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The mission of the Office of Migrant Education is to provide excellent leadership, technical assistance, and financial support to improve the educational opportunities and academic success of migratory children, youth, agricultural workers, fishers, and their families.
BACKGROUND: TITLE I, PART C – MEP STATE ALLOCATIONS

Title I, Part C - MEP allocations to State educational agencies (SEAs) are based on a statutory formula that uses two migratory child counts:

1. The average number of identified eligible migratory children aged 3 through 21 residing in the State, based on data for the preceding 3 years (commonly abbreviated as “Category I” or “eligible” migratory children) and

2. The number of identified eligible migratory children, aged 3 through 21, who received MEP-funded services in summer or intersession programs provided by the State during the previous year (commonly abbreviated as “Category II” or “summer-served” migratory children).

(see section 1303(a)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended)
BACKGROUND: THE MIGRANT STUDENT INFORMATION EXCHANGE (MSIX)

• MSIX is a web-based platform developed and maintained by the Department that accepts data from State migrant-specific databases.

• MSIX creates a single, consolidated record of student-level data for each child.

• Since 2016, MEP grantees have been required to collect and submit to MSIX minimum data elements (MDEs) (such as child name and other demographic data, school and program enrollment information) for the migratory children in their State.

• The primary purposes of MSIX are to facilitate school enrollment, grade and course placement, secondary credit accrual, and participation in the MEP.

• All States are regularly submitting the critical MDEs needed to generate the two types of migratory child counts from MSIX.
CURRENT AND PROPOSED DATA SOURCES

• **Current Source/Method:** Each State applies its own child count methodology to the data in its State migrant-specific database. States report these counts to the Department annually through EDFACTS/Consolidated State Performance Reports (CSPRs).

• **Proposed Source/Method:** The Department would apply a single, uniform child count methodology to the data submitted by States to MSIX from States’ migrant specific databases.
RATIONALE

• Based on our work with States to improve data quality and understand differences between State and MSIX produced counts (child count reconciliation), we have concluded that States may be over- or under-counting the number of eligible migratory children in their State, due to factors such as:

1. Submission of duplicate child counts;
2. Inconsistent database coding of children whose MEP eligibility has expired but who States still serve under the “continuation of services” provision of the MEP program statute (ESEA section 1304(e)); and
3. Insufficient documentation that each child included in the State’s annual count was in the State for at least one day during the performance reporting period (enrollment date, withdrawal date, residency date, residency verification date).
4. Failure to properly document that an eligible migratory child was at least three years old at the time he/she received MEP-funded summer services.

• In addition, States have identified inaccuracies in the child counts they reported to the Department that were due to human error and communication failures at the State level.
BENEFITS

1. Improve consistency in how child counts are calculated and the accuracy of those counts;

2. Reduce the risk to the Department and SEAs of improper payment stemming from a State over-reporting child counts (an issue for three States in FY 2020); and

3. Reduce the burden on SEA and Department staff associated with preparation and review of CSPR submissions.
PRELIMINARY CSPR VS. MSIX CATEGORY I CHILD COUNTS: 2019-20

• MSIX count matches CSPR: 7 States

• MSIX count w/in 1% of CSPR: 11 States (MSIX count is greater for 6 of those States)

• MSIX count w/in 1.1 - 5% of CSPR: 15 States (MSIX count is greater for 5 of those States)

• MSIX count w/in 5.1 – 10% of CSPR: 6 States (MSIX count is greater for 1 of those States)

• MSIX count is more than 10% greater than CSPR: 2 States

• MSIX count is more than 10% less than CSPR: 5 States
PROPOSED TIMELINE

December 2021 and Early 2022: Produce 2020-21 child count data from MSIX using snapshot dates in early December (aligned to December 15 CSPR deadline) and the TBD CSPR re-submission deadline. Share with each State to compare to State-generated child counts.

July 2022: After July 1 awards are issued, share hypothetical allocations, based on use of MSIX-generated 2020-21 child counts.

Late 2022: Finalize the MSIX child count logic

December 2022 and Early 2023: Produce 2021-22 child count data from MSIX using snapshot dates in early December and early 2023

Early 2023: Provide States with FY 2023 July 1 award estimates

July 2023: FY 2023 award allocations using 2021-22 Category I and Category II child counts generated by MSIX
OTHER ACTIONS

• Throughout the process, we plan to engage in communication and technical assistance with States (e.g., webinars, small group meetings, direct communication with individual grantees) to address your questions and concerns. In addition, we will:

  o Assist States in identifying root causes of, and resolving as appropriate, significant discrepancies between State-generated and MSIX-generated child counts.

  o Fine-tune the MSIX child count logic based on self-identified issues and those identified by MEP stakeholders.

  o Work with Department staff and grantees to identify and remove items from the CSPR that would be duplicative and unnecessary given the transition to MSIX.
QUESTIONS?
BREAKOUT DISCUSSION

Please share your initial feedback on OME’s proposal.

• What are your primary concerns? Please be as specific as possible.
• Does the timeline seem reasonable?
• Are there additional benefits to this approach that we should note?
• Do you have any specific recommendations for how we can continue to engage with grantees on this topic over the next 1-2 years and is there specific technical assistance that would be beneficial?
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