Annual count of newly documented Migratory Children	Core Data Element Collection Hrs./Student	Effort to Collect Core Data Elements
90,040	0.88	78,785.0

Annual Percentage of Assessed Eligible Students	Estimate of Assessed Newly Documented Migrant Students	Assessment Data Element Collection Hrs./Student	Effort to Collect Assessment Data Elements
30%	26,587	0.08	2,215.6

Annual Percentage of Regular School Year Secondary Students	Estimate of Reg Year Secondary Newly Doc'd Migrant Students	Course Hist. Data Element Collection Hrs./Student	Effort to Collect Course History Data Elements
22%	19,768	0.92	18,120.8

Total Effort to Collect Core, Assmt., and Course Data for Newly Documented Migrant Children **99,121.3**

Assumptions:

- Annual count of newly documented Migrant Students is based upon the total number of qualifying moves reported during SY 2022-23.
- Core data element Collection hrs./student does not include COE Data elements
- Core data element Collection hrs./student based on feedback from States
- Annual Percentage of Assessed Eligible Students is the ratio of the total number of valid test takers for GPRA 1 (Reading/Language Arts) & GPRA 2 (Mathematics) to the count of eligible migratory children (i.e., eligible for MEP services) by grade, including Birth through 21, Ungraded and Out of School counts for each State
- Assessment data element collection hrs./student based on feedback from States
- Annual Percentage of Regular School Year Secondary Students is the ratio of the estimated total number of enrolled grade 9-12 students to the count of Category 1 students reported in CSPR that are enrolled during the regular school year
- Course History data element collection hrs./student based on feedback from States

Estimate of Reg Year Secondary Newly Documented Migrant Students	Course Hist. Data Element Collection Hrs./Student for most recent prior enrollment in State	Effort to Collect Course History Data Elements for most recent prior enrollments in State
19,768	1.17	23,062.8

Assumptions:

- Estimate of Regular Year Secondary Newly Documented Migrant Students is defined on Tab 1
- Course History data element collection hrs./student based on feedback from States

1.17 x 60 = 70 minutes
1 hour 10 minutes

Number of Responses (for OMB 83-C)	19,768

Ongoing effort to collect and submit indicator of whether out of state records are available for a student

Number of Students with interstate qualifying move, but no MSIX Course History data from prior state	Effort to indicate whether out of state course records are available for a single student (hours)	Total Effort to indicate whether out of state Course History data is available for students (hours)
1,874	0.7	1,249

Assumptions:

- the number of secondary-aged students in MSIX with an interstate qualifying move during SY'22-'23 and no prior state Course History data indicates the potential population of students that may need an out of state transcript

- the effort to determine whether or not an out of state transcript is present for a student is based on state feedback.

.7 x 60 =42 minutes

Number of Responses (for OMB 83-C)	1,874

Assessment Data Elements

Total # Students Assessed	# Terms / Year Assessed	Assessment Collection Hrs./Student	Total Effort (hours)
81,027	1	0.08	6,752.3

Assumptions:

- Assessment results are made available once per student per year, regardless of when the test is administered
- Effort to collect assessment data based on State feedback

Nur

Course History Data Elements

Total # Secondary Students Enrolled		Course History Collection Hrs./Student	Total Effort (hours)
60,246		0.92	55,225.8

Assumptions:

- Effort to collect course history data based on State feedback

Core Data Elements

Total Number of Enrolled Students	Percentage of Students with new data each year	Core Data Collection Hrs./Student	Total Effort (hours)
218,706	100%	0.70	153,094.2

Assumptions:

- Effort to collect Core (non-COE) data based on State feedback regarding the effort to provide Core data elements for initial submission, then reduced from 0.88 to 0.70 to make allowance for states with automated processes to collect and provide updates, and to also account for the fewer number of data elements that are expected with an update instead of an initial submission.
- It is assumed that Core enrollment data elements will need to be updated at least once per year for 100% of the students. These updates will be submitted by States at the end of the next occurring term.

70 x 60 minutes = 42 minutes

Summary

Assessment Data Elements	Course History Data Elements	Core Data Elements	Total Effort (hours)
6,752.3	55,225.8	153,094.2	215,072.3

nber of Responses (for OMB 83-C) 218,706

Number of MSIX Move Notices Generated per Year	Hours/student to collect Core data	Hours/student to collect Assessment data	Hours/student to collect Course Hist. data	Total Effort (hours)
13,440	0.88	0.08	0.92	25,200.0

Assumptions:

- Count of Move Notices based on the average number of Move Notices generated in MSIX per year from 01/
01/01/2025
- Effort to collect data elements based on State feedback

Number of Responses (for OMB 83-C)	13,440

01/2022 -

Number of Requests for Data Correction per State per Year	Number of Participating SEAs	Hours/student to review and correct data	Total Effort (hours)
1	46	0.63	28.8

Assumptions:

- Number of Data Correction requests per state based on State feedback
- Each correction request will only involve one category of data (core, assessment, or course history)
- Effort to review and correct data is assumed to be equal average effort to collect data across all data element groups, based on State feedback

Number of Responses (for OMB 83-C)	46

Number of Requests for Data Correction per Year	Hours/student to review and correct data	Total Effort (hours)
6	0.63	3.8

Assumptions:

- Number of Data Correction requests based on past OME requests and estimated future increases as parental awareness of MSIX increases
- Each correction request will only involve one category of data (core, assessment, or course), but could inolve any of these categories of data
- Effort to review and correct data is assumed to be equal average effort to collect data across all data element groups, based on State feedback

Number of Responses (for OMB 83-C)	6

1. **Newly Documented Migratory Children**

Activity	Frequency of Response	Number of Respondents	Average Hours per Respondent	Total Hours over 3 Years
Data Collection	Within 10 days of documenting a child's eligibility	46 SEAs	6,464	297,364
Data Submission	Within 10 days of documenting a child's eligibility	46 SEAs	-	-
		Total over 3 Years	6,464	297,364
		Person Years (at 2,080 hours/year)	3.1	143
		Annualized Average	2,155	99,121
		Person Years (at 2,080 hours/year)	1.0	48

2. **Newly Documented Migratory Children (Secondary Students)**

Activity	Frequency of Response	Number of Respondents	Average Hours per Respondent	Total Hours over 3 Years
Data Collection	Within 10 days of documenting a child's eligibility	46 SEAs	1,504	69,188
Data Submission	Within 10 days of documenting a child's eligibility	46 SEAs	-	-
		Total over 3 Years	1,504	69,188
		Person Years (at 2,080 hours/year)	0.7	33
		Annualized Average	501	23,063
		Person Years (at 2,080 hours/year)	0.2	11

3. **Newly Documented Migratory Children (Out of State Records)**

Activity	Frequency of Response	Number of Respondents	Average Hours per Respondent	Total Hours over 3 Years

Data Collection	Within 10 days of documenting a child's eligibility	46 SEAs	81	3,748
Data Submission	Within 10 days of documenting a child's eligibility	46 SEAs	-	-
		Total over 3 Years	81	3,748
		Person Years (at 2,080 hours/year)	0.0	2
		Annualized Average	27	1,249
		Person Years (at 2,080 hours/year)	0.0	1

4. End of Term Submission

Activity	Frequency of Response	Number of Respondents	Average Hours per Respondent	Total Hours over 3 Years
Data Collection	Within 30 days of the end of a term	46 SEAs	14,026	645,217
Data Submission	Within 30 days of the end of a term	46 SEAs	-	-
		Total over 3 Years	14,026	645,217
		Person Years (at 2,080 hours/year)	6.7	310
		Annualized Average	4,675	215,072.3
		Person Years (at 2,080 hours/year)	2.2	103

5. Change of Residence Submission

Activity	Frequency of Response	Number of Respondents	Average Hours per Respondent	Total Hours over 3 Years
Data Collection	Within 4 days of receiving notification from MSIX that a migratory child has changed residence	46 SEAs	1,643	75,600
Data Submission	Within 4 days of receiving notification from MSIX that a migratory child has changed residence	46 SEAs	-	-
		Total over 3 Years	1,643	75,600
		Person Years (at 2,080 hours/year)	0.8	36
		Annualized Average	548	25,200
		Person Years (at 2,080 hours/year)	0.3	12

6. MSIX Data Correction

Activity	Frequency of Response	Number of Respondents	Average Hours per Respondent	Total Hours over 3 Years
Data Collection	Within 4 days of determination to correct data submitted to MSIX	46 SEAs	1.9	86
Data Submission	Within 4 days of determination to correct data submitted to MSIX	46 SEAs	-	-
		Total over 3 Years	1.9	86
		Person Years (at 2,080 hours/year)	0.0	0

	Annualized Average	0.6	28.75
	Person Years (at 2,080 hours/year)	0.0	0

Number OME Requests for Data Correction per Year	Hours/student to review and correct data	Total Effort (hours)
1	0.63	0.63

7. Response to the Department

Activity	Frequency of Response	Number of Respondents	Average Hours per Respondent	Total Hours over 3 Years
Data Collection	Within 10 days of a request for information from the Department	46 SEAs	0.2	11
Data Submission	Within 10 days of a request for information from the Department	46 SEAs	-	-
		Total over 3 Years	0.2	11
		Person Years (at 2,080 hours/year)	0.0	0
		Annualized Average	0.1	4
		Person Years (at 2,080 hours/year)	0.0	0

By F
1
2
3
4
5
6
7

274,411

Description
This estimate includes time to collect MSIX MDE information for each newly documented migrant student and enter it into the State's MEP system
It is estimated that there is no additional effort to electronically submit the collected MDEs to MSIX

Description
This estimate includes time to collect Course History MDE information for the most recent secondary school attended previously in the state by migrant student and enter it into the State's MEP system
It is estimated that there is no additional effort to electronically submit the collected MDEs to MSIX

Description

This estimate includes time to whether or not an LEA in the State has records from another State for a migrant student and enter indicate it in the State's MEP system
It is estimated that there is no additional effort to electronically submit the collected MDEs to MSIX

Description
This estimate includes time to collect newly available MDE information for each eligible migrant student in the State and enter it into the State's MEP system
It is estimated that there is no additional effort to electronically submit the collected MDEs to MSIX

Description
This estimate includes time to collect new MDE inforation that has become available for migrant student since the last submission to MSIX and enter it into the State's MEP system
It is estimated that there is no additional effort to electronically submit the collected MDEs to MSIX

Description
This estimate includes effort to correct information previously entered in the State's MEP system
It is estimated that there is no additional effort to electronically submit the corrected data to MSIX

Description
This estimate includes effort to respond to a request from the Department to correct or amend data previously entered in the State MEP system and submitted to MSIX
It is estimated that there is no additional effort to electronically submit the corrected data to MSIX

Reporting Activity	Annualized Burden for all SEA Respondents
Newly Documented Migratory Children	99,121
Newly Documented (Secondary Records - Same State)	23,063
Newly Documented (Secondary Records - Out of State)	1,249
End of Term Submissions	215,072
Change of Residence Submissions	25,200
Parental Request to SEA for Data Correction	29
Response to ED - Parental Request to ED for Data Correction	4
Annualized Total over 3 Years for All SEAs	**363,738**
Average Hours per SEA	7,907
Average Person Years per SEA (at 2,080 hours/year)	3.8
Average Hours per 1,000 Eligible Children (of 274,411 Children)	1,325.52

Control Totals (from Workbook tabs)
99,121
23,063
1,249
215,072
25,200
29
4
363,738
7,907
3.8
1,293.2

Hourly Labor Rate: $39.22

By F
1
2
3
4
5
6
7

274,411

1. Newly Documented Migratory Students

	Nationally			Per SEA		
	Total Hours over 3 Years	Person Years	Cost @ $39.22 per Hour	Total Hours over 3 Years	Person Years	Cost @ $39.22 per Hour
Data Collection	297,364	143	$ 11,662,613	6,464	3.1	$ 253,535
Data Submission	-	-	$ -	-	-	$ -
Totals	297,364	143	$ 11,662,613	6,464	3.1	$ 253,535
Annualized Avg.	**99,121**	**48**	**$ 3,887,538**	**2,155**	**1.0**	**$ 84,512**

2. Newly Documented Migratory Students (Secondary Students)

	Nationally			Per SEA		
	Total Hours over 3 Years	Person Years	Cost @ $39.22 per Hour	Total Hours over 3 Years	Person Years	Cost @ $39.22 per Hour
Data Collection	69,188	33	$ 2,713,566	1,504	0.7	$ 58,991
Data Submission	-	-	$ -	-	-	$ -
Totals	69,188	33	$ 2,713,566	1,504	0.7	$ 58,991
Annualized Avg.	**23,063**	**11**	**$ 904,522**	**501**	**0.2**	**$ 19,664**

3. Newly Documented Migratory Students (Out of State Records)

	Nationally			Per SEA		
	Total Hours over 3 Years	Person Years	Cost @ $39.22 per Hour	Total Hours over 3 Years	Person Years	Cost @ $39.22 per Hour
Data Collection	3,748	2	$ 146,997	81	0.0	$ 3,196
	-	-	$ -	-	-	$ -
Totals	3,748	2	$ 146,997	81	0.0	$ 3,196
Annualized Avg.	**1,249**	**1**	**$ 48,999**	**27**	**0.0**	**$ 1,065**
			$ 4,841,058.57			

4. End of Term Submission

	Nationally			Per SEA		
	Total Hours over 3 Years	Person Years	Cost @ $39.22 per Hour	Total Hours over 3 Years	Person Years	Cost @ $39.22 per Hour
Data Collection	645,217	310	$ 25,305,404	14,026	6.7	$ 550,117
Data Submission	-	-	$ -	-	-	$ -
Totals	645,217	310	$ 25,305,404	14,026	6.7	$ 550,117
Annualized Avg.	**215,072**	**103**	**$ 8,435,135**	**4,675**	**2.2**	**$ 183,372**
			$ 8,435,135			

5. Change of Residence Submission

	Nationally			Per SEA		
	Total Hours over 3 Years	Person Years	Cost @ $39.22 per Hour	Total Hours over 3 Years	Person Years	Cost @ $39.22 per Hour
Data Collection	75,600	36	$ 2,965,032	1,643	0.8	$ 64,457
Data Submission	-	-	$ -	-	-	$ -
Totals	75,600	36	$ 2,965,032	1,643	0.8	$ 64,457
Annualized Avg.	**25,200**	**12**	**$ 988,344**	**548**	**0.3**	**$ 21,486**
			$ 988,344			

6. MSIX Data Correction

	Nationally	Per SEA

	Total Hours over 3 Years	Person Years	Cost @ $39.22 per Hour	Total Hours over 3 Years	Person Years	Cost @ $39.22 per Hour
Data Collection	86	0	$ 3,383	1.9	0.0	$ 74
Data Submission	-	-	$ -	-	-	$ -
Totals	86	0	$ 3,383	1.9	0.0	$ 74
Annualized Avg.	**29.38**	**0**	**$ 1,128**	**0.6**	**0.0**	**$ 25**

7. Response to the Department

	Nationally			Per SEA		
	Total Hours over 3 Years	Person Years	Cost @ $39.22 per Hour	Total Hours over 3 Years	Person Years	Cost @ $39.22 per Hour
Data Collection	11	0	$ 441	0.2	0.0	$ 10
Data Submission	-	-	$ -	-	-	$ -
Totals	11	0	$ 441	0.2	0.0	$ 10
Annualized Avg.	**4**	**0**	**$ 147**	**0.1**	**0.0**	**$ 3**

Reporting Activity	Annualized Burden for All Respondents	Annualized Cost Nationally @$39.22	Cost per SEA @$39.22
Newly Documented Migratory Children	99,121	$ 3,887,538	$ 84,512
Newly Documented Migratory Children (Secondary Students)	23,063	$ 904,522	$ 19,664
Newly Documented Migratory Children (Out of State Records)	1,249.33	$ 48,999	$ 1,065
End of Term Submission	215,072	$ 8,435,135	$ 183,372
Change of Residence Submission	25,200	$ 988,344	$ 21,486
MSIX Data Correction	29	$ 1,128	$ 25
Response to ED - Parental Request to ED for Data Correction	4	$ 147	$ 3
Annualized Total for all SEAs	**363,739**	**$ 14,265,812**	**$ 310,126**
Average per 1,000 Eligible Children (of 274,411 children)	1,325.53	$ 50,640.06	

	ED Staff Time in Government FTEs	ED Staff Costs (Loaded with Benefits, 3% annual increase)	MSIX Contract Costs
Historical Costs			
FY 2006	2.20	$ -	$ 7,980,831
FY 2007	2.20	$ 264,440	$ 3,129,097
FY 2008	2.20	$ 272,373	$ 3,262,624
FY 2009	2.20	$ 280,544	$ 3,034,085
FY 2010	2.20	$ 288,961	$ 3,161,144
FY 2011	2.20	$ 297,630	$ 3,632,746
FY 2012	2.20	$ 306,558	$ 2,660,856
FY 2013	2.20	$ 315,755	$ 2,754,435
FY 2014	2.20	$ 325,228	$ 2,572,637
FY 2015	2.20	$ 334,985	$ 2,565,255
FY 2016	2.20	$ 345,034	$ 2,727,190
FY 2017	2.20	$ 355,385	$ 3,715,296
FY 2018	2.20	$ 366,047	$ 2,913,690
FY 2019	2.20	$ 377,028	$ 2,987,585
FY 2020	2.20	$ 388,339	$ 3,063,600
FY 2021	2.20	$ 399,989	$ 3,141,787
Total		$ 4,918,297	$ 53,302,860
Annualized Total		$ 307,394	$ 3,331,429
Last 3 Years			
FY 2022	2.20	$ 411,989	$ 5,626,149
FY 2023	2.20	$ 424,349	$ 4,310,031
FY 2024	2.20	$ 437,079	$ 4,365,684
Total		$ 1,273,417	$ 14,301,864
Annualized Total		**$ 424,472**	**$ 4,767,288**

Totals
$ 7,980,831
$ 3,393,537
$ 3,534,997
$ 3,314,630
$ 3,450,105
$ 3,930,376
$ 2,967,415
$ 3,070,190
$ 2,897,865
$ 2,900,240
$ 3,072,224
$ 4,070,681
$ 3,279,737
$ 3,364,614
$ 3,451,939
$ 3,541,776
$ 58,221,157
$ 3,638,822
$ 6,038,138
$ 4,734,380
$ 4,802,763
$ 15,575,281
$ 5,191,760

For ON By Rep
1
2
3
4
5
6
7

MB 83-C porting Activity	5/09/2025 # Responses	4/26/2022 # Responses
Newly Documented Migratory Children	90,040	**72,863**
Newly Documented Migratory Children (Secondary Students)	19,768	13,893
Newly Documented Migratory Children (Out of State Records)	1,874	56,762
End of Term Submission	218,706	229,755
Change of Residence Submission	13,440	11,655
MSIX Data Correction	46	46
Response to the Department	6	6
Total Annual Responses	**343,880**	**384,980**

Variance in # Responses
17,177
5,875
-54,888
-11,049
1,785
0
0
-41,100

FS165DG110_SCH_
011024

State	State Eligible for MEP services*	State Assessed**	Reg. Year Secondary***
Alabama	2,014	773	315
Alaska	14,683	4,809	3,380
Arizona	10,198	2,820	3,396
Arkansas	5,258	1,365	818
California	77,683	25,648	17,824
Colorado	4,635	1,142	881
Delaware	391	49	25
Florida	17,897	4,926	3,462
Georgia	9,167	2,286	1,425
Hawaii	2,556	941	782
Idaho	6,996	2,152	1,363
Illinois	1,190	160	132
Indiana	1,659	341	232
Iowa	3,707	1,037	652
Kansas	4,111	1,116	739
Kentucky	5,671	1,505	1,067
Louisiana	1,965	551	300
Maine	372	75	36
Maryland	109	8	8
Massachusetts	681	151	125
Michigan	3,672	463	416
Minnesota	1,501	201	240
Mississippi	667	78	30
Missouri	646	74	68
Montana	1,258	358	159
Nebraska	4,836	1,365	845
Nevada	82	14	13
New Hampshire	24	7	6
New Jersey	511	78	35
New Mexico	884	230	227
New York	5,235	871	639
North Carolina	4,464	1,021	508
North Dakota	579	80	126
Ohio	803	219	14
Oklahoma	207	40	31
Oregon	15,222	4,792	3,589
Pennsylvania	6,260	1,384	882
South Carolina	1,016	112	52
South Dakota	745	233	190
Tennessee	1,398	178	195
Texas	20,660	6,698	6,029
Utah	669	221	146
Vermont	329	37	21
Virginia	355	97	72
Washington	30,906	10,240	8,686
Wisconsin	539	81	66
Total Children	274,411	81,027	60,246
Count of States	46	46	46

Assumptions			
* State eligible for MEP services data is based on the total number of eligible mi category, including Birth through 21, Ungraded and OSY counts for each State			
** State Assessed counts are the greater of the total number of valid test takers			
*** Reg. Year Secondary counts are derived by calcuating the percentage of Cat regular school year, then applying that percentage to the number of Category 1			

Median Response (Hours)	Median Response (Minutes)
0.88	52.5
0.08	5.0
0.92	55.0
1.17	70.0
-	
0.67	40.0

Question
1) How many minutes in total does it take to collect the Core data elements for one student and enter them into your state MEP system? Please note that these data elements do not include any information contained in the National COE. However, it may be necessary to collect information from sources such as SEA systems, LEA systems, MEP files, parents, or students. Please see the provided list of "Core" data elements for definitions.
2) Please summarize how the activities addressed in Question 1 are completed in your state and by whom. Please be concise, but as thorough as possible.
3) How many minutes in total does it take to collect the Assessment data elements for one student's current year State Assessments only and enter it into your state MEP system? Use the average time spent per student regardless of the number of tests. Please see the provided list of "Assessment" data elements for definitions.
4) Please summarize how the activities addressed in Question 3 are completed in your state and by whom. Please indicate which, if any, parts of this process are automated. Please be concise, but as thorough as possible.
5) How many minutes in total does it take to collect current year Course History data elements for one secondary student and enter the data into your state MEP system? This should be the average time per student regardless of the number of courses. Please see the provided list of "Course History" data elements for definitions.
6) Please summarize how the activities addressed in Question 5 are completed in your state and by whom. Please indicate which, if any, parts of this process are automated. Please be concise, but as thorough as possible.
7) How many minutes in total would it take to collect secondary education Course History data elements for the most recent prior secondary school enrollment in your state for one student? The most recent prior secondary enrollment may be prior to the student's MEP eligibility. Please provide an estimated effort if this activity is not currently performed in your state. See the provided list of "Course History" data elements for descriptions.
8) Please summarize how the activities addressed in Question 7 are completed in your state and by whom. Please indicate which, if any, parts of this process are automated. If this task is not currently being executed in your state, please indicate how you envision it would be performed.
9) How many hours would it take to create a new Data Element to indicate (Yes or No value only; the content of the transcript does not need to be collected, entered, or transmitted) whether out-of-state secondary school transcripts are present in your state for a migrant student? Please do not include the effort to request and receive an out-of-state transcript. Instead, please include the effort to modify your existing state MEP system to enter and store only whether or not an out-of-state transcript exists in your state for a student, the effort to modify the state's MSIX interface to transmit this data, and the effort to update your state procedures to collect this data.
10) Assuming the new data element discussed in Question 9 was added in your State MEP system to indicate (Yes or No) whether out-of-state transcripts are present in your state for a migrant secondary student, how many minutes would it take to research (e.g., contacting LEAs, research other state systems and the existing state MEP system, file review) whether an out-of-state transcript is present and then indicate (Yes/No) in the state system?

State

How many minutes in total does it take to collect the Core data elements for one student and enter them into your state MEP system? Please note that these data elements do not include any information contained in the National COE. However, it may be necessary to collect information from sources such as SEA systems, LEA systems, MEP files, parents, or students. Please see the provided list of "Core" data elements for definitions.
Please summarize how the activities addressed in Question 1 are completed in your state and by whom. Please be concise, but as thorough as possible.
How many minutes in total does it take to collect the Assessment data elements for one student's current year State Assessments only and enter it into your state MEP system? Use the average time spent per student regardless of the number of tests. Please see the provided list of Assessment data elements for definitions.
Please summarize how the activities addressed in Question 3 are completed in your state and by whom. Please indicate which, if any, parts of this process are automated. Please be concise, but as thorough as possible.
How many minutes in total does it take to collect current year Course History data elements for one secondary student and enter the data into your state MEP system? This should be the average time per student regardless of the number of courses. Please see the provided list of Course History data elements for definitions.

Please summarize how the activities addressed in Question 5 are completed in your state and by whom. Please indicate which, if any, parts of this process are automated. Please be concise, but as thorough as possible.
How many minutes in total would it take to collect secondary education Course History data elements for the most recent prior secondary school enrollment in your state for one student? The most recent prior secondary enrollment may be prior to the student's MEP eligibility. Please provide an estimated effort if this activity is not currently performed in your state. See the provided list of Course History data elements for descriptions.
Please summarize how the activities addressed in Question 7 are completed in your state and by whom. Please indicate which, if any, parts of this process are automated. If this task is not currently being executed in your state, please indicate how you envision it would be performed.
How many hours would it take to create a new Data Element to indicate (Yes or No value only; the content of the transcript does not need to be collected, entered, or transmitted) whether out-of-state secondary school transcripts are present in your state for a migrant student? Please do not include the effort to request and receive an out-of-state transcript. Instead, please include the effort to modify your existing state MEP system to enter and store only whether or not an out-of-state transcript exists in your state for a student, the effort to modify the state's MSIX interface to transmit this data, and the effort to update your state procedures to collect this data.
Assuming the new data element discussed in Question 9 was added in your State MEP system to indicate (Yes or No) whether out-of-state transcripts are present in your state for a migrant secondary student, how many minutes would it take to research (e.g., contacting LEAs, research other state systems and the existing state MEP system, file review) whether an out-of-state transcript is present and then indicate (Yes/No) in the state system?
For what percentage of migrant students does new or updated Core data element information become available during a typical school term? Please see the provided list of Core data elements for definitions.
Approximately how many times per year does staff in your state update a Student's record in your state MEP system as the result of a request from a parent or student to correct inaccurate data contained in your state MEP system for the student?

Please provide your name and state so we can contact you if we have any additional questions or need further clarification.

Florida
Our estimated answer for #1 is: 30-60 min;The local educational agencies (LEAs) school registrar/MEP staff collect this data on each migrant student and enter it into their local student database. LEAs are required to submit migrant student records from the local student database to the state student database through the Florida Automated System for Transferring Electronic Records (FASTER). FASTER is considered the conduit. Migrant records are submitted to the state based on the OME established time frames.
Once assessments are administered, they are collected and scored. Data entry into local student data base for the test data including scores occur at the LEA/school district level. The assessment data/results are then sent electronically to the state student database through FASTER. The amount of time to collect, score, conduct data entry, etc. is difficult to determine at this time.

The time varies because data collection occurs at several levels, i.e., from instructional staff on to MIS staff. The local educational agencies (LEAs) school instructional, guidance, registrar, and MEP staff collect this data on each migrant student and enter it into their local student database. LEAs are required to submit migrant student records from the local student database to the state student database through the Florida Automated System for Transferring Electronic Records (FASTER). FASTER is considered the conduit. Migrant records are submitted to the state based on the OME established time frames.
The time varies because data collection occurs at several levels, i.e., from instructional staff on to MIS staff. The local educational agencies (LEAs) school instructional, guidance, registrar, and MEP staff collect this data on each migrant student and enter it into their local student database. LEAs are required to submit migrant student records from the local student database to the state student database through the Florida Automated System for Transferring Electronic Records (FASTER). FASTER is considered the conduit. Migrant records are submitted to the state based on the OME established time frames.

For #9, in general, it would take Florida 1.5-2 years to add any new Data Element, if it was not already in existence in the state student database. However, for #9 and #10, specifically, Florida already has the capacity to collect, store, and send out-of-state secondary school transcript information. Question #11 is not very clear. Florida updates core data elements records at least once a year and as needed for every migrant student. Our estimated response for #12 is less than one time per year. For #12, Florida receives infrequent requests to update a student's academic record from a parent or student. If updates are done, it is generally about updating the DOB.

Montana
1000
The information is collected generally by recruiters and directors in an interview setting at the family's temporary home, school, or other setting. The data collection and entry is dependent upon whether the student is: 1)interstate new/returning 2)intrastate new/returning Can take from 30 minutes to three days; nothwithstanding PFS information.
1000
Assessment data is collected yearly at the SEA level and entered through uploads of the state data system to NGS on MT. based students. For interestate students, it can take directors/data personnel at the SEA and LOA level months to obtain. Tests are giving annually, results take up to five months to appear in state systems; then for interstate students we have to match student IDs.
1000

Depends on if student is interstate/new/returning; intrastate new/returning. In summer, difficult to obtain from LOAs who are not there and if most recent information has been entered at homebase. Done by youth coordiator, directors. Can take up to three days if not in system. Data entry on partial credits or updating for interstate students takes much less time (30 minutes) for recieving state; to build an entire course history for a new student takes much more time, again depedning on whether the student is new, returning, interstate or intrastate. Entry done by data entry persnonell, advocate; collection by youth coordiantor/teacher.
1000
See number six
100
100
80
1

Angela Branz-Spall;MT

Pennsylvania
30
Most of this data is collected at time of Recruitment by Recruiters using electronic COE;s and then reviewed at several levels. A few items, such as LEP, IEP, Immunization, Health Alert may be gathered by Recruiters, but are more likely to be gathered by Student Support Specialists, which is also done using direct data entry electronically and also is reviewed. The Facility/District/Project detailed information is primarily maintained by Data Specialists and simply referenced by the staff supplying the correct facility code from a drop-down menu and the rest of the information is automatically looked-up;. Some of these time saving factors may make our time per student slightly less than other states.
30
Annually, we collect what we can electronically from our State Assessment system as well as state Language Assessments. This is a semi-automated process. However, staff may have to collect other data manually if the child leaves before the electronic version is not available or if there are other assessments that are not available electronically. The time required to manipulate the electronic file is also included. With the broad range of possibilities, it is hard to determine the average time, but this is our best estimation.
30

Secondary Student Support Specialists go to schools and collect what courses students are enrolled in. Depending on the School, this may be done by obtaining a printout from the school or it may require manually searching through records. They may then enter that data into their Tablet or put it on a data collection form and submit to the Data Specialist. At the end of each term or if a child leaves the area, the staff return and collect the current grade and clock hours or possibly the final grade and credits as appropriate and record in the same manner. There is no Central Data System from which to automate this collection.
60
This is difficult to answer. If it is at a school we are already dealing with for a child, it would probably be an additional 15 minutes per student, and this is something we are already doing. If while the staff are collecting the information in #5/6 and know that the student has previous course history at that school, they collect it and we enter the required enrollment information (enrollments are required in both MIS2000 and MSIX in order to enter Course History data). If it would require going to another school that would take at least some, if not considerable additional time, especially if it is a school outside the region where the student is or if it is a school where we do not have an established relationship.
10
30
100
1

This is provided by Vaughn Murray in consultation with Carmen M. Medina, State Director as well as Regional Data staff on behalf of the Pennsylvania MEP

Illinois
60
Information is gathered by recruiters, teachers, counselors, and health care providers from student records, parent and student interviews and LEA data systems. Data entry specialists enter the information on NGS. State support staff provide technical assistance to data entry specialists as needed and identify errors in data entry that need to be corrected.
5
Illinois student assessment data is maintained in a state student data base. The NGS staff generate a file of eligible migrant students each year. The Illinois state student data base staff use the file to run a data match to identify the assessment results of all migrant students on the IL student data base. The migrant student assessment results are sent in a file to NGS, where staff load the information into NGS to populate the individual migrant student records.
80

The migrant project staff request course history data from the school counselor. The school counselor retrieves this information from the student record. The NGS data entry specialist enters the information in NGS.
80
The migrant project staff request course history data from the school counselor. The school counselor retrieves this information from the student record. The NGS data entry specialist enters the information in NGS.
40
40
100
3

Beth Robinson, Illinois

Colorado
180
SEA/Regional staff performs various activities to collect and report the Core data elements in the State Student Information System, NGS. Data sources include the following; State Information System, Local Student Information Systems, Other Data Sources within the Department, MEP Files, Parent Surveys, Pre-school Surveys, Student Secondary Transcript, Out-of-School Youth Surveys. The core data elements are collected through regional programs, with support from the LEA. Regional programs have established working relationships with participating school districts and developed a method for collecting student data on an agreed schedule. Through these efforts some districts have granted regional programs direct access to the district internal student database. Districts have designated internal staff to provide student academic information to the regional programs. Core data elements collected by the regional programs included but not limited; Local district formal assessments, local district PK assessments, medical alerts, immunizations, health/dental, enrollment, student state IDs, and course history. The SEA sends data request to the department's data warehouse requesting student demographic data on State Assessments, Language Proficiency, Special Needs, Dropped Out, Received GED, Graduated, students tested in reading and math, MEP Projects and school campus information, as well as, FTE and MEP job classifications.
1000
The SEA sends a list of migrant student state IDs to the data warehouse and requests assessment information on the following state assessments; CSAP, CSAP A, CELA. Once this information is received, the State electronically imports the information into NGS. A validation sample is completed prior to importing all information. State assessment data is not available until late August or September. For students that do not have state assessments, regional programs are required to request local assessments and manually enter them in the students record in NGS.
180

At this time, the SEA is not currently collecting course history data elements. On April 10, 2012, the SEA will be holding Secondary Course History Training. All regional programs are required to participate in this training. Currently, course history information is not reported to the State and therefore must be collected by the districts. The information will be collected electronically and either entered or imported into the State's Migrant Student Information System, the New Generation System (NGS). We established the time it will take the SEA and regional programs to collect and enter course history in the beginning will take 30-180 minutes per student.
180
Regional programs are required to share a Secondary Course History Template with their participating districts, which requires them to report all MSIX course history data elements. Districts will complete this template for each student's subject and course for grades 9-12.
100
100
10
1

Colorado;Brenda Meyer General Professional
Colorado Department of Education
Data Services Unit
201 E. Colfax Avenue, Room 507 Denver, CO 80203
Phone: 303-866-6744 Work Cell: 303-913-0282 Fax: 303-866-6888
Email: meyer_b@cde.state.co.us

Virginia
100
Migrant coordinators or designee enter core elements in the state database which transfers to the MSIX. Migrant recruiters can spend 1-2 days recertifying students and/or identifying new students. The migrant coordinator/designee will enter data to the state system which takes about 30-45 minutes depending upon if they are entering a new record versus updating a student record.
1
The assessment information is transmitted directly from the state assessment system (separate from migrant database) to the MSIX for migrant students with assessment files. The local coordinators do not enter this information.

At this time, the state does not upload course history data.
At this time, the state does not upload course history data.
36
36
100
2

Patience Scott, Virginia

Oregon
5 to 30
Per Sue Cheavtharn: It takes 5-30 minutes to actually request the data, then enter it into OMSIS. There is additional time to wait for information to be provided by the LEA, but the staff person is doing other work during the waiting period. Oregon's MEP program operates at two different levels: Local Education Agency and Regional Education Service Districts (ESD). Oregon has 19 regional MEP programs seven are LEA and eight are Regional ESDs; the regional ESD operates and cover many districts. Obtaining information for an LEA is quick and efficient whereas the opposite is said the ESD's level. LEA access to information is within minutes, if the local data specialist has access to the information. ESDs access to information could range from 15 minutes to weeks or even months, depending on the accessibility to information and personnel. The main MEP liaisons at the regional program are the Recruiters, Data Specialists and/or Coordinators. Communication protocols are set-up at each local MEP offices. Information about student comings or goings is at times reported to the recruiters and at times to no one. Once information is obtain about a student arrival or departure, data is compiled and appropriate forms are completed either by the Recruiter or Data Specialists. Information is then entered to the Oregon Migrant Student Information (OMSIS) by the data specialist.
less than 1 minute
Per Sue C: The Assessment data is automatically provided to OMSIS. It takes less that 5 minutes to download data for all Oregon students once per year. State assessment information is not easily accessible by any of Oregon's regional MEP programs. Because assessment information is considered "Resisted" data, one must have rights and authorization to access "Current" state assessments. The time to collect the information varies from programs to programs, depending on consortium agreements. The times it takes to collect the "current assessment" data can range from one week to possibly never. The OMSIS system does not allow entry of state assessments, however, local and state language proficiency assessments are allowed on OMSIS. On a yearly basis, Oregon extracts previous school year state assessment data and submitted it to MSIX. This usually occurs after the completion of the CSPR Part II. Ideally, current assessment information should be easily accessible for MEP staff in order to evaluate and identify Priority for Service (PFS) students; reality wise, this is not the case. Very few of Oregon's regional MEP programs have access to current assessment information. When current information is not available then last school year state assessments are used to determine PFS for the new school year. Many of the LEAS perform PFS determination for immediate services. Oregon is anticipating with the development of the new OMSIS version 2.0, the state assessments would be easily assessable for all LEA MEP staff.
less than 1 minute

Per Sue C.: Course History is automatically downloaded into OMSIS. It takes less than a minute of work to process data for all Oregon students. Oregon MEP programs personnel do not collect Course History on MEP students. This process happens automatically when a child is flagged as withdrawn on the OMSIS and checked against the KIDs system with an associated enrollment line then the Course History is extracted and set to MSIX. Oregon extracts Course History data from a system call the KIDs. KIDs is a system that store collections of information sent from the LEAs. All LEAs in Oregon are encouraged to join what is called a regional Data Warehouse. All regional Data Warehouse data feeds into the KIDs system.
less than 1 minute
If enrollment information matches on the OMSIS and KIDs, then the collection of Course History happens in seconds. However, if OMSIS does not have an enrollment line that matches the KIDs then nothing is transferred to MSIX.
Per Sue C: 16 to 32 hours Oregon cannot give you an estimated time to create a new Data Element without knowing what data elements are being considered. Adding new data elements would involve many staff, not to mention the changes to the database structure, identifying the source and the validity of the data source. Also we need to add in to the timeline the project flow on obtaining the work approval.
5 to 30
Per Sue C: This would follow essentially the same process to collect data as in Question 1, so the same timeframes would apply. We are unable to provide an estimated time. It all depends on the accessibility and the location of the MEP child.
Per Sue C: Oregon receives less than 1 request per year. Oregon receives very few requests from parents or students to update academic records. If updates are done it is mainly with the child's date of birth and not necessary the academic data.

Jonathan Fernow, Oregon
Sue Cheavtharn, Oregon

Follow-up discussion (as noted in Sue C comments above) between Sue Cheavtharn and John Carden on 4/3/12

California
25 minutes
Migrant Region and/or LEA staff enter program center information into COEstar that is sent and aggregated to the State Migrant Longitudinal Data System (MLDS). Other core data is linked as part of a back office process to distinct state systems files for aggregation into the MSIX data feed. WestEd MSIN staff, CDE Data Management Division staff, CDE Assessments staff all participate. This time includes updates, full history and notes for the student unit record. LEA efforts comprise most of the time, ensuring student identifiers used to match within the state reporting and data products are entered and are accurate
3 Minutes
California maintains wholly separate systems for MEP, Assessments, and state longitudinal student records. The data for assessments for the MEP students is merged as part of a back office process with linkages to state systems and is integrated with the process used to generate other Federal reports, e.g. CSPR, EdFacts. The time included in the estimate is based on the overall process performed each year to bridge the systems and prepare the file for linking to MSIX feeds. The linkages are between relational database tables from the three systems. This estimate does not include the initial development time that was required. WestEd MSIN staff, CDE Data Management Division staff, CDE Assessments staff all participate. LEA efforts comprise most of the time, ensuring student identifiers used to match within the state reporting and data products are entered and are accurate.
3 Minutes

California maintains wholly separate systems for MEP, and state longitudinal student records. The data for assessments for the MEP students is merged as part of a back office process with linkages to state systems and is integrated with the process used to generate other Federal reports, e.g. CSPR, EdFacts. The time included in the estimate is based on the overall process performed each year to bridge the systems and prepare the file for linking to MSIX feeds. The linkages are between relational database tables from the three systems. This estimate does not include the initial development time that was required. WestEd MSIN staff, CDE Data Management Division staff participate. LEA efforts comprise most of the time, ensuring student identifiers used to match within the state reporting and data products are entered and are accurate
5 minutes
This step and activity is not currently performed at the SEA level. Because these are back office operations between distinct longitudunal systems this would require new rules for the data linkages and would leverage, thus be an extension of the existing data processes. This estimate does not include the initial development time that was required. WestEd MSIN staff, CDE Data Management Division staff participate. LEA efforts comprise most of the time, ensuring student identifiers used to match within the state reporting and data products are entered and are accurate
10
90
72% of the 10-11 count had a core data level entry or unpdate.
Unknown - would need to research. There are 23 Regional Centers and 500 participating LEAs to query and verify.

Glenn Miller, Project Director WestEd MSIN Project. California.

IC Data Form Part 1

Section 5: ICR SUMMARY

	Requested	Program Change Due to New Statute	Program Change Due to Agency Discretion
Annual Number of Responses	343,880	0	0
Annual Burden Hours	391,338	0	0
Annual Cost Burden (Dollars)	$15,348,284	0	$0

IC Data Form Part 2

Section 2: BURDEN

Number of Respondents	46
Responses per Respondent	7,476
Annual Nbr of Responses	343,880

Burden per Response			
	Time per Response	**Hours**	**Cost Per Response**
Reporting	1.14	1.14	$44.63
Record Keeping			
Third Party Disclosure			
Total	1.14	1.14	$44.63

Annual Burden with			
	Requested	**Program Change Due to New Statute**	**Program Change Due to Agency Discretion**
Annual Number of Responses	343,880	0	0
Annual IC Burden Hours	391,338	0	0
Annual IC Cost Burden (Dollars)	$15,348,284	0	$0

OF BURDEN

Annual Cost to the Federal Government ($)	$5,191,760

Change Due to Adjustment in Agency Estimate	Change Due to Potential Violation of the PRA	Previously Approved
-41,100	0	384,980
-8,436	0	399,774
$1,720,001	0	$13,628,283

DETAIL

Annual Burden		
	Annual Time Burden (Hours)	Annual Cost Burden (Dollars)
Reporting	391,338	15,348,284
Record Keeping		
Third Party Disclosure		
Total	391,338	15,348,284

Changes		
Change Due to Adjustment in Agency Estimate	**Change Due to Potential Violation of the PRA**	**Previously Approved**
-41,100	0	384,980
-8,436	0	399,774
$1,720,001	0	$13,628,283

State	Parent Phone 2	Parent Email 1	Parent Email 2	Total Hours
WA	300	300	300	900
CA	552	552	552	1,656
MI	53	53	53	159
NY	33	0	33	66
PA	20	20	20	60
TX	1866	1866	1866	5,598
FL	355	355	355	1,065
ID	200	200	200	600
CO	25	121	121	267
TOTAL	3404	3467	3500	10,371
AVG/STATE	378	385	389	1,152
National Total - 46 States	17,398	17,720	17,889	53,007
Median Response (hours)	200	200	200	27600

The median response was calculated instead of an average response to minimize the impact of State responses that deviated significantly (both high and low) from those provided by the other States.

State	Parent Phone 1
WA	Presently Collecting one phone number for the entire family. Stored in our COE table with connection to each student connected to the COE. No major Change in the amount of time to collect this number as it is already collected. We would just need some time to program the new location on our paper COEs, our eCOEs and to update the database with the new name of the field being added. This data is already being entered by the District Recruiters and/or Records Clerks within each of our Project Districts and by our Statewide Recruiters within our Non-Project Districts. Since they are already doing this for a phone number, there is no time commitment for the entry of the data.
CA	Manually entered by LEA MSIN recruiters on each COE, then updated as needed, and during annual verification to each child profile
MI	Recruiter collects at time of interview & documents on paper COE; data entry clerk enters # into MIS2000 which then connects with MSIX.
NY	Recruiter will collect this information and we are already completing this.

PA	We already collect a phone number, but it's only a single number per student/family
TX	This information is already collected by LEA or Regional recruiters or data specialists and entered by data specialists into the State database if entering from a paper COE but entered by recruiter if using an electronic COE. Data from the COE is also reviewed by a Designated State Agency Reviewer (one per LEA).
FL	This MDE would need to be added to our state migratory child database and school district data collection tool. School districts would need to format their student databases to capture this information (if they are not already doing so). Then the district Management Information System (MIS) staff would send batch files with this information to our state database for transmission to MSIX.
ID	Currently we only have one phone number collected on the COE and no emails

CO	Colorado already collects one parent/guardian phone number on its COE.

Parent Phone 2
We are not presently collecting a second phone number for the families by parent. We are only collecting one. This change would add 1 minute per COE to the person filing out the new COEs which would be somewhere in the neighborhood of 6800 minutes (>100 hour) on an average year. There would also be the time need to add this field to the MSIS database and to the COE form and the eCOE form. We would also need programming time to add the field to our HTML screens for viewing and verification of field value as well as the time to update the nightly process to MSIX. This data would need to be entered by the District Recruiters and/or Records Clerks within each of our Project Districts and by our Statewide Recruiters within our Non-Project Districts. Since they are already doing this for the one phone number.
Manually entered by LEA MSIN recruiters on each COE, then updated as needed, and during annual verification to each child profile
Recruiter may collect at time of interview & document on paper COE; would need add'l field created in MIS2000 to enter the # as currently there isn't one.
Instead of parent 2 the recruiters collect a next of kin phone number. This would be a minimal change for New York State.

Not opposed to adding a 2nd number, but not sure assigning it to each parent is the best way and that would require re-working a bunch of things, so it really depends. Preference would be to allow primary and alternate per student/family – would require some programing/training, but annually it would be minimal depending on how implemented
This information would be collected by LEA or Regional recruiters or data specialists and entered by data specialists into the State database if entering from a paper COE but entered by recruiter if using an electronic COE. Data from the COE is also reviewed by a Designated State Agency Reviewer (one per LEA).
This MDE would need to be added to our state migratory child database and school district data collection tool. School districts would need to format their student databases to capture this information (if they are not already doing so). Then the district MIS staff would send batch files with this information to our state database for transmission to MSIX.
Many districts collect some of this information; others may not. It would also require a coding change to our state database to add a second phone number and tie phone numbers to a specific parent/guardian and to add spaces to enter emails. I feel that this would really benefit ID&R (especially the phone numbers) and is worth the time spent.

The additional MDE of Parent/Guardian phone number will be collected by the recruiter during the 2022-23 Performance Period.

Parent Email 1	Parent Email 2
There would also be the time need to add this field to the MSIS database and to the COE form and the eCOE form. We would also need programming time to add the field to our HTML screens for viewing and verification of field value as well as the time to update the nightly process to MSIX. This data would need to be entered by the District Recruiters and/or Records Clerks within each of our Project Districts and by our Statewide Recruiters within our Non-Project Districts. Since they are already doing this for the one phone number.	We are not presently collecting an Email Address for either parent nor for the individual students. This change would add 1 minute per COE to the person filing out the new COEs which would be somewhere in the neighborhood of 6800 minutes (>100 hour) on an average year. There would also be the time need to add this field to the MSIS database and to the COE form and the eCOE form. We would also need programming time to add the field to our HTML screens for viewing and verification of field value as well as the time to update the nightly process to MSIX.
Manually entered by LEA MSIN recruiters on each COE, then updated as needed, and during annual verification to each child profile	Manually entered by LEA MSIN recruiters on each COE, then updated as needed, and during annual verification to each child profile
Not currently collected; would need add'l field created in MIS2000 to enter the # as currently there isn't one	Not currently collected; would need add'l field created in MIS2000 to enter the # as currently there isn't one
This information is collected by the recruiter and is currently being completed.	This would be an additional field for us with minimum amount of time expended

We do not currently collect an email, but we have had requests for it and don't feel it would be a "burden" to collect -- 20 hours initial for programming and roughly 5 minutes per family recruited each year or < 20 hours per year and well worth the effort.	Probably similar to #3, but again, not sure if best to link to a parent, but maybe two per student/family.
This information would be collected by LEA or Regional recruiters or data specialists and entered by data specialists into the State database if entering from a paper COE but entered by recruiter if using an electronic COE. Data from the COE is also reviewed by a Designated State Agency Reviewer (one per LEA).	This information would be collected by LEA or Regional recruiters or data specialists and entered by data specialists if entering from a paper COE but entered by recruiter if using an electronic COE. Data from the COE is also reviewed by a Designated State Agency Reviewer (one per LEA)
This MDE would need to be added to our state migratory child database and school district data collection tool. School districts would need to format their student databases to capture this information (if they are not already doing so). Then the district MIS staff would send batch files with this information to our state database for transmission to MSIX.	This MDE would need to be added to our state migratory child database and school district data collection tool. School districts would need to format their student databases to capture this information (if they are not already doing so). Then the district MIS staff would send batch files with this information to our state database for transmission to MSIX
Many districts collect some of this information; others may not. It would also require a coding change to our state database to add a second phone number and tie phone numbers to a specific parent/guardian and to add spaces to enter emails. I feel that this would really benefit ID&R (especially the phone numbers) and is worth the time spent.	Many districts collect some of this information; others may not. It would also require a coding change to our state database to add a second phone number and tie phone numbers to a specific parent/guardian and to add spaces to enter emails. I feel that this would really benefit ID&R (especially the phone numbers) and is worth the time spent.

Colorado currently does not collect a parent/guardian/self (worker) email address. This new MDE has been added to the state's COE and will be collected by the recruiter during the 2022-23 Performance Period. This also includes adding the email address information to necessary reports.	Colorado currently does not collect a parent/guardian/self (worker) email address. This new MDE has been added to the state's COE and will be collected by the recruiter during the 2022-23 Performance Period. This also includes adding the email address information to necessary reports.

Graduation Date	HSE Date
added if we determine it will need a separate field. We receive this data on our Monthly reconciliation with our State Office in Olympia, by way of Web Services between the MSIS and Wa State Student Database. This data comes to us as a spreadsheet variable with a single value shared with HSE Date which is a termination date in one field and the termination reason in another. The data is uploaded to our MSIS monthly for each eligible student within the MSIS.	the new name of the field being added if we determine it will need a separate field. We receive this data on our Monthly reconciliation with our State Office in Olympia, by way of Web Services between the MSIS and Wa State Student Database. This data comes to us as a spreadsheet variable with a single value shared with Graduation Date which is a termination date in one field and the termination reason in another. The data is uploaded to our MSIS monthly for each eligible student within the MSIS.
Manually entered by LEA MSIN data specialists to each child profile upon graduation	Manually entered by LEA MSIN data specialists to each child profile upon HSE
Data entry clerks enter date into MIS2000 upon end of performance period that student graduates and/or upon receiving/researching notification of student's completion date. *Districts would have to research students who leave the state but are potential grads or HSE students.	Data entry clerks enter date into MIS2000 upon end of performance period that student graduates and/or upon receiving/researching notification of student's completion date. *Districts would have to research students who leave the state but are potential grads or HSE students.
This is collected via the state data repository and splitting this would require very little work or additional time.	This is collected via the state data repository and splitting this would require very little work or additional time

We currently split Graduation vs HSED, so really no burden – just a mapping change for MSIX	We currently split Graduation vs HSED, so really no burden – just a mapping change for MSIX
This information is already collected by LEA or Regional data specialists and entered by data specialists into the State database.	This information is already collected by LEA or Regional data specialists and entered by data specialists into the State database, but prompt might come from the recruiter when notified by the family
This MDE would need to be added to our state migratory child database. School district MIS staff could then send batch files with this information to our state database for transmission to MSIX.	This MDE would need to be added to our state migratory child database. School district MIS staff could then send batch files with this information to our state database for transmission to MSIX.
We do collect HSE and graduation dates and the qualifying activity, so that wouldn't be a burden at all.	We do collect HSE and graduation dates and the qualifying activity, so that wouldn't be a burden at all.

The graduation and HSE information are pulled in via webservices from the Department’s Data Pipeline and imported into SMART as reported by the districts.	The graduation and HSE information are pulled in via webservices from the Department’s Data Pipeline and imported into SMART as reported by the districts.

Qualifying Activity
we have had with this option in other SOCAR meetings, what this really means is “activity and crop” which we store in our system as “Activity” and “Crop” in two separate field in a table in our DB. To combine our two fields into one to upload to MSIX, we would need time to program the new value into the MSIX Web Service that runs nightly to transfer data from the MSIS (Washington DB) to the MSIX. This data is already being entered by the District Recruiters and/or Records Clerks within each of our Project Districts and by our Statewide Recruiters within our Non-Project Districts. Since they are already doing this for the qualifying activity (just the action), there is no time commitment for the entry of the data.
Manually entered by LEA MSIN recruiters on each COE
Recruiter collects at time of interview & documents on paper COE; data entry clerk enters into MIS2000 which then connects with MSIX.
This information is currently being collected by the recruiter. We may want to try to standardize this field so it has more value across the country. Things like Apple-Picking instead of picking apples should be uniform. If we just send in what we have this requires no additional time.

No burden – already collected on our COE
This information is already collected by LEA or Regional recruiters or data specialists and entered by data specialists into the State database if entering from a paper COE but entered by recruiter if using an electronic COE. Data from the COE is also reviewed by a Designated State Agency Reviewer (one per LEA).
This MDE would need to be added to our state migratory child database and school district data collection tool. School districts would need to format their student databases to capture this information (if they are not already doing so). Then the district MIS staff would send batch files with this information to our state database for transmission to MSIX
We do collect HSE and graduation dates and the qualifying activity, so that wouldn't be a burden at all.

The qualifying activity is already being captured by the recruiter as a required data element on the National COE data qualifying move and work section

QA - free text versus list
For question 2) we definitely prefer to keep option 1 with a free text field, which would not create any additional burden. We do not see how a comprehensive list could be created with all the different qualifying activities that we see on CA COEs. In addition to more time during recruitment because recruiters would have to match the information collected from the parent to an option on the qualifying activity list (calculating 3 minutes per COE x 16,500 COEs completed last year= 827 hours) Option 2 would also require a tremendous amount of work such as: • 120 hours- development to refactor the COE (which would cause a pause in current development) • 80 hours- finding a way to match previous definitions to what the field is already accustomed to entering (if there is not an option for "other") • 40 hours- creating tables to map CA-specific activities to OMEs master list • 40 hours- edit and republish the COE instructions • 40 hours- recreate and distribute User Guide videos • 40 hours- retraining the field to use this new functionality
We also concur with Vaughn's comments on the need for this to be free text. Any other type of drop down would be significant work to implement. Free text would assist recruiters in completing COEs based on history which would be helpful. I don't see a significant need to be able to do anything else with the data. I'm sure if it were standardized we could do more reporting and analysis of types of work, but it's not necessary data to implement or improve MEP programming.
We do not use free text for our qualifying activities. We have a table that recruiters are allowed to pick existing qualifying activities. If one is not available it can be easily be added to the table. Speaking from an ID/R perspective having this information in a consistent table is helpful for planning and organizing ID/R. That being said either option works for New York.

We are in favor of Option 1. We concur with the other members on the need for this to be free text. A drop down would be significant work to implement for us as well. Free text is what recruiters use in completing eCOEs. This would not cause a change in burden from what we previously estimated.
a. Option 1: The free text field would provide the best flexibility nationwide, as it allows each SEA to provide very specific information which can then be cross-checked against the activities reported on children's COEs. This would require typing in the qualifying activities manually, which would take the most time. It would not change Florida's estimated number of hours needed to report this MDE; I already factored it into what I sent for the MDE burden survey. b. Option 2: The prepopulated selection list could work well for MSIX because, as Dr. Starr mentioned, it would make it possible to run reports. I think the way to do it would be to have two or three list levels, like this: i. Level 1: Industry Select Agriculture or Fishing ii. Level 2: Type of Activity Select Temporary Employment, Seasonal Employment, or Personal Subsistence iii. Level 3: Type of Work 1. For Agriculture: Select one or more of – Crop Production, Initial Crop Processing, Livestock Production, Initial Livestock Processing, Poultry Production, Initial Poultry Processing, Plant Production, Initial Plant Processing, Dairy Production, Initial Dairy Processing. 2. For Fishing: Select one or more of – Catching Fish or Shellfish, Initial Processing of Fish or Shellfish, Fish Farm Production, Fish Farm Initial Processing. Option 2 would probably be a little more complicated to set up, since it would require each district to update its data base with those option levels. But I actually like Option 2 better, since the reports we could run would provide very helpful data that our recruiters can use. Also, once it's set up, it could prove to be faster to enter the data
Option 1 is the only option possible for our state and is what the burden statement was based on. I can't imagine how we could even do option 2 without an enormous burden and major re-writing of our eCOE system. The list of activities and crops is nearly endless and our eCOE is a free text field to accommodate that. I thought of something else too (surprise!). As far as analyzing the qualifying activities with a free text field, there are some advanced filters that would allow for partial matches so that, while it wouldn't be as accurate as we could wish, I could filter looking for the keyword for an activity or a crop (e.g. *hops,* *slaughtering*) and I would probably get some useful information. We do teach liaisons to include use "verb+ing noun," (e.g. tying hops) so there is some consistency that would help us filter or sort a report.

In the beginning of implementing SMART, the qualifying activity field was a ‘free text field’. We ran into issues with how users were adding irrelevant information and typo’s. Additionally, Colorado also invoked a character limitation. The solution was standardizing the list with ‘AutoComplete’ functionality. Not quite a Drop Down Menu but typing something in the field that would bring up selectable choices.

The standardization for collecting the ‘qualifying activity’ is essentially implemented in SMART today. We already have a table in our database that captures this information. The ‘AutoComplete’ feature for the ‘qualifying activity’ field can easily be modified to a structured Drop-Down List provided by OME. From a code change perspective, Colorado would obviously need to modify all stored procedures to accommodate the changes in the User Interface (UI) and provide a method to transmit this information to MSIX. MSIX will most likely develop some testing criteria in its test environment to prove the concept first and Colorado is including our estimate in our accumulated time. All activities considered, our estimate is 100 hours of development time, as this would be a minor change to our UI. User training and materials, estimate is 40 hours for development and technical assistance.