

## SEA Title III/ED*Facts* Coordinator Webinar 01/18/2023 Transcript

Leticia Braga:

[slide 6] Hi, everyone. Good afternoon. I think for most folks joining, it's afternoon by now. I'm happy to have you with us today. I am going to go over some overview slides before we dive into the substance of the webinar and we'll have opportunities throughout to pause for questions. So, as Elizabeth noted, please do add your questions in the Q&A feature rather than the chat, unless it's something like some technical help that you're asking for her to assist with, so that we can be sure to see your question in the Q&A when we do those pauses.

So, our agenda today is we'll do a quick introduction again to the US Department of Education's (ED) Title III team and provide an overview of the Title III data quality effort. Then we'll dive into ED*Facts* Business Rules Single Inventory (BRSI) rules and clarifications. We of course won't go through every single rule. There are many for the English learner (EL) and Title III data, but we've highlighted a few.

We'll talk briefly about ED*Facts* Modernization, then data notes, their importance and best practices, talk a little bit about additional technical assistance (TA) products and events that we're excited to share with you, and then do a little bit of wrap up. Next slide.

[slide 7] All right. Introduction to the Title III team. We do this every time, but we'd like to highlight the folks who are supporting these efforts. So, next slide.

[slide 8] Key staff for Title III, we have Deborah Spitz, who is our Group Leader. I am Leticia Braga, again, and I'm the Title III Team Lead.

On our Title III team, we have Fariba Hamedani, who is a Program Officer and who leads a lot of the data work and will be presenting today. We also have Sophie Hart, who is a Program Officer part-time on the Title III program, and Scott Richardson who is also a Program Officer part-time on the Title III program. With us today representing the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) Data Team, we're happy to have Keith McNamara, who will be talking about the ED*Facts* Modernization and data notes components of the presentation. He can also help clarify any questions about the BRSI codes as we go along. Next slide.

[slide 9] So, as a reminder of what is the Title III data quality effort, next slide.

[slide 10] It's an opportunity to provide technical assistance and support for State Education Agency (SEA) Title III and ED*Facts* coordinators to improve the quality of Title III-related data that states submit through ED*Facts* and the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR), to encourage collaboration between SEA Title III and ED*Facts* coordinators, and to determine priorities for future state technical assistance work. Next slide.

[slide 11] Some of our planned activities include a guidance document on Title III data, establishing quarterly meetings, such as this one, between ED, SEA Title III staff, and SEA ED*Facts* coordinators, starting a Community of Practice for Title III coordinators and ED*Facts* coordinators around specific topics of interest, which we will highlight that later in the presentation, and develop 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 my colleague, Fariba, to go through the BRSI rules and clarifications. Over to you, Fariba. Thanks.

Fariba Hamedani:

Thanks so much, Leticia, and hello, everyone. It's great to be with you all today. I'm going to provide a quick overview of the ED*Facts* Business Rules Single Inventory, which we refer to as BRSI for short, and then we'll take a closer look at the business rules related to the Title III program that are flagged the

most often to gain a better understanding of the logic behind them. So, let's move to slide 13, please, and start with a quick overview of the BRSI.

[slide 13] As most of you hopefully know, the BRSI is a single compilation of all the business rules that are applied to ED*Facts* data submissions. I know this topic of business rules may be very dry and hard to sit through, but I ask that you please bear with me because the BRSI is really important.

It helps to ensure that the data you submit to ED are complete and accurate and it sometimes even helps to identify issues in the SEA's and LEA's policies and procedures that need to be tweaked. It also helps to provide the public with more context around the data that's made publicly available. So, if you have a cup of coffee on your desk, take a couple of sips now, or if you're a chocoholic like me and have some chocolate lying around, take a couple of bites and we'll all take a few deep breaths and dive into this topic. And at the end of this slide deck, we have included a link to the webpage for the BRSI and on that webpage, you'll find the BRSI itself, which is an Excel spreadsheet that includes all of the ED*Facts* business rules. There's also a User's Guide for the BRSI that explains the layout of the Excel spreadsheet and includes some helpful FAQs, and also includes some commonly used filters that can make it easier for you to interact and interface with the BRSI spreadsheet.

Please note that as part of the ED*Facts* Modernization effort, starting with the submission of school year 2022-23 data, the business rules will be transitioning to pre-submission. That means that the SEAs will need to review and resolve all the business rules that are flagged for their data before they can submit their data to ED for school year 2022-23 data reporting. Our colleague Keith will be covering more about ED*Facts* Modernization later on in this webinar. Now, let's move to slide 14, please.

[slide 14] This slide and the next list the business rules related to the Title III program that were flagged the most often for school year 2020-21 data reporting. We have covered some of them at a higher level at our previous data quality webinars. As a quick side note here and reminder, the materials from our previous data quality webinars are now posted to the Title III website, and the link to that material is provided at the end of the slide deck and was also included in the registration in the email you received for today's webinar. Now, let's move to slide 15 please.

[slide 15] So, this slide is a continuation of the business rules that were flagged most often for the school year 2020-21 data submission. As another note, some of the business rules were changed for school year 2021-22 data reporting. As we take a closer look at these business rules on the subsequent slides, I will point out instances where changes were made to a business rule for school year 2021-22 data reporting. Starting on the next slide, we'll take a closer look at each of these business rules. As a reminder, as I present the information, if you have any questions that come to mind, please do type your questions into the Q&A tool and we'll pause to go over your questions in a few minutes. So, now let's all take a deep breath and move to slide 16.

[slide 16] Hopefully, most of you have taken a look at the BRSI Excel spreadsheet before. But for those of you who haven't yet, the BRSI spreadsheet includes a lot of columns and hundreds of rows for all the business rules related to ED*Facts* data. The table on this slide just shows some of the columns from the BRSI spreadsheet and only one row for one particular business rule. Each business rule does have its own unique ID and the content on this slide is for the business rule with unique ID OESE-EL-003, as displayed in the header for this slide. So, for those of you who haven't seen the BRSI spreadsheet before, we'll just quickly provide an overview of the columns shown on this slide.

The first column called rule type is pretty self-explanatory. It describes the type of rule each business rule falls under. So, looking at the rule type here, business rule OESE-EL-003 does a check for accuracy. More specifically, it checks to see if the data reported is outside the expected range. The next column, failure classification, indicates whether the business rule flags an error or a warning. So, this particular business rule is a warning, meaning that ED understands that there may be instances where the data

submitted are actually correct, even when the business rule is flagged. In those cases, it's important that you add a data note explaining why the data are correct as reported. The next three columns are SEA, LEA, and SCH (standing for school). These columns indicate what level of data the specific business rule is checking. As you see by the "Y" under the SEA column here, rule OESE-EL-003 checks the data at the SEA level.

Now, the next two columns indicate the file specification (FS) and data group (DG) that each business rule is associated with. Next, the definition column explains what the specific business rule is and the rule logic column explains the calculation behind the rule. Finally, the error message column indicates the error that you as the SEA will see if this particular rule is flagged for your data. So, now we'll take a closer look at this particular business rule presented on this slide.

OESE-EL-003 is tied to file spec 137, which collects data on the ELs who were enrolled during the annual English Language Proficiency (ELP) assessment window. The business rule checks the number of ELs reported as not participating in the annual ELP assessment.

The reason we have this business rule will hopefully be clear from the definition column. The expectation is that all ELs in kindergarten through grade 12 be administered the annual ELP assessment, regardless of whether or not they're receiving Title III services. So, we would expect the number of ELs reported as not participating in the annual ELP assessment to be zero. Now, we do recognize that there are sometimes valid reasons why districts aren't able to assess all ELs. So, as you see in the rule logic column, this business rule is only raised if more than 4 percent of ELs are reported as not participating in the annual ELP assessment.

Now, let's take a closer look at how this rule's logic works. So, for file spec 137, each SEA reports ELs in three different groups for participation. One group is ELs who participated in the annual ELP assessment. Another group is ELs who had a medical exemption from participating. Then the last group is ELs who did not participate. So, how the rule logic works is that it adds up the students in these three groups to get a total number of students who were enrolled during the testing window, and then it calculates the percentage of ELs not participating using that total. A flag is raised if that percentage of students not participating is greater than 4 percent. So, if you see this business rule flagged for your SEA, please double-check the data and if you identify errors in the data, please resubmit the data during the second submission window. But if you double-check the data and the data are correct as reported, please add a data note to clarify the reason why not all ELs were assessed. Now, let's move to slide 17 and look at another business rule. As a reminder, as questions come up, please do type them into the Q&A tool.

[slide 17] This business rule is similar to the one we just looked at, except that business rule OESE-EL-006 focuses on file spec 138 and only those ELs receiving Title III services. So, since these two business rules are so similar, we won't spend more time going over it in more detail here and we'll move to slide 18.

[slide 18] So, OESE-EL-025. This was another business rule that raised a lot of flags for school year 2020-21 data reporting. But as we will discuss in a minute, that high number of flags was due in part to an error that we had in the business rule that we've since fixed for school year 2021-22 data reporting.

First, I'll share a quick overview of why we have this business rule in the first place. This rule is tied to data group 648 in file spec 116, and as we discussed on a previous data quality webinar, data group 648 collects the unduplicated number of ELs served by an English Language Instruction Program supported with Title III funds, and the unduplicated count of ELs is collected for the entire SEA and also for each LEA receiving Title III funds in that data group. So, we generally expect the sum of EL counts reported across all the LEAs to be greater than or equal to the total EL count reported at the SEA level.

Now, looking at the text in the rule logic column and in the error message column, you'll notice that there's some words in green font and some words that are stricken through in red font. These are to

## SEA Title III/ED*Facts* Coordinator Webinar 01/18/2023 Transcript

reflect changes we made to the business rule to correct the errors that we had. The text in the green indicates words that were newly added to the business rule for school year 2021-22 data reporting and the text in red font that's stricken through indicates words that were deleted from the business rule for school year 2021-22 data reporting. The error that we had in the rule logic and error message columns for school year 2020-21 was that the business rule was being flagged even if the total count across all LEAs was equal to the total count at the SEA level. But a flag shouldn't be triggered if the totals are equal.

We do apologize to those of you who had to deal with this business rule being incorrectly flagged for school year 2020-21. It has been fixed now, like I said, so if you see this business rule raised in your data reporting for school year 2021-22, please double-check the data and if the data are correct, add a data note explaining why the data are correct. For example, one useful data note we've seen from some of you in the past is an explanation that your SEA provides services to some ELs at the state agency level rather than at the LEA level. That's why in your specific situation, your SEA total EL count is actually greater than the total across all of your LEAs. Now, let's move to slide 19 and go over your questions in the Q&A tool.

Leticia Braga:

[slide 19] Thank you, Fariba. I don't actually see any open questions, but we'll give folks a moment to see if they have any. I think the advantage of the BRSI is that it is fairly straightforward once you know what goes in each column, and you did a great job walking us through it. So, that may be the reason why folks don't have questions yet. I did see one answered question about the presentation being available. We do work to post 508-compliant versions of the slide deck as well as the transcript after the webinar. There does tend to be a little bit of lag time in doing so, but we will be working to get those posted after the webinar. I'll give it another moment to see if people have questions and if not, we can move along.

Fariba Hamedani:

Thanks, Leticia. Well, I hope the reason we don't have questions is that it has been clear so far. They will get a little bit more complicated as I go through the slides. So, let's keep taking those deep breaths as we move through.

Leticia Braga:

Sounds great, and I still don't see any questions, so I think we can go ahead, Fariba.

Fariba Hamedani:

Sounds great. So, let's move to slide 20, please.

[slide 20] OESE-EL-029 is associated with file spec 141. And file spec 141 collects data on all ELs enrolled, disaggregated by multiple categories, including by native language spoken. As you can see in the definition column, this business rule expects that the count of ELs speaking any particular native language won't change by more than 20 percent compared to the prior reporting year. As indicated in the third through fifth columns, this business rule only checks data at the SEA level, indicated by the "Y" under the SEA column. Now, looking at the rule logic column, you'll see that the way to run this business rule is to look at the SEA-level count of ELs reported for each language in the current reporting year and then comparing that count to the previous year's count of ELs reported for that same language.

Only if the difference between the two years' counts is a hundred students or more for a particular language, then calculate the percentage difference between the two years. If that percentage difference is 20 percent or more, then a flag is raised for this business rule. Now, ED does understand that there

may be years when the number of ELs enrolled that speak a particular language may change by more than a hundred students and 20 percent compared to the previous year. That's why this business rule is flagged as a warning rather than an error, as you can see in the second column for failure classification. So, if this business rule is flagged for your SEA, please double-check the data submitted both for the current reporting year and for the previous reporting year, since it is a longitudinal check. If you determine that the data are correct as reported, please add a data note to explain why the data are correct, and if the data are incorrect, please resubmit the data.

Now, we'll move to slide 21 and look at some sample calculations for this business rule, which is a little more complicated than the ones we've looked at.

[slide 21] So, here are some EL counts reported by one sample state disaggregated by four different native languages spoken by its ELs, and we'll just refer to the languages as language A, B, C, and D, each with its own row in the table. So, looking at the row for language A, we see that in the prior reporting year, which was reporting year school year 2020-21, 24,760 ELs were reported as speaking language A. In the current reporting year, which is school year 2021-22, 25,245 ELs were reported as speaking language A.

So, the difference in EL counts for language A between the current and previous reporting years is 485 students, as indicated in column E. This translates to a 1.96 percent difference in the number of ELs speaking language A between the two years, and this is shown in column F. Now, looking at the final column, column G, as I mentioned on the previous slide, this business rule is flagged if the change in the number of students is a hundred students or more and also the percentage change is 20 percent or more. So, for language A, the change in the number of students is more than a hundred students, but the percentage change is only 1.96 percent, close to 2 percent. So, it does not meet the 20 percent threshold for triggering a flag for this business rule for language A.

Looking down the rules for the other languages, you'll see that the only language that meets the threshold in both columns E and F is language D in the last row because for language D, there was a change of more than a hundred students plus more than 20 percent change. So, if this business rule is flagged for any native languages in your SEA, please double-check the data and either resubmit or add a data note explaining why the data are correct. With that, we'll move to slide 22 and as a reminder, if you have any questions, please type them into the Q&A tool.

[slide 22] OESE-EL-030 is also tied to file spec 141 and all ELs enrolled. This business rule checks to see if any ELs are reported for a language that is probably not spoken anywhere around the world, and it's one of the most frequently flagged rules that we see. We have touched on this issue of improbable languages during previous data quality webinars and the rule logic for it is straightforward, so we won't dive into it in more detail here, but we do want to encourage you to review the list of improbable languages and follow up with any districts that are reporting such languages to see what procedural changes or training may be needed to make sure that the correct language codes are selected at the point of data entry. And please do refer to file spec 141 for more information on the correct language codes to use and improbable languages. With that, let's move to slide 23, please.

[slide 23] OESE-EL-118 is also tied to file spec 141 and all ELs enrolled. As you'll notice by looking at the third, fourth, and fifth columns, this business rule looks only at LEA-level data and it checks to see if English is ranked in the top 10 languages when each LEA reports its EL counts disaggregated by native language. We've touched on this issue during previous data quality webinars as well and we encourage you to refer back to those webinars, and the rule logic is straightforward so we will not be diving into it in more detail here.

But we did want to mention this business rule again because it is, again, one of the most frequently flagged rules that we see. So, if English does show up in the top 10 languages spoken by ELs in any of

your LEAs, please follow up with the LEA to see if procedural changes or training is needed to make sure ELs and their native languages are identified correctly. For example, there may be cases when another language code may be more appropriate than just selecting English, such as, for example, the code for “Creoles and pidgins, English based” may be a more appropriate selection than just selecting English. Now, let's move to slide 24 and go over any questions you've submitted.

Leticia Braga:

[slide 24] Thank you, Fariba. In this case, we do have a few questions. I'll try to do my best to respond to them and then please feel free to jump in, yourself or Keith, with any additional clarifications. I'll note as I've seen the questions coming in, if you are able to indicate the file or the BRSI code that you are referencing, it might be helpful in your questions, but I think for the most part we can decipher it regardless here.

So, the first question we received was asking about the hundred student rule and whether that's equivalent for states with low populations and that in the case of one state, they have fewer than a hundred total ELs for all but two languages. So, yes, the rule is consistent across states, but I think based on what Fariba highlighted, that is one of the reasons why the rule is not activated unless you have 100 or more students or else the percentage change might trigger multiple flags, especially for states that have low numbers. So, the percentage change would be large. So, we're only looking at cases where you have a hundred students or greater. SEAs still have the responsibility to monitor the data and ensure that it's accurate as submitted. But the business rule itself would only be triggered if there are at least a hundred students in that cell and then if the percentage difference is greater than 20 percent. As Fariba went through, that is when the flag would arise for the state.

There's a question about data group 648 and 849 being in FS 116 and having different reporting periods. That is still the case for this data submission. I'll note that that's something that was looked at for the OMB package that recently went through for school year 2022-23 data. But for the current year, yes they are different data groups in the same file specification, and the BRSI codes, if you look at the actual Excel spreadsheet, it will specify what data group the code applies to. So, even if you have the same file specification, the data group will be specified there and the flag will be specific to that data group.

There was also a question about that 20 percent threshold. That is a good question. We analyzed the data year to year—we actually just went through this—to look at the codes and see if there might be reason to adjust the thresholds. So, again, it's based on the fact that looking at the number of students by language spoken, we would typically not expect to see such a great fluctuation over 20 percent. However, we know that that may occur, especially for states and districts that are receiving an influx of a new population. In that case, again, the flag is simply a warning in this case and what you would do is submit a data note justifying why that change has occurred. However, as I noted, we do review those thresholds each year and there may be instances where we propose raising thresholds if we find that a particular flag is being raised over and over for multiple states and that states are mostly reporting through their data notes that this is correct data, in which case it may warrant revisiting the threshold.

There's also a question about a resource that shows similar or related languages. I think that's a great question and one we could follow up on further. I would say that the first place I would indicate looking is the actual website for the ISO codes 639-2 has the codes that are approved for submission. However, if you look at 639-3, it does parse out additional languages that fall under a family of languages. So, while you may not be able to submit that specific branch of languages under ED*Facts* reporting because we only use the ISO 639-2 codes, except for a few exceptions that have been added, you may be able to use that to figure out what is the family tree that you should be reporting under.

There's a question about the website for improbable languages. I think we can add, maybe Keith or someone else, could add a hyperlink in the chat for that. I'll note that there's also information about that in the file specification. So, hopefully that won't be too hard to find, but I'm sure that we could put something in the chat.

Then, so there's a great question here from a state about being mostly English only because of the large native community and their tribal languages. So, this is, again, a unique population that we've covered in some of the earlier webinars, where it is possible and appropriate that a student who is a native student would be identified as an English learner using the ESEA English learner definition that's used for Title III. I would say if you have any questions about the definition, we're happy to follow up with you through the Title III mailbox. But this would be a case where, again, if that is the reason why this particular flag is being triggered, you would report in your data note that the data is correct and the reason for this is because of the population that you have.

Another person is asking again about the ISO codes. I can also put that link in the chat for you all. But again, it's fairly easy to Google it. Hopefully, it would be, I think, the first search result, but essentially it directs to the [www.loc.gov](http://www.loc.gov) website where it contains those codes, and I will put that in the chat for your reference.

If there are instances in the definition of English learner where, again, that would be a language of significant influence that would cause difficulties in the four domains of language that would, again, allow the student to be identified as an English learner for the purpose of Title III funding. So, again, I would recommend looking at the definition, seeing if you have any questions or concerns about how your student population fits into that. We're happy to follow up through the Title III mailbox if you need any clarification on that.

With that, I don't see any additional questions, so I think we can move on, unless, Fariba or Keith, you want to add or elaborate on anything that was answered.

Fariba Hamedani:

Okay. Thanks, Leticia. As Leticia mentioned, we've talked about the definition of an English learner and instances where somebody whose primary language may be English but has significant influence of another language and has some difficulties and challenges with their English could be identified as an English learner. So, we encourage you to look at the transcripts and slide decks from our previous data quality webinars for more information on that. Then as Leticia mentioned, please feel free to contact our Title III mailbox if you have additional questions.

Then Leticia also mentioned that our file spec collects data based on the ISO codes in 639-2 with some particular exceptions. So, those exceptions were added to the list of options to select from, thanks to some of you providing feedback to us about additional languages that would be beneficial to add to our list. For the school year 2021-22 data reporting, we added Dari as an additional language to select from, thanks to input from some of you who mentioned that refugees from Afghanistan are coming and their native language is Dari. So, we have added that to the list of ISO language codes that you can select from. If you see frequent occurrences of languages that are not in the ISO code list of 639-2, please do reach out to us through our Title III mailbox and if we are able to, we will add them to the list of options to choose from.

[slide 25] So, with that, let's move on to slide 25, please, and everyone can take another deep breath because OESE-EL-092 is one of the more complicated rules that we have. As indicated in the third through fifth columns, this rule checks data at the SEA level. As shown in the file spec column, it checks data across two different file specs, file spec 050 and 138. As a quick overview of these two file specs, file spec 138 collects data on the ELs who were enrolled during the time of the annual ELP assessment

and also were receiving Title III services. File spec 050 collects data on the English language proficiency progress made by those ELs who participated in the annual ELP assessment and were receiving Title III services.

We created this business rule because we were seeing that the overall universe of students reported for file spec 050 and 138 seemed very different, which was unexpected because file spec 138 reports on the number of ELs for whom progress can be calculated and file spec 050 reports on the number of students for whom progress was actually reported by SEAs. So, there should be alignment across the data between those two file specs. In looking at the definition column here, this business rule takes the sum of ELs making progress and those not making progress reported in file spec 050 and compares that to the sum of participation data from file spec 138. Now, some feedback we have heard in the past is that some SEAs have included non-participants in the “not making progress” bucket, but for the purposes of reporting data for file spec 050, ELs who did not participate in the annual ELP assessment should not even be included in the data for file spec 050.

So, as you'll notice in the last three columns, we changed this business rule for school year 2021-22 data reporting to not even include students not participating in the ELP assessment, as indicated by the text stricken through in red font. Now, if you look in the rule logic column, you'll see that this business rule sums the number of ELs making progress and those not making progress reported in file spec 050 and compares that sum to the file spec 138 data on the number of ELs who participated in the annual ELP assessment, minus the number of ELs assessed for the first time, and the flag is raised for this business rule if this difference is greater than 10 percent. Now we'll move to slide 26 to take a look at a specific example, and while we move to that slide, we'll all take another deep breath.

[slide 26] So, this table shows four sample states and how the rule logic is calculated and when a flag would be raised. Looking at the row for state A, in column F, pulling data just from file spec 138, we subtract the number of students first assessed from the number of students who participated in the annual ELP assessment, and that gives us a value of 26,070 in column F for state A. Now, the reason the number of students first assessed is subtracted from the number of students who participated is because a measure of progress, by definition, should mean having two different data points to compare, and students who were assessed for the very first time don't have two different data points to compare. They only have the one. When calculating the count of students first assessed, it's important to include both the group of students who took the regular ELP assessment for the first time and those who took the alternate ELP assessment for the first time. So, for state A in column F, the value of 26,070 represents the number of students for whom English language proficiency progress can be calculated.

Now, let's move to column G, which pulls data from file spec 050. In column G, we calculate the sum of students making progress and those not making progress, and this includes the sum of the counts for both the regular and alternate assessments. This number in column G represents the number of students for whom progress was actually reported by the SEA. So, for state A, the value in column G is 28,140. Next, using the formulas included in the column headers for columns H and I, we calculate the numeric difference and the percentage difference between the values in columns F and G, and the business rule is flagged if the percentage value in column I is greater than 10 percent. So, looking down the rows for the different states in this example, this business rule would not be triggered for states A and C because the percentage value in column I is below 10 percent for states A and C. But the business rule would be flagged for states B and D because the value in column I for states B and D is greater than 10 percent. So, states B and D would need to check their data for both file specs 050 and 138.

Now, let's move to slide 27 and look at the final business rule we'll be discussing today, and please continue to type your questions into the Q&A tool.



[slide 27] OESE-EL-093's definition and rule logic are very similar to the business rule we just looked at. But as you'll notice in the file spec, in the FS column here, this business rule compares the data reported for file spec 137 and 139, which collect data for all ELs, rather than just ELs who are receiving Title III services. Similar to the business rule we just looked at, you'll notice the red font text that's stricken through here because we also changed this business rule for school year 2021-22 data reporting to remove the references to students who did not participate in the annual ELP assessment. Now, we won't look at an example for this business rule because the concept is the same as the example we just looked at on the previous slide and we will just move to slide 28 and go over any questions you submitted.

Leticia Braga:

[slide 28] Thank you, Fariba. I don't see any questions yet. We'll give folks a moment. I know that was some pretty weedy information provided there. But again, you did a great job walking through step by step and folks can always follow up with us if they have any questions about these business rules. I'll just note as we're waiting that we added a couple of links directly in the chat for your reference. We have the link to the ISO 639-2 website, which Fariba had referenced in the chat. There's also a note that comes directly from our file specifications that says additional information on language families is contained on the Ethnologue website. So, that's another approved reference source for you to use in determining the languages for LEAs to use for submission. Then finally, there's a direct link to the information on the Partner Support Community website that includes the list of improbable languages. So, you can use that reference as well. I still don't see any questions, Fariba. So, why don't we keep going and then again, as people think of things, feel free to add them to the Q&A as we go?

Fariba Hamedani:

Sounds good. Thanks, Leticia, and thanks, everyone, for bearing with me through this weedy but important topic of business rules. We made it through and now I'll turn it over to our colleague Keith who'll cover the ED*Facts* Modernization effort next.

Keith McNamara:

[slide 29] Hi, everyone. So, many of you have probably already heard about ED*Facts* Modernization that will be taking place not this year, but next year, in the 2022-23 data cycle. I'm just going to briefly present a broad overview of the changes to expect and then speak a little bit about the importance of data notes as it relates to those anticipated changes. Next slide, please.

[slide 30] So, these next two slides I'm going to show you are actually from a previously presented ED*Facts* Modernization webinar from September of last year, 2022, and can be accessed on the ED*Facts* community website, the link to which is on the bottom of this slide. What you see here is basically our current ED*Facts* cycle, the one that we've been having the last couple of years and what will occur also for this year for 2021-22.

So, states submit their data by the due date to the ED*Facts* Submission System, or ESS. Some business rules, though not all, are applied during the submission process. Once that submission window closes, OESE will then pull the data and begin its data quality review. After it completes its review, it will send back the results of that data quality review in the form of business rule flags and comments, or error messages, that explain why a particular file flagged. Then states are required to resubmit files or respond to those data quality findings. As I said, this will also be what you'll see this year for 2021-22. But as many of you know, the next year will be a different procedure, a different process. So, next slide.

[slide 31] This is what the new modernized ED*Facts* cycle will look like. Business rules will be applied during pre-submission. States will submit their data by the due date through a new system called EDPass. The reason or the logic behind this is that data will be usable once submitted. The ideal is to not have post-submission data quality review for anything that has been submitted through EDPass. So, the main difference with modernization is there'll be one data quality review due date as opposed to two. There won't be an initial and resubmission, just the one initial, and much of the data quality review will be conducted prior to the due date by SEAs. This new EDPass system will allow states to run their data through a data quality system to check against business rules prior to submission. We're not going to go into the details about this new EDPass system here. There are additional resources related to this and other topics on modernization available on the ED*Facts* community website, including a more recent December webinar that goes through some of the most up to date details on how the system is likely to work. Next slide, please.

[slide 32] So, this brings us to the topic of data notes and best practices. It's going to be really important for states to submit clear, accurate, and informative data notes, especially once modernization takes effect in the 2022-23 cycle. We should consider this year, 2021-22, as an opportunity to improve the data quality and usefulness of the data notes, especially to prepare for modernization. Next slide.

[slide 33] What are data notes? Well, as you know, SEAs are required to respond to any data quality feedback that is sent to them by ED, whether that's after the first close and before the second, as it has worked up until now and will work again this upcoming year, or as in modernization prior to that first and only close.

But in addition, SEAs are also allowed to submit data notes with their data, both within the state submission plan (SSP), through the ED*Facts* Submission System, ESS, and the CSPR tool, and I might add, next year through the EDPass system as well. Now, data notes that adequately address the underlying data concerns provide context to the Department to understand and review the data that SEAs submit. It's also really important to potential users, once the data's released to the public, in that it accompanies the actual data to help users interpret what they're seeing. Next slide, please.

[slide 34] So, some basic best practices. Data notes should always be concise, they should explain a problem or large change contained in the data, they can explain why data have not been submitted if they haven't been, they can explain steps that the SEA is taking to correct the data, and they can explain why the data are accurate, even though a particular ED*Facts* business rule was triggered. We do see some common mistakes related to data notes, however. Next slide.

[slide 35] The five most common SEA mistakes with regard to including notes in their data include using the same note that was used in a previous collection window, even though it's out of date and not relevant. It includes notes for a data point that don't actually apply to the data. So, submitting a note regarding ELP assessment participation along with, say, the immigrant file spec 045. Including a data note for a business rule that isn't relevant to the business rule. So, submitting a note about a large year to year change in home languages when asked to explain a comment from us about a data flag in the assessment data.

Including a note referring to statutory requirements, especially without different additional context. Business rule flags are primarily based on ED's interpretation of statutory requirements. So, adding a statutory requirement without additional explanation isn't going to help the Department understand why the SEA has reported the data in the way that it did and, at times, could lead to data notes being suppressed if the quoted statutory requirements or policy interpretation is incorrect.

Finally, including notes that are unclear and confusing. So, "data are correct." "We don't think this is a data error" or "This is the same methodology we used last year". If you believe the data are correct, tell us why. Give us a good explanation as to why it looks the way it does. If you don't think there's been a

data error, tell us why that is. The more information you give in concise and clear language explaining why we're seeing what we're seeing, the better it is for us and really the better it is for users of the data once we do publish this. Next slide.

[slide 36] In contrast, the following are examples of different types of notes that help clarify data and therefore are likely to reduce the number of corrections that the SEA will be asked to make.

Errors and anomalies in submitted data can trigger data quality flags for a number of reasons. For example, providing explanations for incomplete or incorrect data for reasons that are out of the SEA's control. So, a good example: "We encountered an error in the system and were unable to complete the upload. Partner Support has been contacted for assistance" and give us a ticket number. Perfect. That gives us a link to figure out and trace what actually happened. "We realize that the data are incorrect. We will correct them during the reopening period." That's something that you can use one more year. You won't be able to use that, of course, next year because there won't be a reopening period.

Other situations, policy changes or other statewide non-data related changes that could impact what you're submitting. "Due to a restructuring of our Title III statewide consortium, there was a large drop in the number of LEAs receiving Title III funds in our state." Also, demographic changes, changes in your population that were unexpected, can often lead to data that flag because there are changes that we wouldn't normally expect. Things like "Our exit criteria changed in this particular year, which resulted in significantly more students leaving Title III services. So, comparing this year to prior years would be impacted by this change." That's a perfectly reasonable explanation that tells us something that will give us information that will help us with the submission and understand what's going on. Next slide.

[slide 37] There could also be state-specific situations or practices. So, for example, "The number of immigrant students has increased as our general population has increased. Accuracy of student identification has also improved with training of school staff. Both factors may result in larger changes than expected compared to the prior year. The current counts reflect more accurate identification." So, it's clear, it's concise, but it gives us just enough information to understand what's going on. Again, "Due to demographic changes, the number of ELs/the number of ELs participating in the annual ELP assessment increased by more than XX percent during the last 5 years." Okay. Just as simple as "due to demographic changes" if in fact that's the case. Other things like "Due to a small EL population in our state, most of our LEAs have difficulty employing teachers who are fully certified ESL teachers." So, if this is the teacher data that looks unusual or flags, an explanation like that would be helpful.

So, the more concise, the clearer, the more specific you are in terms of explaining the data that you submit, the easier it is for the Department, and the more usable it will be for future users. Next slide, please.

[slide 38] For this year's window, these are the relevant due dates for both ED*Facts* December and CSPR Part I. As noted earlier, for the school year 2021-22, there will be a reopening period for both data submissions as well. For those new to the process, we have coordinated the due dates so that the CSPR manual entry typically opens two weeks before the CSPR submission date and is usually scheduled to close at 5:00 PM the day following the due date for corresponding ED*Facts* data. So, we try to keep them parallel. ED*Facts* will usually close at midnight on a Wednesday and CSPR manual entry related to that data will close on a Thursday at 5:00 PM. So, if you have questions about that, if you have questions related to the modernization that's not too technical, we will take your questions. So, next slide, the Q&A.

Leticia Braga:

[slide 39] Thank you, Keith. No Q&A at the moment. I think your explanations were clear to me, hopefully to others as well. A couple of important points to highlight there are that the data notes really

do help us in the review process to understand why you may be submitting data in a certain way. We don't like to suppress data notes, if at all possible. We want to publish them because that's the data that the public will be looking at on our website on ED Data Express and they'll be using data notes for context. So, the more that you can make those clear, the more it helps us in our review and the more it ensures that those data notes will be added to the final published data.

Let's see here. Submission windows for school year 2022-23. Keith, I'll see if you want to elaborate on anything there; I don't believe those have been established yet. However, under ED*Facts* Modernization, my understanding, and we're, I'll say from the program office perspective, still learning about this as well. I think we all are as the system gets ready to roll out. But the submission dates will actually be a little bit later. It gives you more time to do those checks on the front end. So, we think that's going to be helpful. But the goal there is to give states more time to submit the data so that you can run all those business rules and ensure that once the data's submitted, it is accurate, as accurate as possible because again, there won't be an opportunity for resubmission. But I'll turn it over to Keith if I misspoke about anything or if you want to add anything to that, Keith.

Keith McNamara:

Yeah. They haven't published the 2022-23 submission window yet. As Leticia mentioned, we anticipate it's going to be a little bit later than the typical December window. In anticipation of that, prior to that, there'll be an opportunity for states to run their business rules, do their data quality checks so that when the due date does arrive, you'll be ready for it and you'll have better quality data and you'll be able to prepare your data notes. So, at least that is the goal. We don't have dates yet unfortunately.

Leticia Braga:

Thank you. Of course, your ED*Facts* coordinator should be an important resource in providing that information as it comes through ED*Facts* and the Partner Support Community contacts. They'll be, I think, one of the first to hear, but we'll also be providing that information as we get it in our upcoming webinars. There was a question about the link to webinars; that will be in one of the upcoming slides. We can also post it in the chat. That's essentially our main Title III website where we've been posting those resources. So, with that, I think we can move on. Again, if you have additional questions, feel free to drop them in and you can always follow up with our team after the webinar.

[slide 40] I'll briefly go over some additional TA products and events. Next slide.

[slide 41] We're very excited to launch our first Community of Practice series. The focus of this first Community of Practice is Language Instruction Educational Programs (LIEPs). We want to understand how states are defining LIEPs for their districts, of course, in conjunction with the information that comes from ED. Any challenges that you see in how districts and schools are reporting this information and rolling it up to SEA reporting, if you can learn from each other regarding best practices or problem solving for some of these issues. But the first webinar is really going to be an opportunity to gather some information that can help inform the subsequent webinars. We did want to offer you the dates for all of the webinars because a Community of Practice is most effective if folks are able to participate throughout the series. With that in mind, we sent out an email on Tuesday regarding the registration for the first date.

Subsequent to that, it came to my attention that that might conflict with some of the sessions in the NAESPA conference that some of you may want to attend, and we want to ensure as much as possible that folks are able to join us. So, we've switched the date for the first Community of Practice gathering from, I believe it was February 2 to February 6. I'll be sending a follow-up email about that. But the registration link remains the same. So, if you click on the registration link from the original email, you'll

be able to see the updated date with the time there, and Elizabeth also provided the link in the chat as well. So, we really hope you're able to join us. We'll be gathering some information during that first convening to be able to inform the remaining sessions. If you have any questions about that, please do reach out and we'll do our best to accommodate and address as we go, since this will be the first series that we're launching. Next slide.

[slide 42] Again, the registration for the first session, the link is here and also in the chat, and I will also be sending a follow-up email with the updated date for your reference. If you did not receive that email, please do reach out through the Title III mailbox because again, we want to ensure that these emails are going to the right folks. We try to maintain a list of the Title III coordinators. There's only one per state. So, again, as long as someone who's primarily working on Title III is receiving these, that is our goal. We're also going to be disseminating this through the *EDFacts* network so that *EDFacts* coordinators also receive this information in parallel. Next slide.

[slide 43] All right. Another thing that we're very excited about is that we've rolled out a couple of TA resources that you'll also find on our website. The first is a Title III data reporting process infographic, and it's going to give you an overview of the data lifecycle. Again, for some of you, this may be very well-worn information, but we do get a lot of new Title III coordinators, folks who maybe aren't as deeply enmeshed in the data collections and submissions, and so we thought this would be a useful resource. There's also, on the second page of this, where we only have a screenshot here, but if you go to the resource, you'll also see some communication strategies that are listed. I'll note that some of this will be changing given *EDFacts* Modernization, some of what's laid out here may no longer apply for next year, but we did want to provide it for the purpose of this year, and we'll update it as needed once we know more about how the *EDFacts* Modernization and *EDPass* system will function. Next slide.

[slide 44] This is a document that I'm particularly excited about, which is the Title III *EDFacts* Data Collections Crosswalk, because it's about a four-page document that really goes in depth about the different files that are submitted to the Title III program for review and how they relate to one another. I know it can get confusing, especially for someone who's new to this work, figuring out which files go where. Some are only reporting for Title III, some are for all ELs. So, we're hoping, again, while this is an overview, that it'll provide a really nice quick guide to understand which file specifications are coming in for review in the Title III program. We welcome any feedback. If you catch anything there that you think is wrong or if you find something particularly useful, please reach out to the mailbox because we'd love to hear about that and incorporate any feedback into subsequent TA documents that we'll be rolling out. Next slide.

[slide 45] With that in mind, additional forthcoming products, we're hoping to launch a Guide to Collecting and Reporting Title III Data. We do recognize that we're kind of mid-cycle already for the 2021-22 submission. But we're hoping that this can be a broader reference document for you and then we'll figure out how to adapt that for *EDFacts* Modernization. We're also working on a video overview of data reporting and resources for new SEA Title III and *EDFacts* coordinators. This really is a compilation of some of the infographics so that there's a quick overview of how these pieces come together for someone who is initially joining the team and working on this data. Then we're also anticipating a few additional infographics specific to the Title III CSPR data submission, as well as the Title III *EDFacts* data submission. As those are available, we will reach out and/or roll them out during subsequent webinars. Next slide.

[slide 46] All right. So, we get to the wrap up. We can go to the next slide.

[slide 47] Just some updates here. Again, materials, as Fariba noted, from the last webinar and the TA resources that I just noted are now available. The link is here, and I believe Fariba also added it to the chat, so you should be able to access that information. If it hasn't been added yet, we can certainly add

the link. But I think I see it there. Then for any questions, we do want to be clear about where you should be submitting your questions, though of course, if something comes in to us that isn't directly for us, we will always forward it to our appropriate colleagues within ED. Questions about the data quality effort in general or feedback on the TA documents, please go ahead and send those to the Title III mailbox that's listed here.

Please continue to send specific questions related to your state's *EDFacts* data to [EDFacts@ed.gov](mailto:EDFacts@ed.gov). Again, some of those questions can be directly addressed by *EDFacts*. Others, they do send to us and collaborate with us in responding, but please do submit it to their mailbox. You're welcome to copy the Title III mailbox, but those primarily go to them. Then questions related to the state's CSPR data go to [CSPR@ed.gov](mailto:CSPR@ed.gov). Again, you're welcome to copy the Title III mailbox if you want to ensure that we see those right away. Okay. Next slide.

[slide 48] This is a list of resources. You can see these in the slides that are already posted on our website, but we do like to repeat these because we think they're important to share. We have the Consolidated State Performance page where you can see some of the resources, the *EDFacts* file specifications, which are a critical reference, and I'll note that a lot of the SY 2022-23 file specifications have already been posted, not all, but many of them for Title III as well as other programs. So, you can reference those to understand what the requirements will be for next year.

*EDFacts* File Due Dates, again, I don't believe that those are available yet for next year, but for the current iteration, the timelines are laid out there. The *EDFacts* Business Rules Single Inventory, which we discussed a lot today, also a great resource looking at that Excel document, and thank you, Elizabeth, for posting the direct links in the chat. A new one that we've added here is *EDFacts* Modernization, including links to previous webinars that *EDFacts* has already rolled out because that'll be your primary source of information for what's to come. Next slide.

[slide 49] All right. So, before I get to this, I'm just looking in the chat here that, yes, we're verifying that the first Community of Practice session has been rescheduled to February 6. It was originally on February 2, but that conflicts with the NAESPA conference, so it now will be occurring on Monday, February 6. All right. So, again, feel free to add any additional questions. We'll stay on for a couple of minutes. We do really appreciate feedback from you.

You will see a pop-up when you log out from the webinar. You will also be receiving an email to the email that you registered with after the webinar with a quick optional survey, though we do encourage you to fill it out because it's very helpful to us, with any feedback on this webinar that you'd like to provide and any additional feedback or considerations, especially for the upcoming Community of Practice. We try to the extent possible to incorporate the feedback into our upcoming events.

All right. So, thank you, Elizabeth added the link to our Title III Performance page, which will have the links to the prior webinars, as well as the TA resources that I just referenced. Any final questions before we wrap up for the day? I don't see any yet, but I will pause for a moment. Maybe not a full teacher pause, but pause for a moment to see if anything comes in. Well, if not, again, thank you for the questions that you submitted. Hopefully, we've answered them. If not, as always, feel free to follow up through the Title III mailbox and we look forward to hopefully seeing you at the Community of Practice and future webinars. So, thanks again for joining today. Thanks for hanging in there through a very weedy topic that Fariba did a great job in covering, and thanks to Keith for presenting on modernization and the data notes, and we look forward to seeing you next time.