Public Comments for ICR 202111-1850-003

Author Full Name :   KC Elander   **Received Date :** 04/26/2022 04:12 PM

Comments Received :

30 Day Comment Period: North Carolina April 2022
Accountability/Assessments:
Q1. Please be aware of the burden on the submission team that breaking these data out into separate assessments as presented will certainly be an added burden on EdFacts staff, from both a file creation and file submission standpoint. Subsequent positive impacts are hard to quantify at this point.
Q2. Other than needed time to edit/adjust current data files to complete new data spec, impact will be minimal.
Q3. – Q5
The change in naming convention to "initial and follow-up assessment" for N or D does not change the inability to collect information from Reportable Programs with no access to our student information system. NC believes that states should have the option of reporting either "initial and follow-up" or reporting results from the state assessments.

Q14. Modernization
NC supports combining DGs whereever it makes sense to do so, in an effort to streamline necessary separate specifications submissions. Timing of availability of those data groups will need to be considered prior to combining. NC also encourages modernization to take a long look at timing of specs that are reliant upon one another (Membership/Free and Reduced Lunch as an example) or stop comparing numbers collected in month 1 and month 7. This type of comparison will always result in false flags.

Q15. NC currently is set up for the collection of Male/Female in the Sex value, and doesn't expect a change to the Sex value options. However, discussions are underway to add another element labeled "Gender" to our SIS which would allow a more nuanced list of options. Use of said information has not yet been discussed, as the edit to our SIS is likely at least a year out.

Additional comments: Title III
NC would like to request that ALL languages from the ISO code list be included in the problem tracker in EdFacts; we continually get data quality questions regarding languages chosen by families that should not cause issues, but do year after year. NC loads the ISO code list into our SIS and families self -select from this authoritative document; is there a reason this document isn't used by USED in review of home language in FS141?