Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) Qualitative Data Submissions: For SY 2019-20

Migrant Education Program (MEP) Webinar
December 16, 2020
3:00 pm – 4:30 pm ET

OME Mission
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.
Before We Get Started!

1. Dial-in Number: +1 202-991-0393,
   Access Code: 819 682 923#

2. Participate! Ask Questions!
   – Use the “Raise Hand” feature
   – Use the chat box
   – Just ask 😊

3. Listen

4. Speak – Unmute your microphone

5. Anything Else?
Legal References for CSPR and EDFacts Collection

**Title VIII. General Provisions:** Part C, Section 8303, Consolidated Reporting (ESEA, as amended through P.L. 115-64).

**Code of Federal Regulations:** 34 CFR 76.720

Applies to a State’s reports required under 2 CFR 200.328 (Monitoring and Reporting of Program Performance) and 2 CFR 200.327 (Financial Reporting).

**Guidance:** MEP Guidance, March 2017, Chapter IX. Program Performance and Child Count Reporting, pages 96-105.
Purpose of CSPR Webinar

OME seeks to:

• Improve resources to assist State Migrant Education Programs (MEPs) in fulfilling qualitative data reporting requirements, and

• Improve “first-submission” accuracy by providing examples and data quality tools to State MEPs.

• Inform States on CSPR Qualitative data submission processes.
CSPR Webinar Objectives

• Discuss CSPR Part II
• Address MEP Glossary
• Review CSPR Part II Data Quality Errors
• Review MEP CSPR Part II Rating Instrument
• Discuss CSPR Part II Qualitative Questions including Child Count Methodology and Quality Control Processes (Re-interview)
What is CSPR Part II?

The CSPR Part II provides timely information on the implementation of the States’ approved Consolidated State Plans, to include program-specific performance information.
In order to complete CSPR/EDFacts accurately, you should review the MEP CSPR Glossary with its key terms and definitions.

OME will share the MEP CSPR Glossary via MEPSTATE Listserv.
CSPR Part II
2018-19 Results

Child Counts Methodology Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial Submission</th>
<th>Final Submission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Acceptable</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SY 2019-20 CSPR Part II Process

• EMAPS will no longer serve as the tool used for the CSPR manual entry submission
• OESE will launch a new tool using *Illume* that States will use for their CSPR manual entry submission.
• ED*Facts* data will not populate the CSPR collection tool but will still need to be submitted separately via the ED*Facts* Submission System (ESS).
Helpful Resources for Submission

• Data Check Sheet (with instructions)
• MEP CSPR Rating Instrument
• MEP CSPR/EDFACTs Glossary
• Results Website: https://results.ed.gov/
• MEP NRG (Chapter IX) MS WORD
MEP CSPR Part II Rating Instrument Tool

• Is intended to be a resource to States to better understand how OME reviews CSPR submissions.

• Gives examples of the types of information OME expects to find in the States CSPR Part II submission as it relates to methods for counting eligible children and quality control processes.

• States should **NOT** complete the CSPR rating instrument.
2.4.1.2 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

Explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1 greater than 10%.

- 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.

RATING:
- Complete and Accurate = 0,
- Incomplete/Issues = 1

2.4.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

Explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 2 greater than 10%.

- 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.

RATING:
- Complete and Accurate = 0,
- Incomplete/Issues = 1
Migratory Child Counts

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based and how and when these concerns will be resolved.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters
CSPR Part II Section 2.4.1.2 & 2.4.2.1

2.4.1.2 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

2.4.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 2 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.
Child Count Elements – 2.4.3.1

Critical Child Count logic elements that the State MUST address in its description.

- Ages 3 - 21
- Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)
- Residency (for all children as well as for two-year-olds turning three)
- Elimination of prior year’s Graduates and HSED obtainers
- SEA approved Certificate of Eligibility (COE)
- Unduplicated counts
- Category 2 criteria
Category 1 Elements for 2.4.3.1

- The unduplicated count of eligible migratory children, ages 3-21,
- Only children who were within 36 months of a QAD,
- That the child resided in the State during the 2019-2020 Performance Period (September 1, 2019 – August 31, 2020) by checking one or more of the following dates: enrollment date, residency date, recertification/residency verification date, or withdrawal date between 9/1/2018 and 8/31/2019.
Category 1 Elements for 2.4.3.1 Cont.

- Children who graduated from high school or attained a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) during the performance period and ensures that these children are not counted in the subsequent performance period’s child count.

- Children who had an SEA approved Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and were entered in the State’s migratory student database.
Brief Discussion #1

• How are eligibility requirements related to age and QAD accounted for in your State’s data base?
2.4.3.1 Verifying residency:

- A home visit after September 1 and before August 31 for every child in the Category 1 count who is not enrolled in school.
- School attendance records for those enrolled in school.
- For two-year-old children turning three years of age, MEP staff must verify the child’s residency after the child’s third birthdate.
Brief Discussion #2

• How does your State verify residency for two-year-old children turning three?
• How do you account for these children?
2.4.3.1 Unduplicated child counts:

Examples:

- Create a unique student ID for each child
- Conduct initial student searches in:
  - State-specific systems
  - National system, MSIX, by State
Brief Discussion #3

• How does your State ensure that every child is counted only once in your child count?
2.4.3.1 Unduplicated child counts:

- Run the MSIX Potential Duplicate Report, or
- If the State has its own potential duplicate report, description should be outlined also
Poll Question

• Does your State run the MSIX Potential Duplicates Report?
Category 2 Elements for 2.4.3.1

2.4.3.1 Category 2 service data:

- Category 2 Count is a subset of the Category 1 children who received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term.
- Must be enrolled in the State migrant database with an “S” enrollment type for one or more days.
- Ensure that children are between the ages of three through 21 at the time of enrollment.
Brief Discussion #4

• Are you familiar with the MSIX Child Count Reconciliation Report for Category 1 and Category 2?

• How often does your State run the MSIX Reconciliation Report?
## Accuracy of the Data Process

### Accuracy of EDFacts Data Files

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The State deployed a process that ensured that it transmits accurate migrant data to the Department in every required EDFacts data file.</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Yes</td>
<td>□ No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Use of MSIX to Verify Data Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the State use data in the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) to verify the quality of migrant data?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Yes</td>
<td>□ No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.
Re-interview Process for 2019-20 Performance Period Overview

MEP Eligibility determination by using re-interview process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The number of eligibility determinations sampled.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Independent Prospective Re-interview Process

Independent prospective interviews should be conducted at least once every three years by an independent interviewer, performed on the current year’s identified migratory children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What was the most recent year that the MEP conducted independent prospective re-interviews (i.e., interviewers were neither SEA or LEA staff members responsible for administering or operating the MEP, nor any other persons who worked on the initial eligibility determinations being tested)? If independent prospective re-interviews were not administered in any of the three performance periods, please provide an explanation in the “Comment” row at the end of this table.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- SY 2019-20
- SY 2018-19
- SY 2017-18
# Re-interview Process for 2019-20 Performance Period

## Obtaining Data from Families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check the applicable box to indicate how the re-interviews were conducted:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Face-to-face re-interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Phone Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Both</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was there a protocol for verifying all information used in making the original eligibility determination?</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were re-interviewers independent from the original interviewers?</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you did conduct independent re-interviews in this reporting period, describe how you ensured that the process was independent. Only enter a response if your State completed independent re-interviews in SY2019-20.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In the space below, refer to the results of *any* re-interview processes used by the SEA, and if any of the migratory 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.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In the space below, please respond to the following question:

| Does the state collect all the required data elements and data sections on the National Certificate of Eligibility (COE)? | □ Yes | □ No |
SY 2019-20 MEP Data File Submission Due Dates

EdFacts
• Initial submission due date: February 10, 2021 at 11:59 PM ET

CSPR Part II
• Initial Open Date: January 28, 2021
• Initial Close Date: February 11, 2021 at 5:00 PM ET
• Second Open/Close Date: Mid May

Note: OME anticipates moving the Child Count section of the CSPR into Part I for the 2020-2021 Performance Period.
Child Count Resubmission

Resubmission of State-level (SEA) category 1 and category 2 child count after first submission,

• The SEA must submit an email request through the EDFacts Partner Support Center (PSC) to the U.S. Department of Education, OME Program Director for pre-approval to modify its child count(s).

• The request must include an explanation of the data that needs to be changed, why the change needs to be made, and what the State is doing to prevent the error in the future.
Child Count Resubmission (cont.)

• The request should be sent at least seven days (one week) prior to the EDFacts/CSPR Part II resubmission window.

• Resubmissions of SEA child count data with upward or downward revisions without prior approval may not be accepted by OME.

• If OME accepts a revision from the State, a formal response via email will be issued by OME’s Director, Lisa C Gillette.
Certification Signature

The authorizing official is the Chief State School Officer. If any other individual certifies the data submission, the Department assumes the following:

- The other signatory has been delegated authorized authority by the Chief State School Officer; and
- The Chief State School Officer is aware of and has reviewed the data submission
H.R. 8472 directs the Secretary of Education to use, for purposes of calculating Title I, Part C allocations to States, migratory child count data from 2018-19 or 2019-20—*whichever data are greater*—for fiscal year (FY) 2021 and subsequent years in which 2019-20 data would otherwise have been used.

In order for the Secretary to determine whether the 2018-19 or 2019-20 migratory child count data is greater for each State, it is imperative that States follow the established process for reporting timely and accurate 2019-20 migratory child count data to the Department—i.e., the EDFacts and Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data due on *February 10 and 11, 2021*. 
Questions?

Please submit any questions that you may have about the webinar’s content through the conversation box.
Please Tell Us How to Improve!

We have five questions that we will ask you to answer, and then we’ll provide a chance for you to suggest improvements to this webinar.
Evaluation Questions

1. The training products and/or materials used expanded the understanding and learning of the subject matter covered during the session.
2. The speaker communicated effectively, explained the information, and answered questions thoroughly.
3. The presentation was interactive, and participants were engaged.
4. Overall, the session was relevant, and I will be able to apply what I learned.
5. What suggestions do you have for how the session could be strengthened in the future?
THANK YOU!

Preeti Choudhary  Preeti.Choudhary@ed.gov
  202-453-5736
Christopher Hill  Christopher.d.hill@ed.gov
  202-453-6061

Partner Support Center (PSC) Contact Information:

Telephone:  877-457-3336 (877-HLP-EDEN)
Fax:  888-329-3336 (888-FAX-EDEN)
TTY/TDD:  888-403-3336 (888-403-EDEN)
E-mail:  EDEN_SS@ed.gov
Website:  EDFacts Initiative

Hours of Operation:  8:00 am - 6:00 pm ET, Monday-Friday, excluding federal holidays.