

Migrant Re-interview Report 2019–20

California Department of Education Migrant Education Office

Submitted to:

Jamie Contreras

California Department of Education
Migrant Education Office
1430 N Street, Suite 2204
Sacramento, CA 95814

Submitted by:

WestEd

1000 G Street, Suite 500
Sacramento, CA 95814

Submitted on:
December 18, 2020

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Key Findings	3
Introduction	4
Methodology	5
Sampling Plan	5
Re-interview Instruments	6
Re-interview Training	7
Re-interview Data: Collection, Review, and Management	7
Results	11
Conclusion	13
Recommendations	13
Appendix A: Re-interview Instrument Excerpts	15
Family Re-interview Instrument, English	15
Self-Qualifier Re-interview Instrument, English	16
Appendix B: 2019–20 Statewide and Local Re-interviews: Purposes, Protocols, and Tools Training Agenda	17
Day 1: Thursday, December 5, 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.	17
Day 2: Friday, December 6, 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.	18
Appendix C: Re-interview Data File Template	19
Identifying Information from the Label	19
Personal Information	19
Qualifying Worker	19
Qualifying Work	19
Child Move	19
Subsequent Move	19
Round-Trip Move	19
Appendix D: Re-interview Review Form	20

Executive Summary

For 2019–20, the Migrant Education Office of the California Department of Education contracted WestEd to develop and implement a process to coordinate and conduct a prospective statewide re-interview of California’s migrant families. The purposes of a prospective statewide re-interview are to verify eligibility of children and youths for migrant education services and to identify a valid eligibility discrepancy rate for the state. Information collected from a prospective re-interview process is used as an early warning system for states to identify potential issues with the quality control of identification and recruitment of migratory children and youths.

This report summarizes the status of prospective statewide re-interview activities for program year 2019–20, which extended from September 1, 2019, to August 31, 2020. The structure of the report includes a methodology that describes the approved re-interview tasks (writing and implementing the sampling plan, providing a re-interview training to local Migrant Education Program staff, and managing and analyzing re-interview data); descriptive results of the prospective re-interviews (state response and discrepancy rates, including reasons for ineligibility decisions); and data interpretation and recommendations for future re-interview cycles.

Key Findings

- The state’s re-interview response rate was 100 percent for the 2019–20 re-interview cycle.
- The state’s discrepancy rate was 1.7 percent for the 2019–20 re-interview cycle.

Recommendations based on these key findings and on the re-interview process as a whole are provided in the Conclusion section of this report, beginning on page 13.

Introduction

The Migrant Education Program (MEP) is authorized under Part C of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The California MEP is administered by the California Department of Education (CDE) Migrant Education Office (MEO). The CDE provides subgrants to 20 local MEP offices that serve students in 45 of the state's 58 counties. Each year, per Title 34 Code of Federal Regulations 200.89 (b)(2), the CDE must validate current-year child eligibility determinations through a re-interview of a randomly selected sample of children previously identified as eligible to receive services from the MEP. Prior to the update effective September 1, 2020, the Code of Federal Regulations required the statewide re-interviews to be completed by independent re-interviewers at least once every three years. The CDE MEO last conducted an independent re-interview for the 2018–19 program year.

For the 2019–20 re-interview cycle, the CDE MEO contracted WestEd to coordinate prospective statewide re-interviews of California's migrant families. The purposes of a prospective statewide re-interview are to verify eligibility of children and youths for migrant education services and to identify a valid eligibility discrepancy rate for the state. Information collected from a prospective re-interview process is used as an early warning system for states to identify potential issues with the quality control of the identification and recruitment (I&R) of migratory children and youths. The 2019–20 re-interviews were conducted in accordance with the US Department of Education's 2010 Technical Assistance Guide on Re-interviewing.¹

This report summarizes the prospective statewide re-interview activities for program year 2019–20, which extended from September 1, 2019 to August 31, 2020.

The structure of the report includes a methodology that describes the approved re-interview tasks (implementing the sampling plan, providing re-interview training to local re-interview coordinators, and managing and analyzing re-interview data); descriptive results of the prospective statewide re-interview (state response and discrepancy rates, including reasons for ineligibility decisions); and data interpretation and recommendations for future re-interview cycles.

¹ US Department of Education. 2010. *Technical Assistance Guide on Re-interviewing*. Washington, DC: Author. <https://results-assets.s3.amazonaws.com/tools/mep-reinterviewing-guide-dec-10.pdf>

Methodology

Sampling Plan

WestEd conducted a simple random sample for the state, calculated using a 4 percent discrepancy rate with a 95 percent confidence level and a plus or minus (+/–) 5 percent margin of error. A sample of 59 children was calculated, based on the 2018–19 statewide count of 38,697² student recruitments. To account for nonresponses, an oversample of an additional 59 children across the state was drawn, for a total sample draw of 118 child names.

To ensure the sample demonstrates rigor and is representative of the state’s population of children eligible to receive MEP services, the sampling universe included all children from the state’s database whose Certificate of Eligibility (COE) was signed between September 1, 2019, and August 31, 2020. Each child had an equal chance of being chosen. The sample included five draws, one each for quarters 1, 2, and 3, and two³ for quarter 4, as follows:

- **Quarter 1 COEs:** In early December 2019, a sample of 19 student names and an oversample of 19 student names were drawn from COEs signed between September 1, 2019, and November 30, 2019.⁴
- **Quarter 2 COEs:** In early March 2020, a sample of 10 student names and an oversample of 10 student names were drawn from COEs signed between December 1, 2019, and February 29, 2020.

² The count of student recruitments used for the sampling plan is taken before the annual close of data; however, small adjustments to the number of recruitments are unlikely to affect the number of re-interviews necessary using the calculation of a 95 percent confidence level and a +/- 5 percent margin of error.

³ There are two draws for quarter 4 COEs to ensure the entire year’s student population is included in the sample and to allow the state sufficient time to submit accurate data for the Consolidated State Performance Report. Having two draws allows for more time to conduct quarter 4 re-interviews. To illustrate, if quarter 4 followed the same pattern as the previous three quarters, the sample would be drawn once in early September, allowing only a few short weeks to conduct 16 re-interviews across the state.

⁴ Each sample draw was weighted based on the prior year’s quarterly eligibility percentage. For example, in the 2018–19 program year, 33 percent of recruitments occurred during the time period of September 1, 2018, to November 30, 2018. This percentage was used to determine what percentage of the overall sample was drawn for quarter 1 COEs (33 percent of 59 is 19.4, rounded down to 19 student names and doubled for oversample to equal 38 student names).

- **Quarter 3 COEs:** In early June 2020, a sample of 15 student names and an oversample of 15 student names were drawn from COEs signed between March 1, 2020, and May 31, 2020.
- **Quarter 4 COEs:**
 - In early August 2020, a sample of 10 student names and an oversample of 10 student names were drawn from COEs signed between June 1, 2019, and July 31, 2019.
 - In early September 2020, a sample of 5 student names and an oversample of 5 student names were drawn from COEs signed between August 1, 2019, and August 31, 2019.

Re-interview Instruments

California uses four re-interview instruments: (1) family instrument, English; (2) family instrument, Spanish; (3) self-qualifier instrument, English; and (4) self-qualifier instrument, Spanish. The family instrument is used when re-interviewing a COE signer who is a parent or guardian, and the self-qualifier instrument is used when re-interviewing a COE signer who qualified as the worker. The language of the instrument (English or Spanish) is determined by the preferred language of the family.

These instruments were created to align with California's 2017 COE⁵ and were developed and tested in accordance with the US Department of Education's 2010 Technical Assistance Guide on Re-interviewing. These re-interview instruments were validated in a live pilot, occurring between September 2017 and January 2018, that sought to approximate re-interview field conditions. This pilot test used live COEs created between July 1 and August 31, 2017. Two rounds of pilot testing, each consisting of 50 COEs across five subgrantees, were used in the validation process, with data collection occurring after each round to assess the utility and usability of the instruments. Five subgrantees were selected to participate in the pilot test because of their historically high recruitment in July and August, which would offer a substantial enough pool of COEs to draw from.

Each instrument includes a gray-shaded column on the right-hand side for comparisons between the re-interview data and the COE. On each instrument, the specific section of the COE that corresponds to a re-interview question is listed next to the question. This transparent alignment between the COE and the instruments helps to ensure that the re-interviewer and the reviewer appropriately compare the re-interview data to the

⁵ California's 2017 COE was developed to reflect the US Department of Education's eligibility guidelines as updated in March 2017.

information recorded on the COE. Appendix A includes excerpts from the English versions of the family and self-qualifier instruments.

Due to health restrictions and statewide and local stay-at-home orders as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, re-interviews were conducted remotely between March and September 2020. To accommodate remote re-interviews as well as distanced transferring of re-interview data (electronically), California implemented a fillable PDF version of each re-interview instrument. This fillable re-interview instrument matched the validated paper instruments described above exactly in structure and contents. The fillable PDF versions of the re-interview instruments were used to conduct re-interviews between March and September of 2020. These PDFs were stored and transferred in adherence with state and local guidelines for data security.

Re-interview Training

In December of 2019, representatives from all California MEP subgrantees were invited to participate in an in-person day-and-a-half re-interview training. The training addressed the following topics: (1) an overview of statewide and local re-interviews, including subgrantee roles and responsibilities in each; (2) collecting unbiased data by completing the re-interview questionnaire thoroughly; (3) scheduling a re-interview appointment; (4) demonstrating cultural sensitivity throughout the re-interview process; (5) learning about the re-interview instruments and practicing using them within the re-interview protocol for interviewing families and self-qualifiers; (6) establishing a reliable re-interview review process for local re-interviews; (7) understanding the simple random sample used for re-interviews and when subgrantees may wish to sample beyond a simple random sample; and (8) using local data analysis and reflection tools and protocols. The training agenda is included in Appendix B.

Re-interview Data: Collection, Review, and Management

WestEd disseminated packets⁶ to re-interviewers after each sample draw. WestEd disseminated physical packets for quarters 1 and 2 and electronic packets for quarters 3 and 4. The electronic packets were used to support subgrantees to adhere to state and

⁶ The term *packet* refers both to physical and electronic re-interview packets. A physical packet is a sealed manila envelope with a COE inside and a label affixed to the outside. The label includes information necessary for a re-interviewer to make an appointment with a family without opening the envelope (since the re-interview protocol specifies that the COE be removed from the envelope only at a specific time during the re-interview). An electronic packet includes the same information as a physical packet, including a file with a re-interview label and a COE with instructions not to open until the appropriate time in the re-interview.

local health and safety guidance during the pandemic. Table 1 shows the length of time re-interviewers conducted re-interviews in each quarter.

Table 1: Re-interviews Are Conducted Near the Time of the Sample Draw

Quarter	Date range of COE signatures	Date of sample draw	Date range of re-interviews
1	September 1 to November 30, 2019	December 2, 2019	December 13, 2019 to January 30, 2020
2	December 1, 2019 to February 29, 2020	March 3, 2020	March 9 to April 18, 2020
3	March 1 to May 31, 2020	June 3, 2020	June 25 to July 13, 2020
4	June 1 to July 31, 2020	August 5, 2020	August 18 to August 30, 2020
4	August 1 to August 31, 2020	September 3, 2020	September 4 to September 21, 2020

Physical packets were returned to WestEd via United Parcel Service, using labels prepared by WestEd. Electronic packets were returned to WestEd via a secure file system, Box, which meets California's requirements for data security when data is at rest and in transfer.

WestEd created two tools for data collection and management: a re-interview contact log and a re-interview data file, both in spreadsheet format. WestEd entered accurate and complete data into the re-interview contact log and the re-interview data file. WestEd updated the contact log after receiving re-interview packets from subgrantees, and the data file after the re-interview review process was complete.

Re-interview Contact Log

WestEd created and populated a contact log in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. The contact log included information on (1) family contact attempts, (2) re-interviewer name, (3) method of re-interview (in person or by phone), (4) any qualitative notes that could be used as lessons learned to improve the process, and (5) data related to tracking the submission and receipt of re-interview packets. The re-interview contact log served the dual purpose of capturing details of family contact attempts and re-interview outcomes, as well as tracking physical and electronic packets through the re-interview and review process.

Re-interview Data File

WestEd created and populated a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet that included a column for each data point in each instrument, as well as columns to capture specific differences between the re-interview and the COE. The re-interview data spreadsheet acted as an electronic record of each re-interview. The re-interview data file template is included in this report in Appendix C.

Re-interview Review Process

The re-interview review process consisted of two tiers (Tier 1 and Tier 2), each with its own review team. The Tier 1 review team screened and reviewed every completed re-interview. Those re-interviews were deemed “clean” (no eligibility concerns) by the Tier 1 review team were given to a data specialist for logging and filing. Any packet determined by the Tier 1 team to have potential eligibility issues was submitted to the Tier 2 review team. For each packet in question, two Tier 2 team members independently reviewed the packet. If they agreed on the recommendation, that recommendation was submitted to the CDE. If the Tier 2 reviewers did not agree after their independent reviews, they discussed the packet in an effort to come to a consensus; the consensus recommendation was then provided to the state. Each round of review was documented, with rationales for ineligibility included, using a standardized form (included in Appendix D).

Each packet that passed through Tier 2 review was presented to the CDE with an eligibility recommendation. Those recommendations fell into one of three categories: (1) maintain eligibility, (2) ineligible, or (3) important information on the COE not verified. The CDE reviewed all eligibility recommendations and made final eligibility determinations for each case. The eligibility determinations fall into the same three categories as the recommendations mentioned above. Descriptions for each determination and its outcome process are captured below. Note that all determinations and outcome processes are included below, although not all were implemented this year. For example, no subgrantees submitted an appeal on an ineligibility determination this year.

- **Maintain eligibility** — There were no eligibility concerns. Any differences between re-interview data and that recorded on the COE were minor and did not affect the child’s eligibility. In these cases, the state did not notify the subgrantee, and no action was required on the part of the subgrantee. The child continued to be eligible to receive MEP services. The re-interview outcome was *maintain eligibility*.
- **Ineligible** — Based on information collected during the re-interview, the child did not appear to meet eligibility criteria and was deemed ineligible to receive MEP services.

The state notified the subgrantee. The subgrantee had fifteen days to appeal the ineligibility decision through engaging in the statewide appeals process.

- If no appeal was submitted or if the appeal was denied, the COE was marked ineligible in California's Migrant Student Information Network (MSIN) and the child was no longer eligible to receive services. The re-interview outcome was *ineligible*.
- If an appeal was submitted and accepted, the child maintained their eligibility to receive MEP services. The re-interview outcome was *maintain eligibility*.
- **Important information on the COE not verified** — Based on information collected during the re-interview, the child appeared to meet eligibility criteria; however, there were substantive differences between the information collected during the re-interview and that recorded on the COE (e.g., move dates off by weeks or months, different move-to or move-from cities). The state notified the subgrantee. The subgrantee had fifteen days to send a recruiter—different from the original recruiter—to conduct a new recruitment interview.
 - If the child was determined to be eligible on the basis of that recruitment interview, either the existing COE was validated and maintained or the current COE was deleted and a new COE generated. The child continued to be eligible to receive services. The re-interview outcome was *maintain eligibility*.
 - If the child was not eligible based on that recruitment interview or the subgrantee did not conduct a second recruitment interview, the child was deemed ineligible. The COE was marked ineligible in MSIN, and the child was no longer eligible to receive services. The re-interview outcome was *ineligible*.

Results

Overall, re-interviewers conducted 59 valid re-interviews across the state, for a 100 percent response rate. Twenty re-interviews were conducted in person, while 39 were conducted by phone⁷. One of these 59 re-interviews resulted in an ineligibility determination, for an eligibility discrepancy rate of 1.7 percent, a decrease from the discrepancy rate found in the 2018–19 re-interview cycle. Response and discrepancy rates are shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Response and Discrepancy Rates



On the next page, Table 2, shows the reasons for eligibility determinations and re-interview outcomes for each packet forwarded to the the Tier 2 team and determined to be either ineligible or important information on the COE not verified. If the child’s eligibility was withdrawn as a result of the re-interview process, that re-interview contributed to the discrepancy rate. If the child maintained their eligibility to receive services after the re-interview, that re-interview did not contribute to the discrepancy rate.

⁷ The number of phone re-interviews is higher than in years past because all re-interviews conducted during stay at home orders or when health conditions necessitated social distancing were conducted over the phone.

Table 2: Eligibility Determinations and Outcomes, by COE

COE #	Eligibility determination	Reason(s) for eligibility determination	Re-interview outcome	Contributed to discrepancy rate?
D917783	Important information on the COE not verified as recorded	The child did not move with, to join, or to precede worker. The worker did not move in preceding 36 months.	The initial recommendation and eligibility determination found the child to be <i>ineligible</i> . The subgrantee then determined that the child was qualified on existing COE D915918 through December 9, 2020. Since the child maintained their eligibility based on a previous move, the final re-interview outcome was <i>COE not verified as recorded</i> , and the child maintained eligibility to receive services. COE D917783 was marked ineligible in MSIN.	No; the child maintained eligibility to receive services.
D420016	Important information on the COE not verified as recorded	The child's move cities were not verified. The worker's move cities were not verified.	The subgrantee sent an experienced recruiter—different from the initial recruiter—to conduct a second recruitment interview. During that interview, the child was found to meet eligibility criteria, and a new COE with accurate information was created. COE D420016 was marked ineligible in MSIN and replaced with COE D420921. The final re-interview outcome was <i>Important information on the COE not verified as recorded</i> , and the child maintained their eligibility to receive services.	No; the child maintained eligibility to receive services.
D420552	Ineligible	The worker's move date was not verified.	The initial recommendation and eligibility determination found that there was <i>important information on the COE not verified as recorded</i> ; however, the family would not agree to meet with subgrantee staff again to verify eligibility. The re-interview outcome was <i>ineligible</i> , and the COE was marked ineligible in MSIN.	Yes; the child was no longer eligible to receive services.

Conclusion

During the 2019–20 prospective statewide migrant re-interview cycle, 59 valid re-interviews were conducted, for a state response rate of 100 percent. Out of the 59 re-interviews, one child was determined to be ineligible to receive services, for a state eligibility discrepancy rate of 1.7 percent, a decrease from the previous cycle's statewide discrepancy rate.

Like the 2017–18 and 2018–19 re-interview cycles, the 2019–20 cycle used a revised, Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)–compliant re-interview instrument. This user-friendly instrument allowed for the collection and review of data more efficiently and with less human error than in the years prior to 2017–18. The CDE's re-interview instrument and the tools and processes used to review and track re-interview data allow for an accurate, thorough, consistent, and transparent re-interview process.

The following recommendations will enable the state to continue conducting a transparent, high-quality, valid, and reliable re-interview process.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Continue the rolling re-interview process

As in prior years, WestEd recommends that the state maintain a quarterly rolling re-interview process when conducting statewide re-interviews, whereby re-interviews are conducted throughout the year. A quarterly re-interview process minimizes errors because families are re-interviewed closer to the time of the original recruitment interview. The shorter time frame between recruitment and re-interview should also make families easier to locate for a re-interview, leading to higher response rates; it also may enable families to better recall details of qualifying moves, leading to the collection of more reliable data.

Recommendation 2: Develop an electronic instrument platform to reduce the possibility of error

The ESSA-compliant instruments used in the 2019–20 statewide prospective re-interview cycle were designed to be as user-friendly as possible while collecting all data points necessary for reviewers to verify eligibility (or to highlight eligibility concerns or issues with COE quality). To reduce the possibility of human error in data collection, WestEd recommends transitioning to a smart electronic instrument that utilizes automatic fill, immediate comparison of items, and skip logic. Such a transition would decrease the potential for human error during data collection, tracking, and review. After transitioning to phone re-interviews during the pandemic, subgrantee re-interviewers used a fillable PDF of the instrument. This fillable PDF version of the instrument has

some benefits of a smart electronic instrument (e.g., it can be transferred electronically); overall, it is functionally very similar to the paper form. At this point, the fillable PDF instrument does not have the capability of connecting with a database or source document that might allow for the pre-population of data or an automatic comparison between re-interview data and the data recorded on the COE.

Recommendation 3: Continue to use the current re-interview instruments

As in the previous cycle, WestEd recommends that the state continue to use the validated, revised, ESSA-compliant re-interview instruments for both local and statewide re-interviews, either paper or fillable PDF, unless and until smart electronic versions are in place. Although paper and fillable PDF instruments, in general, may allow for more error than a smart electronic instrument would, the existing instruments enable thorough, accurate, valid, and reliable data collection.

Recommendation 4: Provide ongoing support and feedback for local re-interviewers

During the past several re-interview cycles, subgrantee re-interviewers benefited from ongoing support and technical assistance throughout the re-interview process. WestEd established flexible opportunities for subgrantees to receive support, including through a call line, a dedicated email address, and through individual calls and virtual meetings. The combination of these efforts improved the quality of the data collected and, thus, the fidelity of the re-interview process. WestEd recommends that future re-interview cycles also provide ongoing support and technical assistance opportunities for local re-interviewers, coordinated by WestEd or through local MEP offices.

Recommendation 5: Continue standardized local re-interview processes

In the 2019–20 re-interview cycle, the discrepancy rate dropped from 10.2 percent the year before to 1.7 percent. The CDE MEO and WestEd have been providing ongoing training and guidance to subgrantees to help support quality I&R practices, and subgrantees have adopted the statewide protocols and tools into their own, ongoing re-interview processes. By employing a standardized process by which subgrantees conduct local re-interviews using the same re-interview protocol that is used in the statewide re-interview, both subgrantees and the CDE better understand subgrantee-specific trends, bright spots, and needs within local I&R processes.

Appendix A: Re-interview Instrument Excerpts

Family Re-interview Instrument, English

Date of Re-Interview: _____		Start Time of Re-Interview: _____	
Name of Re-Interviewer: _____		Re-interview conducted: <input type="checkbox"/> In-person <input type="checkbox"/> Phone	
Introduction			
<p><i>After greeting the re-interviewee, please say:</i> Thank you for your participation in this re-interview. As you might recall, the person who conducted the initial interview of your child(ren) who is/are in the Migrant Education Program, mentioned that there may be a follow-up interview. That follow-up interview is the one we are about to begin now. This re-interview serves to confirm the information originally collected to establish the eligibility of your child(ren) in the Program.</p>			
<p>Directions are in italics. To complete this form:</p> <p> = write <input type="checkbox"/> = check [] = complete without asking</p>			
Personal Information	Re-Interview Questions: Personal Information		Do not complete this column until instructed to in #10.
	<p>1. What is your full name? (IX)</p> <p></p> <p>What is your relationship to []? (IX)</p> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;"><i>sampled child name</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Parent (Father/Mother)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Guardian</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Spouse</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (explain):</p> <p style="color: blue; font-size: small;">The Roman numeral in parentheses refers to section IX of the COE. This is the section of the COE the re-interview and reviewers should compare with the data collected in this question in the re-interview.</p>		<p>Focus on the fields where you entered information on the left. Use the labels in parentheses next to each field to identify the corresponding COE items for comparison.</p> <p>Do the fields match the corresponding COE items?</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><i>If No, COE shows:</i></p> <p>Explain the reason(s) for the difference(s):</p>

Self-Qualifier Re-interview Instrument, English

SELF-QUALIFIER

Date of Re-Interview: _____

Start Time of Re-Interview: _____

Name of Re-Interviewer: _____

Re-interview conducted: ☐ In-person ☐ Phone

Introduction

After greeting the re-interviewee, please say: Thank you for your participation in this re-interview. As you might recall, the person who conducted the initial interview for your participation in the Migrant Education Program, mentioned that there may be a follow-up interview. That follow-up interview is the one we are about to begin now. This re-interview serves to confirm the information originally collected to establish your eligibility in the Program.

Start of Re-Interview

Directions are in italics. To complete this form: = write <input type="checkbox"/> = check [] = complete without asking	
Personal Information	Re-Interview Questions: Personal Information
	<p>1. We are conducting this re-interview for <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 1.2em; margin: 2px 0;"></div> <i>sampled child name</i></p> <p>What is your full name? (VI - names) </p> <p>What is your birth date? (VI - birthdate) </p> <p>When you were initially interviewed on <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100px; height: 1.2em; margin: 2px 0;"></div> <i>MEP date on label</i>, had you graduated from high school or the equivalent in the United States? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No (VII - grade) <i>If yes: When did you graduate from high school or the equivalent in the United States?</i> _____</p>
<p>Do not complete this column until instructed to in #6.</p> <p>Focus on the fields where you entered information on the left. Use the labels in parentheses next to each field to identify the corresponding COE items for comparison.</p> <p>Do the fields match the corresponding COE items? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><i>If No, COE shows:</i></p> <p>Explain the reason(s) for the difference(s):</p>	

Appendix B: 2019–20 Statewide and Local Re-interviews: Purposes, Protocols, and Tools Training Agenda

Day 1: Thursday, December 5, 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Topic	Learning Outcomes
Welcome & Introductions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue developing a collaborative support network
Local and Statewide Re-interviews Overview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understand the purpose for local re-interviews and statewide re-interviews Understand the difference between the statewide re-interviews and local re-interviews as part of local quality control Understand subgrantee roles in both the statewide and local re-interview
Accurate Data Collection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understand the importance of accurate data collection for the re-interview process Understand how to use probes to gather specific data Understand strategies to document collected data specifically and without bias
Lunch 11:30–12:30 p.m.	N/A
Scheduling a Re-interview Appointment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understand and apply techniques to successfully schedule an appointment with a family
Successful Re-interviewing through Cultural Sensitivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrate cultural sensitivity when engaging in the re-interview process
Re-interview Tools Overview: COE & Re-interview Questionnaire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Begin to become familiar with the family and self-qualifier re-interview questionnaires
Break 2:15–2:30 p.m.	

Topic	Learning Outcomes
Family Questionnaire & Self-qualifier Guided Practice & Partner Practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to develop familiarity with the re-interview questionnaires, including use of the COE during re-interviews • Apply knowledge of the re-interview questionnaires • Apply knowledge of using the COE during re-interviews
Stretch break 4:00–4:10 p.m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A
Local Process for Review of Re-interview Questionnaires	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand and apply a standardized review process to ensure valid and reliable re-interview results
Sampling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand and apply standardized techniques to pull a valid random sample of children
Closure and Day 1 Survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communicate learning and feedback to the facilitation team

Day 2: Friday, December 6, 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Topic	Learning Outcome
Recap of Day 1 and Q & A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinforce understandings from Day 1
Local Quarterly Survey & Data Reflection and Analysis Tools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the purpose of the data analysis and reflection tools • Understand how to use the data analysis and reflection tools • Understand and apply the criteria for a quality reflection that demonstrates continuous improvement
Closure and Day 2 Survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communicate learning and feedback to the facilitation team
Distribution of Packets for Statewide Re-interviews, Quarter 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receive statewide re-interview packets

Appendix C: Re-interview Data File Template

Identifying Information from the Label

2	Region	RID	COES_ID	COE_#	Recruiter	Date
---	--------	-----	---------	-------	-----------	------

Personal Information

2	PI.1 Match?	Name	COE_Signer_Name	relationship	relationship	COE Signer?	non-match
---	-------------	------	-----------------	--------------	--------------	-------------	-----------

2	PI.2 Match?	RI_Child_Name	Child_Name	RI_DOB	COE_DOB	RI_Grade	COE_Grade	match
---	-------------	---------------	------------	--------	---------	----------	-----------	-------

Qualifying Worker

2	MP Match?	Move_Date	te	W/in 3 yrs?	RI_Move_From	_From	o	_To
---	-----------	-----------	----	-------------	--------------	-------	---	-----

2	RI_Worker_District_Move_From	District_Move_From	District_Move_To	COE_Worker_District_Move_To	RI_Worker	COE_Worker	relationship	relationship	Explanation for non-match
---	------------------------------	--------------------	------------------	-----------------------------	-----------	------------	--------------	--------------	---------------------------

Qualifying Work

2	Match?	obtained	Obtained	60 days?	type	type	obtained_1	Obtained_1	pe_1	type_1	match
---	--------	----------	----------	----------	------	------	------------	------------	------	--------	-------

Child Move

2	MP1 Match?	e	Move_Date	Join	Join	RI_QAD	COE_QAD	Explanation for non-match
---	------------	---	-----------	------	------	--------	---------	---------------------------

Subsequent Move

2	Date	te	om	om	Move_To	r_Move_To	ved_From	e_From
---	------	----	----	----	---------	-----------	----------	--------

2	RI_Move_Type	COE_Move_Type	ove_Date	Move_Date	RI_QAD	COE_QAD	match
---	--------------	---------------	----------	-----------	--------	---------	-------

Round-Trip Move

2	Match?	Away		Away	Explanation for non-match
---	--------	------	--	------	---------------------------

Appendix D: Re-interview Review Form

Data Accuracy Outcome: ☐ Data is accurate and thorough enough to review. ☐ Crucial pieces of data are missing.

Review Outcome	
<input type="checkbox"/> Child is eligible to continue to receive services.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Child is <u>ineligible</u> to receive services. <i>(Choose one or more reasons from the list below.)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Child older than 22 at the time of recruitment. <input type="checkbox"/> Child not entitled to public education at the time of recruitment. <input type="checkbox"/> Child did not move in preceding 36 months. <input type="checkbox"/> Child's move not for economic necessity. <input type="checkbox"/> Child did not move across district boundaries. <input type="checkbox"/> Child did not move with, to join, or to proceed worker. <input type="checkbox"/> Worker did not move in preceding 36 months. <input type="checkbox"/> Worker's move not for economic necessity. <input type="checkbox"/> Worker's move not across district boundaries. <input type="checkbox"/> Worker did not engage in qualifying work. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Work was not within 60 days. <input type="checkbox"/> Work was permanent. <input type="checkbox"/> Work was not in agriculture or fishing. <input type="checkbox"/> Worker did not engage in qualifying work within 60 days. <input type="checkbox"/> Worker does not have a recent history of moves (if 4b was chosen). <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe) 	<input type="checkbox"/> Important information on the COE was <u>not verified</u>, even though child may be eligible. <i>(Choose one or more reasons from the list below.)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Child's move date not verified. <input type="checkbox"/> Child's move cities/districts not verified. <input type="checkbox"/> Child's move type (e.g., to join/with) not verified. <input type="checkbox"/> Worker not verified. <input type="checkbox"/> Worker's move date not verified. <input type="checkbox"/> Worker's move reason not verified. <input type="checkbox"/> Worker's move cities/districts not verified. <input type="checkbox"/> Worker's qualifying work not verified. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Crop and/or task not verified. <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe)
<i>Please provide any necessary comments. Continue on the back of this sheet if more room is necessary.</i>	