

MEP CSPR Part II RATING INSTRUMENT for SY 2016-17

Name of State:		
Reviewer:		Date Reviewed:

Action to be Taken (place an "x" next to the appropriate rating:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rated UNACCEPTABLE: If 1) any question that requires a complete response is not answered accurately and completely, or 2) any quantitative data check for 2.3.2.1 through 2.3.8.2 reveals a data check error, or 3) eligible students exceed enrolled students in 1.3.1 and 1.3.2, or 4) all questions with 4 points available average less than 75%, the CSPR will be rated UNACCEPTABLE. The OME reviewer will call the SEA and provide an explanation (with embedded comments) for revision and resubmission by the SEA.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Rated ACCEPTABLE: If all qualitative responses are answered completely and require only minor comments, all data checks do not include errors, and only eligible migrant students are reported as participating in statewide assessments, the CSPR will be rated as ACCEPTABLE.
Summary of Questions for State:	

Directions for OME Reviewer: Complete the following instrument by: 1) providing, if necessary, the "Data Quality Issue" column any data quality issue that may have occurred within the SEA responses, 2) within the "Notes/Response" column, elaborating specific details for the data quality issues in the questions that begin with 2.3.2.1 through 1.3.2/2.3.1.1, and 3) leaving "blank" cells within the "Data Quality Issue" column in which the reviewer has found no data quality issues. Last, summarize questions for the State in the table above, to the right of "Summary of Questions for State."

* If the State MEP has increased/decreased its Category 1 Count by 10%, review all increased/decreased quantitative responses within this context.

CSPR Section	Question	Notes/Response	
2.3.1	Accuracy of Count	If inaccurate, note with an "x" under Issues.	
2.3.1.1	Category 1 Count	Please review.	
2.3.1.1.2	Birth Through Two Eligible	Please review.	
2.3.1.2	Category 2 Count	Please review.	
2.3.1.2.2	B-2 Served S/I	Please review.	
2.3.1.3.1 (1 st box)	SIS – Data System	Must be completed.	
2.3.1.3.1 (Table 1)	SIS – Cat. 2	Must be completed.	
2.3.1.3.1 (2 nd box)	SIS – Cat. 2 Different Data System?	Complete only if answer to previous box is "no."	
CSPR Section	Question	Notes/Response	Data Quality Issue
2.3.2.1	PFS Eligible		
2.3.2.2	LEP Eligible		
2.3.2.3	IDEA Eligible		
2.3.2.4	QAD		
2.3.2.5	QAD During RY		
2.3.2.6	Referrals PP		

MEP CSPR Part II RATING INSTRUMENT for SY 2016-17

2.3.2.8.1	Dropouts		
2.3.2.8.2	HSEDs		
2.3.3.1	Served RY		
2.3.3.2	PFS Served RY		
2.3.4.2	PFS Served S/I		
2.3.5	Services PP		
2.3.5.1	PFS Served PP		
2.3.5.2	COS PP		
2.3.5.3	IS PP		
2.3.5.3.1	Type of IS for PP		
2.3.5.3.2	Support Services/Counseling for PP		
2.3.6.1	Schools and Enrollment RY		
2.3.6.2	Consolidated SWP RY		
2.3.7.1	Type of MEP Project		
1.3.1 and 2.3.1.1	Math Participation/Eligibility		
1.3.2 and 2.3.1.1	Reading/LA Participation/Eligibility		

RATING (PROVIDE A NUMERICAL VALUE)	QUESTIONS WITH SUGGESTED CRITICAL ELEMENTS	REVIEWER COMMENTS
	<p><u>2.3.1.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases</u> Explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1 greater than 10%.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Compare current total of Category 1 Child Count with the total for Category 1 Child Count from previous year to confirm the State's reported difference.</p> <p>RATING: Complete and Accurate = 2, Incomplete/Issues = 1</p> <p><u>Complete and Accurate (2):</u> contains <i>specific</i> information for the increase or decrease, based upon changes within the state, e.g., several large agricultural employers are no longer in business, an early freeze resulted in major crop loss, and/or Immigration and Customs Enforcement fined several employers for inappropriate hiring practices causing several employees to leave or be detained.</p> <p><u>Incomplete/Issues (1):</u> contains <i>vague</i> information or "unknown reasons" for the increase or decrease, e.g., more students entered the program, less students qualified, unknown, and the economy has worsened.</p>	
	<p><u>2.3.1.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases</u> Explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 2 greater than 10%.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Compare current total of Category 2 Child Count with the total for Category 2 Child Count from previous year to confirm the State's reported difference.</p> <p>RATING: Complete and Accurate = 2, Incomplete/Issues = 1</p> <p><u>Complete and Accurate (2):</u> contains <i>specific</i> information for the increase or decrease, based upon changes within the state, e.g., many migrant children attended summer programs funded with other Federal and State funds which resulted in the MEP serving fewer children, , few migrant families arrived this summer due to a shortage in housing, several large agricultural employers are no longer in business, an early freeze resulted in major crop loss, and/or Immigration and Customs Enforcement fined several employers for inappropriate hiring practices causing several employees to leave or be detained.</p> <p><u>Incomplete/Issues (1):</u> contains <i>vague</i> information or "unknown reasons" for the increase or decrease, e.g., more students entered the program, less students qualified, unknown, and the economy has worsened.</p>	

RATING (PROVIDE A NUMERICAL VALUE)	QUESTIONS WITH SUGGESTED CRITICAL ELEMENTS	REVIEWER COMMENTS
	<p><u>2.3.1.3.3 Method(s) Used to Count Students. (4 BOXES)</u> (1st Box in Section 2.3.1.3.3)</p> <p>Question 2.3.1.3.3 collects information about the methods that States use to collect counts of migrant students. When providing a written response, ensure that you describe your state-specific information as it applies to eligibility requirements, rather than using generic examples that are provided below.</p> <p>The State's written response <i>MUST</i> describe its process for only including children who were at least three years of age and less than 22 years of age for at least one day of the performance period of 9/1/2016 to 8/31/2017 and met all of the program eligibility criteria, including the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Only children ages 3- 21; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <i>e.g., the State's algorithm accounts for the child's date of birth such that the child was at least three years of age and less than 22 years of age for at least one day of the performance period of 9/1/2016 to 8/31/2017.</i> o <i>e.g., during SY 2016-17 performance period, the State's database looks at children born after September 1, 1994 and before September 1, 2014.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> only children who were within 36 months of a QAD; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <i>e.g., the State MEP database automatically calculates an end of eligibility date 36 months from every child's qualifying arrival date. The State's algorithm then ensures that each child's end of eligibility date does not occur before 9/1/2016.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> only children who resided in your State for at least one day during the child count period; for 2-year olds who turned three during the child count period, include a description of the State's process for ensuring that these two year olds resided in your State for at least one day after they turned three years old; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <i>e.g., MEP staff conducted a home visit after September 1 and before August 31 for every child included in the Category 1 count to verify their residency in the State. A residency date is then recorded in the State's data system. The State's child count algorithm ensures that only children with a residency date between September 1, 2016 and August 31, 2017 are included in the Category 1 count.</i> o <i>e.g., MEP staff conducted a home visit after September 1 and before August 31 for every child in the Category 1 count who was not enrolled in school. For every child who was enrolled in school, MEP staff verified the child's residence via school attendance records. A residency date is then recorded in the State's data system. The State's child count algorithm ensures that only children with a residency date between September 1, 2016 and August 31, 2017 are included in the Category 1 count.</i> 	

MEP CSPR Part II RATING INSTRUMENT for SY 2016-17

- *e.g., local project staff run a monthly report of every two-year old turning three during that month. A MEP recruiter visits every family on the list after each child turns three to verify that the child was a resident in the State during the performance period and after s/he turned three. A residency date is then recorded in the State's data system. The State's child count algorithm ensures that only children with a residency date between September 1, 2016 and August 31, 2017 are included in the Category 1 count.*
- only unique children in Category 1, and eliminates duplicate students within its State MEP database;
 - *e.g., before a new student record can be created, the system checks for duplication based on the student's last name or similar last name by using a system-generated wild card prompt. Potential duplicates are then checked against additional fields such as first name, birth date and parents' names. Any matches generate further review by data staff.*
 - *e.g., if a record does not already exist for a student, the database creates a unique student identification (USID) for him/her.*
 - *e.g., once the student has a record in the State MEP database, State and/or local MEP staff run local project reports in conjunction with unique student count reports to provide a continuous verification of student enrollment into the system.*
 - *e.g., once the student has a record in the State MEP Database, LOAs verify their child counts by using other MEP database reports, certificates of eligibility (COEs), data entry logs, the maximum enrollment line for Category 1, and local databases to ensure that all identified students have been included in the Category 1 and Category 2 Counts and to eliminate any duplications.*
 - *e.g., as part of the clean-up process and before the State takes a snapshot of its database for purposes of child count reporting, State MEP staff work with LOAs to review their Duplicate Student reports to ensure that all potential duplicates have been checked and any duplicates have been merged into a single student record.*
- children who graduated from high school in the performance period are NOT included in the subsequent performance period's (SY 2017-18) child count;
 - *e.g., students who graduate from high school are flagged for removal from the State's database during the subsequent performance period.*
- for the Category 2 count, only a subset of the Category 1 children who received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term;
 - *e.g., for each new or updated COE for the Category 1 Count, a history line with an "R" (regular term enrollment) or "P" (participant or residency only for a student who is not enrolled in school) flag is created in the State data system. A history line with an "S" (summer school enrollment) or "I" (year round school intersession enrollment) flag is created for each summer enrollment for the Category 2 Count. In order for a child to be counted in the Category 2 Count, he or she must meet all of the above criteria and have an "S" or "I" flag associated with his/her history line during the corresponding child count reporting period.. Additionally, in order to count a child for a summer service, the child must have turned three before receiving the service.*

RATING:

Bull's Eye = 4, On-Target = 3, Getting Close = 2, Missed the Mark = 1

(2nd Box in Section 2.3.1.3.3)

How does the State ensure that the system that transmits migrant data to the Department accurately accounts for all the migrant children in every ED *Facts* data file?

The State's information *MUST* include a statement about the specific process that the State uses to ensure that all migrant children counted in every ED *Facts* file are matched with migrant children contained within the State's database and the State's migrant specific database. This process should ensure that all migrant children who participate in statewide assessments *ARE identified* as eligible migrant children within the State's migrant specific database and that all eligible migrant children within the State's migrant specific database *ARE APPROPRIATELY CODED AND REPORTED* as part of the migrant subgroup for State assessments. While every State may have a different process, the process of matching migrant children in each database is typically accomplished through a process using multiple fields that are contained in both the migrant specific database and the State's database.

RATING:

Bull's Eye = 4, On-Target = 3, Getting Close = 2, Missed the Mark = 1

	<p>(Table 1 and 3rd Box in Section 2.3.1.3.3) If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.</p> <p>If MSIX is not used to verify data quality, do NOT provide information within this box. If MSIX is used to verify data quality, the State's written response <i>should</i> include a statement about the process that the State uses to ensure that all migrant children with a SEA unique identifier in every ED<i>Facts</i> file are matched with the migrant children contained within MSIX.</p> <p><u>RATING:</u> <u>Bull's Eye = 4, On-Target = 3, Getting Close = 2, Missed the Mark = 1</u></p>	
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

RATING (PROVIDE A NUMERICAL VALUE)	QUESTIONS WITH SUGGESTED CRITICAL ELEMENTS	REVIEWER COMMENTS
	<p>2.3.1.3.4 Quality Control Processes (5 Boxes)</p>	
	<p>(Tables 1 and 2, and 1st Box in Section 2.3.1.3.4)</p> <p>Describe any reasons children were determined ineligible in the re-interviewing process.</p> <p>The State's written response <i>MUST</i> include specific information that explains the circumstances surrounding ineligible children, e.g., non-qualifying move, non-qualifying work, non-qualifying age. Provide the number of children associated with each major ineligibility issue that demonstrates the move was not a qualifying move.</p> <p><u>RATING:</u> <u>Bull's Eye = 4, On-Target = 3, Getting Close = 2, Missed the Mark = 1</u></p>	

RATING (PROVIDE A NUMERICAL VALUE)	QUESTIONS WITH SUGGESTED CRITICAL ELEMENTS	REVIEWER COMMENTS
	<p>(Table 3 and 2nd Box in Section 2.3.1.3.4)</p> <p><i>IF the sampling was stratified by group/area, please describe the procedures.</i> If stratified sampling was not used, in other words the State used a statewide simple random sample, do not complete this box. The State's written response <i>MUST</i> include the groups (e.g., regions or counties) that were selected for random samples, and explain how subgroups, e.g., temporary, seasonal, ELL, are contained in the sample.</p> <p><u>RATING:</u> <u>Bull's Eye = 4, On-Target = 3, Getting Close = 2, Missed the Mark = 1</u></p>	
	<p>(3rd Box in Section 2.3.1.3.4)</p> <p>Please describe the sampling replacement by the State.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> If the State oversampled, the State's written response <i>MUST</i> include information regarding the projected number of re-interviews, and the actual number of re-interviews that took place. <input type="checkbox"/> If the State did not oversample, please describe the sampling replacement process. The State's written response <i>MUST</i> include how the replacement is systematic and included either sampling from the entire list or sampling from multiple sampling lists. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o e.g., if the State needed to complete 72 re-interviews and it was not able to locate 10 of the first 72 children on its list (assuming the State used a simple random sample), explain how the State replaced those 10 children with other children. <p><u>RATING:</u> <u>Complete and Accurate = 2, Incomplete/Issues = 1</u></p>	

RATING (PROVIDE A NUMERICAL VALUE)	QUESTIONS WITH SUGGESTED CRITICAL ELEMENTS	REVIEWER COMMENTS
	<p>(Table 4 and 4th Box in Section 2.3.1.3.4) If you conducted independent re-interviews in this performance period, describe how you ensured that the process was independent. This explanation should include how the State ensured independent re-interviewers (i.e., interviewers who are neither SEA or LOA staff members working to administer or operate the State MEP nor any other persons who worked on the initial eligibility determinations being tested) from the original interviewers, and the specific training those independent re-interviewers received.</p> <p><u>RATING:</u> <u>Complete and Accurate = 2, Incomplete/Issues = 1</u></p>	
	<p>(5th Box in Section 2.3.1.3.4) In the space below, refer to the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA, and if any of the migrant children were found ineligible, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations.</p> <p>If the State found no ineligible migrant children in the re-interview process, the State does not complete this box. If the State found ineligible migrant children in its re-interview process, the State <i>MUST</i> provide corrective actions or improvements that the SEA will make to improve its accuracy of MEP eligibility determinations. The improvements must include specific actions that address the SEA's specific eligibility determination issues, e.g. improvement of the recruiter training plan, improvement of the SEA plan for monitoring COEs, etc.)</p> <p><u>RATING:</u> <u>Complete and Accurate = 2, Incomplete/Issues = 1</u></p>	

	<p><u>1.3.1 Number of Migratory Students to Receive a Valid Score in the Mathematics Assessment</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Ensure that the number of students enrolled and received a valid score does not exceed the number of eligible students in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and HS in section 2.3.1.1.</p>	<p>PLEASE USE DATA CHECK INSTRUMENT TO VALIDATE DATA</p>
	<p><u>1.3.2 Number of Migratory Students to Receive a Valid Score in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Ensure that the number of students enrolled and received a valid score does not exceed the number of eligible students in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and HS in section 2.3.1.1.</p>	<p>PLEASE USE DATA CHECK INSTRUMENT TO VALIDATE DATA</p>