slide.

[slide 46] So here's an overview of the first four COP series focused on supporting districts to improve EL and Title III data quality. We have four subtopics that we're going to focus on. The first of these will focus on the language of instruction educational programs, the LIEPs. The first session will provide an overview of defining LIEPs and really just digging in a little bit more deeply. And we really want to focus on those reporting requirements associated with these and then really spend the rest of the time dedicated to some small groups where you all are going to have a time to just discuss with your peers, how does the definition and the reporting requirements create challenges for reporting data? We also want to be sure to build in time so that way you all can get to know your peers and really create that space to begin to develop that rapport.

This COP is going to launch in the fall, probably late October or November [postponed to the start of 2023]. And then after that, these sessions are going to take place about monthly. The second COP will focus on delivery models in your states, and we really want to hear a problem of practice from one of your peers. We want to spend some time discussing what does that variation in program implementation look like across states? And how does that likely impact the reporting of the data? Then we want to focus the third COP on data improvements and infrastructure related to LIEP reporting. We want to hear from you all, what are the kinds of changes to your data system structures? Or maybe what's some kind of PD that you all are doing or maybe that you might think about doing to address some of the reporting challenges? And this COP is likely to take place in the new year.

And then finally, there's a final session in this series planned that will focus on data analysis and thinking about how can we use the data and LIEPs to inform programming? And then lastly, I want to add that we are also open to being flexible as we go along to hear the needs of participants. You all have been posting some great questions, so we want to keep that up and really hear about how we can adapt the COP to meet your needs and to make sure that the COP is addressing your needs and questions.

[slide 47] Okay. So we're going to go to the next slide, because we want to get some feedback from you all. So we have a Menti poll, and this is completely optional. But we want to get some additional feedback as we're planning for the COP. So, if you're able to and you want to, if you could go to Menti and either scan the QR code or go to [menti.com](https://www.menti.com) and type in the following code to participate. And we have a few questions we want you to answer, and if you're not comfortable with any of them, you can skip them as well.

And it's... You're going to see the same barcode on the next few slides. We can go to the next slide.

[slide 48] So yeah, so the first one is we want to spend a lot of time during the COP for you to interact with your colleagues, and we want to hear from you how that time might be spent productively. And so we have some ideas how we might break up these small groups, and we want to hear from you all about some ideas that we have of how those could be broken up. It could be by distribution of EL population within states. Another one could be by the geographic proximity. Another might be by reporting challenges. So some examples of those might be, and we've raised a few of those today, could be looking at the file specs, such as 116 related to how Title III EL students are served. And some questions that have come up in some of the past webinars are looking at rural low-incident schools or maybe reporting differences between state-funded LIEPs and federally-funded LIEPs.

Some other categories of challenges may arise. Could have to do with how to do a crosswalk between state or LEA definitions of all LIEPs, and how is that impacting the data? Another one might be where teachers are being captured appropriately across that data for LIEPs. You might have another idea of a breakout category in mind. So if that's not accurately captured here, you could also put that in the chat. So if you're interested in giving feedback, go ahead and enter that into the Menti poll.

[slide 49] And we're going to go ahead and go to the next slide. So if you're filling that out, we have a couple other questions we want to get some feedback from you as well. We want to know about the COP, how likely are you to attend the COP session? And also what's your role? And what is your state? So this will help us as we're preparing over the next month or so, the COP. So go ahead and continue to fill that out. And in the meantime, I'm going to go ahead and turn this back over to Leticia as she closes us out.

Leticia Braga:

[slide 50] Thank you so much, Brenda. Brenda and team have put in a lot of effort into the planning so far, and we're really excited to get this launched. So really appreciate any feedback you're willing to provide so we can incorporate that. All right, next slide.

[slide 51] All right. So the wrap-up. We did end up using most of our time. I loved the level of engagement today. Really appreciate all of your questions. Just wanted to highlight a few things. One is that the materials from the second webinar are now available on our website. If you haven't seen that yet, they are available at the link, for the first as well. I also wanted to bring up something that some of you may be aware of, but I was asked to highlight by our colleagues in IES, which is that IES, the Institute of Education Sciences at ED, is conducting a study of the impact of English Learner reclassification policies, which is a large-scale study related to Title III. Really excited about this. It's a really important topic and something we want to, I think, collectively know more about.

And IES has contracted with Westat and its research partner WestEd to conduct this study. So the study team is going to be sending a letter to states soon with further details, but they wanted me to let you know that the study team has already contacted the Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) office in states to start discussion about how to prepare a data request based on this. And then they'll be following up with the SLDS office about the specific data needed. So that's with SLDS, and won't necessarily impact the EDFacts coordinators if you're different offices, different groups, but wanted to highlight that. And the Title III coordinators are likely going to just be receiving a letter about this study overall. So more to come on that.

And then questions. As we've been highlighting, we're happy to take your questions, your additional questions as you think them through. Questions about the data quality effort or anything related to program and policy, please send to our Title III mailbox to make sure that it gets seen as soon as possible. And then send specific questions related to your state's EDFacts data to [EDFacts@ed.gov](mailto:EDFacts@ed.gov). And then questions related to your state's CSPR data to [CSPR@ed.gov](mailto:CSPR@ed.gov). We do coordinate around the questions, but it's just kind of what the most reasonable entry point is, depending on the type of question that you have. So please do reach out. Let's go to the next slide.

I think, is it Sarah who was putting information in the chat about the link to the CSPR and the federal register and the public comments received during the 60 day period.

So I... since we have a couple of minutes, I was just going to highlight, for the good of the transcript, that there was one question that we received that wasn't answered live that had to do with the period to distribute funds and whether substantially approved could count towards that. And so you're able to see the answer in the Q&A, but essentially what I noted was that what we're looking for is when funds are available for obligation.

So part of the question is whether substantially approvable clears that bar. And in the likelihood that it doesn't, we have seen that having the substantially approvable option and kind of getting started on the process of approving the applications as soon as possible, in many cases, getting started prior to the funds even being available, really helps with shortening the timeline overall. So we do encourage, certainly, that process in terms of getting applications into substantially approvable status. It's just the question of whether the funds are then available for obligation to the LEA as part of counting that towards the distribution of funds in the average state. So that's a little bit out of order there, but again, wanted to make sure that we have it captured in the transcript when this gets posted.

[slide 52] Regarding the CSPR and EDFacts resources, nothing really to go through here other than having some links available to you for your benefit. And we can go to the final slide, which is webinar feedback.

[slide 53] You're going to see a pop-up when you close out which is asking you for a quick optional survey about feedback on this webinar that we're always grateful to receive. And if you have any additional feedback or considerations for the upcoming Community of Practice, that would be great as well. I'm seeing some thanks come through in the chat. We're all... We love the thanks, we appreciate the thanks. We're also happy to take constructive feedback to try to keep improving these as we go. So it will pop up. You will also be receiving an email from Zoom/Deirdre, I think, in short order, maybe later today, tomorrow. I'm not sure, Deirdre, but an email will be coming through as well with that link.

So appreciate your feedback, your time. We know you're busy. So, again, if your colleagues weren't able to join, please feel free to share that the materials will be posted, and we want to get as much engagement as possible. "Thanks for the time and energy." I appreciate that, Barbara. I started with the frog in my throat. It seems to have gone away, but we're trying to keep up that energy for you and get through the day here. So again, appreciate you. Talk soon, and reach out to us with any additional questions you may have. And with that, I will give you four minutes back. Thanks so much.

A question about the link to the presentation. It will be posted on our website, Joseph. And we will try to notify you all when that is available. All right. Take care, everyone. Bye-bye.