<u>**Minimum Data Element Comments and Responses**</u>

1. **Comment #1:** Data Element #59 – Course Type. While I agree with the nature of the changes, I question how it is implemented. Why was the current value of "06 Not Applicable" changed to "07" and then 08 was still added after that? I suggest that "06" remain as "Not Applicable" and then the two new values are added as 07 and 08. The possible implications of changing existing codes/data as well as changing the processes systems already have in place that currently assign a value of 06 now having to change to 07 simply adds a lot of work and exponentially adds to the possibility of error, let alone compatibility with existing MSIX data.

   Response: We agree with the commenter's statement and have modified the values list accordingly.

   Change: For data element #59, Course Type, value 06 will remain as "Not Applicable", value 07 will be defined as "Dual Enrollment" and value 08 will be defined as "Concurrent Enrollment".

2. **Comment #2:** Data Element #56 -- Assessment Interpretation. The current MDE call for suggested values, but do not require these particular values. Many assessments do not fit these suggested values (such as Language Proficiency Tests). If these are the only accepted values, then important information will be lost. This should simply be free-text of 20 characters or there should be another value added as "Other" and a new data element added with free text to allow for submission of these other values.

   Response: We agree with the commenter's statement in general; however we would propose keeping the existing values and allow for "other" values in a more defined context. We have modified the values list accordingly.

   Change: Data Element #56, Assessment Interpretation, has been changed to "free text" and a new value structure and instructions have been added to allow for "Other – [Interpretation]".

3. **Comment #3:** Data Element #69 SAT Score and #70 ACT Composite Score – While I see some value in collecting this data, it does not seem logical to collect it as separate data elements. First of all, what happens if there are multiple scores (such as being taken multiple times)? There is also no recording of when the tests are taken given the proposed method of collection. I see the most logical way to track this is simply as another Assessment, and then have SAT and ACT as additional Assessment Type (Element #52). This provides the most flexibility in reporting these data.

   Response: We agree with the commenter and have deleted data elements #69 and #70 and updated the Assessment Type data element accordingly.

   Change: Deleted new data elements SAT Score and ACT Score. Added SAT Score and ACT Score as allowable Assessment Types.

4. **Comment #4:** Data Element # 68 District of Residence. This is critical for tracking students enrolled in facilities and programs without an NCES code to link them to a District. It is also important that MSIX now use this new element (instead of element #67 School District ID or calculating it from element #32 School Identification Code) for determining data flow in Regions within MSIX for states that have a regional structure. Having the NCES District Code is necessary for unique tracking, but also requiring the text of the name would make it more readable for data verification and troubleshooting. I understand that MSIX displays will of course do a translation to the text for viewing in MSIX, but that would not be available in raw data files.

   Response: We agree with the commenter.

   Change: None