

Migrant Re-interview Report 2020–21

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:

Liz Jameyson, WestEd
1000 G Street, Suite 500
Sacramento, CA 95814

Submitted on:
December 17, 2021

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	16
Family Re-interview Instrument, English	16
Self-Qualifier Re-interview Instrument, English	17
Appendix B: 2020–21 Statewide and Local Re-interviews: Purposes, Protocols, and Tools Training Agenda	18
Appendix C: Re-interview Data File Template	20
Identifying Information from the Label	20
Personal Information	20
Qualifying Worker	20
Qualifying Work.....	20
Child Move	20
Subsequent Move	20
Round-Trip Move	20
Appendix D: Re-interview Review Form.....	21

Executive Summary

For 2020–21, 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 2020–21, which extended from September 1, 2020, through August 31, 2021. 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 2020–21 re-interview cycle.
- The state’s discrepancy rate was 1.7 percent for the 2020–21 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 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 2020–21 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 2020–21 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 2020–21, which extended from September 1, 2020, through August 31, 2021. 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 2019–20 statewide count of 29,809² 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, 2020, and August 31, 2021. 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 2020, a sample of 19 student names and an oversample of 19 student names were drawn from COEs signed between September 1, 2020, and November 30, 2020.⁴
- **Quarter 2 COEs:** In early March 2021, a sample of 12 student names and an oversample of 12 student names were drawn from COEs signed between December 1, 2020, and February 28, 2021.

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 2019–20 program year, 33 percent of recruitments occurred during the period of September 1, 2019, to November 30, 2019. 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 2021, a sample of 15 student names and an oversample of 15 student names were drawn from COEs signed between March 1, 2021, and May 31, 2021.
- **Quarter 4 COEs:**
 - In early August 2021, a sample of 8 student names and an oversample of 8 student names were drawn from COEs signed between June 1, 2021, and July 31, 2021.
 - In early September 2021, a sample of 5 student names and an oversample of 5 student names were drawn from COEs signed between August 1, 2021, and August 31, 2021.

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, guardian, or spouse, 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

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

re-interviewer and the reviewer appropriately compare the re-interview data to the 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 orders because of the COVID-19 pandemic, re-interviews were conducted almost entirely remotely for the duration of the re-interview cycle. 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 for the 2020-21 re-interview cycle. These PDFs were stored and transferred in adherence with state and local guidelines for data security.

Re-interview Training

In December of 2020, representatives from all California MEP subgrantees were invited to participate in remote re-interview training that spanned three days. The re-interview training was held remotely to accommodate health restrictions imposed because of the COVID-19 pandemic. The training addressed the following topics: (1) reviewing the process 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 for each of the four re-interview quarters. The electronic packets were used to support subgrantees

⁶ The term *packet* refers to electronic re-interview packets. An electronic packet is a folder that includes four documents: a label document, which includes contact information for families (to facilitate making a re-interview appointment without opening the COE) and a table for capturing contact attempts; a COE; and both Spanish and English versions of the appropriate re-interview instrument.

adhere to state and local health and safety guidance during the pandemic. Table 1 below 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, 2020	December 2, 2020	December 12, 2020, to January 20, 2021
2	December 1, 2020, to February 28, 2021	March 3, 2021	March 11 to April 7, 2021
3	March 1 to May 31, 2021	June 3, 2021	June 16 to July 13, 2021
4	June 1 to July 31, 2021	August 5, 2021	August 6 to September 16, 2021
5	August 1 to August 31, 2021	September 3, 2021	September 4 to September 16, 2021

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 deemed “clean” (no eligibility concerns) by the Tier 1 review team were then logged and filed. 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 tier of review was documented, with rationales for ineligibility included, using a standardized form (included in appendix D).

Each packet that passed through Tier 2 and was found to have eligibility concerns was presented to the CDE with an eligibility recommendation. Those recommendations typically fell into one of two categories: (1) *ineligible* or (2) *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 three categories: both the recommendations mentioned above and a *maintain eligibility* category. Descriptions of all determinations and their outcome processes 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 15 days to send a recruiter—a different one than 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. Two re-interviews were conducted in person, while 57 were conducted by phone.⁷ One of these 59 re-interviews resulted in an ineligibility determination, for an eligibility discrepancy rate of 1.7 percent, the same discrepancy rate found in the 2019–20 re-interview cycle. Response and discrepancy rates are shown in figure 1 below.

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 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.

In a single, isolated case, a re-interview with eligibility concerns was invalidated and removed from the sample. This re-interview, for COE D320095, had been conducted inaccurately, resulting in the review teams being unable to understand the data. WestEd returned the re-interview to the subgrantee with instructions to contact the family again and obtain accurate information. The re-interview was returned to WestEd, and the data had not been collected accurately a second time. The reviewers were unable to make an eligibility decision with confidence because of the poor quality of the data collection. To avoid overly burdening the family with multiple contact attempts, WestEd invalidated the re-interview. WestEd also provided multiple technical assistance sessions to the subgrantee to ensure the re-interview protocol is appropriately followed going forward.

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?
D234044	Important information on the COE not verified as recorded	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The worker's move date not verified. ▪ The worker's move reason not verified. ▪ The worker's qualifying work not verified. 	During a follow-up interview, COE D234044 was determined to have accurately recorded information. The COE remained eligible in MSIN, and the child maintained eligibility to receive services.	No; the child maintained eligibility to receive services.
D320808	Ineligible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The worker did not engage in agricultural work. ▪ The work was permanent. 	The subgrantee did not appeal the decision within the allotted 15-day appeals window. The COE was marked ineligible in MSIN, and the child was no longer eligible to receive services.	Yes; the child was no longer eligible to receive services.
DG46767	Important information on the COE not verified as recorded	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Child move date was not verified. ▪ The worker move date was not verified. 	During a follow-up interview, COE DG46767 was determined to have information that was not accurately recorded, but it was determined that the child did meet eligibility criteria. COE DG46767 was marked ineligible in MSIN and was replaced with COE DG47524. The child maintained eligibility to receive services.	No; the child maintained eligibility to receive services.

Conclusion

During the 2020–21 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, which is the same discrepancy rate as last year.

Like the 2017–18, 2018–19, and 2019–20 re-interview cycles, the 2020–21 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 the re-interview instrument used 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 2020–21 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 the same as 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 resources through which subgrantees could receive support, including a call line, a dedicated email address, and 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, whether coordinated by WestEd or through local MEP offices.

Recommendation 5: Return to an in-person annual re-interview training as soon as safety measures allow

The annual re-interview training for the 2020–21 re-interview cycle was held remotely to account for state and local health orders and recommendations. While each of the requisite segments was delivered in the virtual training, including practice with the re-interview instruments in breakout rooms, the nature of the training may be more effective in person. When in person, participants can practice the instrument face-to-face with one another and get immediate feedback from a facilitator who is circulating throughout the room. On the virtual platform, while facilitators observed breakout rooms, it was not feasible to give the same level of feedback as occurs in an in-person training.

Recommendation 6: Continue standardized local re-interview processes

In the 2020–21 re-interview cycle, the discrepancy rate held steady at 1.7 percent, as compared to 10.2 percent two years prior. 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 <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.		
Personal Information	<i>Directions are in italics. To complete this form:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = write <input type="checkbox"/> = check [] = complete without asking	
	Re-Interview Questions: Personal Information 1. What is your full name? (IX)  What is your relationship to []? (IX) <small>sampled child name</small> <input type="checkbox"/> Parent (Father/Mother) <input type="checkbox"/> Guardian <input type="checkbox"/> Spouse <input type="checkbox"/> Other (explain):  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.	<i>Do not complete this column until instructed to in #10.</i> 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. Do the fields match the corresponding COE items? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If No, COE shows: Explain the reason(s) for the difference(s):

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

<i>Directions are in italics. To complete this form:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = write <input type="checkbox"/> = check [] = complete without asking		
Personal Information	Re-Interview Questions: Personal Information 1. We are conducting this re-interview for [<i>sampled child name</i>] What is your full name? (VI - names) What is your birth date? (VI- birthdate) When you were initially interviewed on [<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:</i> When did you graduate from high school or the equivalent in the United States? [<i>_____</i>]	Do not complete this column until instructed to in #6. 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. Do the fields match the corresponding COE items? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <i>If No, COE shows:</i> Explain the reason(s) for the difference(s):

Appendix B: 2020–21 Statewide and Local Re-interviews: Purposes, Protocols, and Tools Training Agenda

Wednesday–Friday, December 9–11, from 9:00 a.m. to noon each day

Virtual, Zoom

Day 1 Agenda: Wednesday, December 9, 9:00 a.m. to noon

Topic	Goal or purpose
Welcome, agenda review, and connection exercise	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Understand the focus for the day▪ Get to know each other and set the frame for active listening
Statewide and local 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 gather thorough, specific data without bias
Successful re-interviewing through cultural sensitivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Use cultural sensitivity when engaging in the re-interview process
Scheduling a re-interview appointment	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Use appropriate techniques when scheduling a re-interview appointment
Re-interview tools overview: COE & re-interview questionnaires	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Begin to become familiar with the family and self-qualifier re-interview questionnaires and their relationship to the COE
Closure and survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Express understanding of the day's learning and any remaining questions or needs

Day 2 Agenda: Thursday, December 10, 9:00 a.m. to noon

Topic	Goal or purpose
Welcome back, agenda review, and Q&A from Day 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Understand the focus for the day ▪ Receive answers to questions from Day 1
Family questionnaire: Guided and partner practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to develop familiarity with the family re-interview questionnaire, including use of the COE during re-interviews ▪ Apply knowledge of the family re-interview questionnaire ▪ Apply knowledge of using the COE during the re-interview process
Self-qualifier questionnaire: Guided practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to develop familiarity with the self-qualifier re-interview questionnaire, including use of the COE during re-interviews
Closure and survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Express understanding of the day's learning and any remaining questions or needs

Day 3 Agenda: Friday, December 11, 9:00 a.m. to noon

Topic	Goal or purpose
Welcome back, agenda review, and Q&A from Day 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Understand the focus for the day ▪ Receive answers to questions from Day 2
Self-qualifier questionnaire: partner practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Apply knowledge of the self-qualifier re-interview questionnaire ▪ Apply knowledge of using the COE during the re-interview process
Local review process	<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 the concept of a simple random sample and when, how, and why to go beyond a simple random sample
Local quarterly survey and 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 criteria for a quality reflection that demonstrates continuous improvement
Closure and survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Express understanding of the day's learning and any remaining questions or needs

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	Explanation for non-match
---	-------------	---------------	------------	--------	---------	----------	-----------	---------------------------

Qualifying Worker

2	MP Match?	Move_Date	te	W/in 3 yrs?	RI_Move_From	From	o	To
---	-----------	-----------	----	-------------	--------------	------	---	----

2	RI_Worker_District_Mo	District_Move_Fr	District_Mo	COE_Worker_District_Mo	RI_Worker	COE_Worker	Relationship	Relationship	Explanation for non-match
---	-----------------------	------------------	-------------	------------------------	-----------	------------	--------------	--------------	---------------------------

Qualifying Work

2	Match?	tained	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	ri_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	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Child is eligible to continue to receive services.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Child is <u>ineligible</u> to receive services. <i>(Choose one or more reasons from the list below.)</i></p> <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)	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Important information on the COE was <u>not</u> verified, even though child may be eligible. <i>(Choose one or more reasons from the list below.)</i></p> <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.<input type="checkbox"/> Crop and/or task not verified.<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe)
<p><i>Please provide any necessary comments. Continue on the back of this sheet if more room is necessary.</i></p>	