
OSEP/Westat Overlapping Part B & Part C Data Meetings Newsletter

Monday, July 9

Welcome Part B From OSERS/OSEP

Lou Danielson, Director, RTP

Dr. Danielson kicked off the meeting by noting that OSEP began collecting data on students with disabilities 31 years ago, when the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) was known as the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. Data, he stated, are central to the work that OSEP does. Currently, the focus is on getting data systems set up and collecting the data; in the future, greater emphasis will be placed on using the data. Dr. Danielson also reported that the Department has been collecting performance data under *IDEA* for 10 years, and the trends are in a positive direction.

Washington Update for Part B

Nancy Reder, Esq., NASDSE

Ms. Nancy Reder presented information about the reauthorization of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA [NCLB])*, other legislation being discussed by Congress, the implementation of *IDEA*, other OSERS/OSEP initiatives, and pertinent litigation. She reported that both the House and the Senate are aiming for fall markups of their respective *NCLB* reauthorization bills. Some of the issues that will need to be resolved before a bill is passed include growth models, assessment of English language learners, how to respond to low-performing schools, highly qualified vs. highly effective teachers, adequate yearly progress and the 2014 deadline, and high school reform. Ms. Reder described the proposed FY 08 appropriations bills for both the House and the Senate.

Updates to the Part B Data Collection

Lisa Holden-Pitt, OSEP/RTP; Carol Bruce and Danielle Crain, Westat

In December 2004, President Bush signed into law a bipartisan bill amending *IDEA*. This resulted in substantial changes to the 2006-07 Part B data collections and the addition of a new data collection. Dr. Holden-Pitt and Dr. Bruce discussed the upcoming changes to the Part B data collection forms that are expected to be implemented in 2007-08. There are changes to the following tables: Exiting (Table 4), Assessment (Table 6), and Dispute Resolution (Table 7). There will be no changes to Tables 1, 2, 3, and 5, Child Count, Personnel, Educational Environments, and Discipline.

Part B Concurrent Session Topics

Understanding the Part B Assessment Data Collection

Preschool Educational Environments Categories—A Facilitated Discussion

Collecting Data on Early Intervening Services—Report From the May Task Force

Moving the Measurement of Secondary Transition-Related Part B Indicators Through Collection of Reliable and Accurate Data, Analysis, and Use of Results

Child Outcomes Data for Preschool (619)—Assuring Quality

Dispute Resolution Data

EDEN/ED*Facts*—Challenges, Successes, and Developing Working Relationships

6-21 Educational Environments Categories: Consistency/Comparability and Developing Questions for Q and A

EDEN and ED*Facts*—Update

Ross Santy, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development

In September 2006, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) cleared the ED*Facts* package as a required collection. Recognizing that many states did not have the technical expertise to meet OMB requirements immediately, ED published a data collection regulation in January 2007 that identified ED*Facts* as ED's primary data collection method and established a 2-year transition to 100% data submission by states through ED*Facts*. Currently, 34 states are approved to submit at least one of their 618 data tables through EDEN/ED*Facts* only. Through regular meetings with OSEP leadership, ED is exploring the role EDEN/ED*Facts* can play in the SPPs/APRs. ED is looking to the future of ED*Facts* as a program management tool that will enable OSEP to look behind the data by indicators. For more information about ED*Facts*, visit www.ed.gov/EDFacts. For help from the Partner Support Center, email eden_ss@ed.gov.

Part B Converse With the Crew

OSEP RTP/MSIP and Westat Staff

During this question-and-answer session, the following topics were discussed:

- Rationale for changing the regular early childhood program definition from 50% to 70% students without disabilities on the educational environments form (Table 3);
- Earlier feedback from MSIP to states on their SPP/APR submissions;
- Timing for release of the revised Indicator Measurement Table for the 2008 APR;
- Proposed elimination of Indicator 4;
- Use of Table 6 (Assessment) in the SPP/APR;

-
- Need for additional guidance from MSIP regarding targets for disproportionality;
 - Authority of the Secretary to request information at the district level; and
 - Movement within states to combine general education and special education data collections.

Tuesday, July 10

An Introduction to Response Rates and Non-Response Bias: A Draft Document From NPSO

Roberta Garrison-Mogren

During this early-bird session, Ms. Garrison-Mogren discussed the recent document prepared by Westat under contract with the National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO). The response rate document was written in order to emphasize the importance of reporting response rates and identifying and discussing nonresponse bias. It answers five basic questions: What is a response rate? How high does a response rate need to be? What is nonresponse bias? How do you know if there is nonresponse bias? What should you do if you have nonresponse bias? The concepts covered apply to any of the SPP/APR indicators that rely on survey data. The document will be published on the NPSO web site: <http://www.psocenter.org>.

Update From EIMAC

Sandra McQuain, West Virginia

This presentation was an overview of the Education Information Management Advisory Consortium (EIMAC), which is part of the Council of Chief State School Officers and has 46 member states. EIMAC represents state education agencies (SEAs) on national data issues and facilitates networking among SEAs, Federal program offices, and data collectors. Two meetings are held each year, in October and May, and travel is provided for three people per member state. EIMAC's subcommittees include general statistics, special education, assessment, and longitudinal data systems. The May 2007 special education subcommittee meeting was attended by representatives from more than 27 states, as well as OSEP, *EDFacts*, and Westat staff. Topics discussed included notice for data collection changes, alignment of Federal reporting, SPPs/APRs, *EDFacts* submission calendar, and *IDEA* reauthorization.

Engaging Stakeholders With Data—Role of Stakeholders-Part B

Alan Coulter and Jane Nell Luster, NCSEAM; Priscilla Baker, Sandra Beech, and Wanda Trahan, Louisiana; Nissan Bar-Lev, Anita Castro, and Nancy Fuhrman, Wisconsin

This session focused on how data relate to planning for and improving statewide systems and ensuring that stakeholders are involved in the process. Priscilla Baker and Wanda Trahan described Louisiana's data collection system, a web-based application that is continuously open and that can be accessed from any location. It captures student-level data, all the SPP/APR components, child count, and the compliance process (e.g., transition from individualized family service plan (IFSP) to individual education program (IEP) and IEP compliance). Currently, 12 years of data can be accessed. One-time or occasional data are

captured on Excel spreadsheets. Ms. Beech stated that her role as a parent of a child with a disability is to explain to the committee how the effects of using data affect her son.

Nissan Bar-Lev, Anita Castro, and Nancy Fuhrman explained how Wisconsin involves stakeholders in the data process. In 2003, a Focused Effective Continuous Monitoring Stakeholder group was created. They strive to have an environment that “allows disagreement in order to reach agreement.” The state has devised a “one-click” reporting system that is web based and stores their longitudinal data. Comparisons can be conducted at the state, district, and school levels.

Welcome Part C From OSERS/OSEP **Patty Guard, Acting Director, OSEP**

Ms. Guard began by addressing states’ concerns raised on Monday regarding the proposed change to the regular early childhood program definition on the educational environments form (Part B – Table 3). She stated that OSEP had received input from the field regarding the change, is submitting the change to OMB, and there will be a 60-day public comment period. Ms. Guard told conference participants that the increased emphasis on accountability over the last decade has resulted in a concomitant increase in the importance of using data. OSEP’s core mission is to improve results for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. The remainder of her presentation focused on five OSEP priorities: (1) providing early intervention programs and services to ensure long-term gains; (2) partnering with parents; (3) integrating *IDEA* and *NCLB*; (4) preparing America’s children for global competition through response to intervention and early intervening services; and (5) ensuring success in post-secondary education, employment, and independent living. Ms. Guard noted that OSEP has aligned each of its technical assistance centers with one of the 20 indicators under Part B and the 14 indicators under Part C. She referred states to the Federal Regional Resource Center web site for more information: <http://www.rfcnetwork.org/content/view/137/192>.

Working Together To Ensure Quality Data **Lisa Holden-Pitt, OSEP/RTP; Carol Bruce, Westat**

Dr. Holden-Pitt stated that the past year had been one of considerable transition due to revised data collections, more state data submissions through EDEN, and new or restructured state data systems. Data accuracy, timeliness, and documentation remain essential. Dr. Holden-Pitt noted a trend toward more accurate and timely data—a trend that can be continued through further collaborative efforts. As ED has transitioned to EDEN, there is a more collaborative atmosphere, while each office maintains primary ownership and responsibility for the quality of its data. This should be modeled at the state level. Dr. Holden-Pitt and Dr. Carol Bruce both emphasized the importance of federal, state, district and Westat staff working as partners to ensure data are of the highest quality possible because these data are vital for accountability. Dr. Bruce outlined what states can expect from Westat and what Westat expects from states.

Part C Concurrent Session Topics

Child Outcomes Data—Assuring Quality

Using the NCSEAM Part C Family Survey To Measure and Improve Family Outcomes

Part C Settings—Implementation Solutions

Data Sharing for Tracking Children From C to B

Nyle Robinson and Scott Beaver, Illinois; Frank Miller, Pennsylvania;
Facilitator: Anne Lucas, NECTAC and WRRC

Illinois and Pennsylvania have developed data sharing processes and are implementing these strategies to track children as they transition from Part C to B. Both states are beginning to report improvements in their performance on early childhood transition.

Illinois Part C entered into a collaborative data sharing agreement with the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) to track children transitioning to Part B. They use a multi-step process that involves geocoding to assign a school district for children who turn 27 months of age or who enter Part C after 27 months of age. They are sending monthly individual child data to local education agencies (LEAs), completing a “transition tracking form” (completed by service coordination agencies), and following up on LEAs with failed transitions. In addition, both Part C and Part B include local performance in transition as a component of their status determination process.

Pennsylvania, similar to Illinois, has separate lead agencies for Parts C and B, two separate databases, and two different agencies at the local level responsible for providing services to children in early intervention and in preschool special education. The state’s new protocol includes notification from the Part C program office to LEAs, the Mutually Agreed Upon Written Arrangement (MAWA) holder, and the SEA. Under this protocol, Pennsylvania has had an increase in the number of MAWAs reporting that all referrals were received and a decrease in the number of discrepancies. Overall benefits have included increased communication at the local level before transition, better consistency between data systems, and increased compliance with SPP/APR indicators.

Wednesday, July 11

National Early Intervention Longitudinal Study (NEILS)

Kathy Hebbeler, SRI

Dr. Hebbeler described the findings from the National Early Intervention Longitudinal Study (NEILS), the first study with a nationally representative sample of the Part C early intervention (EI) program for infants and toddlers with disabilities or at risk for developmental delay and their families. The sample of 3,338 infants and toddlers and their families, weighted to represent all U.S. children in Part C, was recruited from over 200 programs in 20 states in 1998. Children and families were followed from entry into EI until kindergarten. Dr. Hebbeler presented and discussed data about the characteristics of the children in EI and their families, reasons for eligibility, the services they received, and the

child and family outcomes they experienced at age 3 and in kindergarten. She compared kindergarten findings to outcomes at earlier time points for both child and family outcomes.

Feedback on Annual Performance Reports and State Determinations

Ruth Ryder, OSEP/MSIP

Ms. Ryder discussed the SPP/APR state determination letters that were issued on June 15, 2007. OSEP reviewed states' APRs to evaluate whether states had valid and reliable data, made progress against targets, demonstrated compliance, and included the required information. According to Ms. Ryder, some of the basic challenges that states faced included not understanding the indicator requirements, not following instructions, and not addressing issues that were in their SPP response tables. Ms. Ryder also reminded states that they are required to publicly report on LEA/EIS program performance. Once states make their LEA/EIS program determinations, they should notify their MSIP state contact regarding the location of this information.

APR Plenary for Part B

Ken Kienas, Sara Menlove, Ellen Safranek, OSEP/MSIP

The MSIP team took participants through a detailed discussion of changes to the Part B SPP/APR indicator measurement table, discussed a scoring rubric for operationalizing Part B Indicator 20, and highlighted issues from OSEP's analysis of states' SPP/APRs. OSEP submitted changes to the Part B indicator measurements table for public comment in July and will submit them for OMB approval following the comment period. Most changes are technical rather than substantive and focus on making directions and instructions as clear as possible for states. OSEP introduced a draft "Indicator 20 Scoring Rubric" designed to help states understand and meet the criteria against which OSEP will make determinations about the timeliness and accuracy of state-reported 618 and SPP/APR data. Use of the rubric is encouraged but not mandatory. Highlights of OSEP's analysis of states' SPPs/APRs focused on four issues that applied to over half of the states. First, states need to follow the measurement tables. Second, it was difficult to locate the state's raw data and there were calculation errors. Third, APR data were inconsistent with 618 data. Fourth, states reported specific data issues they were having, such as whether response rates were representative, but did not tell OSEP what the state did or was planning to do to correct the problem.

APR Plenary for Part C

Julia Martin, Alma McPherson, Virginia Sheppard, OSEP/MSIP

The MSIP team provided an overview of the Part C SPPs/APRs due February 1, 2007. Issues common across states were discussed, including errors in calculation and disaggregation of data, and incorrect location of raw data in the reports. The proposed changes for February 2008 were also presented. The changes are mostly clarifications to the instructions and a few changes to the measurement. The session concluded with a presentation of a draft rubric to determine whether state-reported data are timely and accurate as described in Indicator 14. OSEP is planning to use this rubric to score states and is encouraging states to use it also.

Updates to the Part C Data Collections

Scott Campbell Brown, OSEP/RTP; Carol Bruce and Danielle Crain, Westat

In December 2004, President Bush signed into law a bipartisan bill amending *IDEA*. This resulted in substantial changes to the 2006-07 data collections and the addition of a new data collection. Dr. Brown discussed the upcoming changes to the Part C data collection forms that are expected to be implemented in 2007-08, fewer changes than for 2006-07. The changes will be in Table 4 - Dispute Resolution, in terminology only. There will be no changes to Tables 1, 2 and 3, Child Count, Settings, and Exiting.

Thursday, July 12

Engaging Stakeholders With Data—Role of Stakeholders-Part C

Jane Nell Luster and Sharon Walsh, NCSEAM; Sondra Crayton and Cec Deibel, Ohio; Charles Peterson and Kim Hegg-James, Idaho

Ms. Crayton began the session by stating that Ohio's Part C is one of three programs in the state's Help Me Grow System, which provides services to children age birth to 3 through the At-Risk Program, the Part C Program, and the Newborn Home Visiting Program. The Ohio Department of Health is the Lead Agency, and Part C is administered locally by 88 counties. The Monitoring Stakeholder Group has provided feedback on Ohio Part C's revision of its General Supervision System and on the new self-assessment tool. It has also provided advice on the formula to be used for the local determination process. Both Ohio panel members described the value of stakeholders' input in informing the process with necessary practical implications for implementation. The state plans to add more local personnel to the Monitoring Stakeholder Group and to move to using stakeholders for output rather than just input.

Mr. Peterson stated that Idaho is the third fastest growing state in the country after Nevada and Arizona. Its Part C system is organized according to seven regions that are responsible for providing early intervention services to eligible children and their families. Idaho's child count grew from 1,666 children to 3,464 in the last 10 years. The panel shared and described the regional data profiles that have been posted on the state's web site as required by *IDEA* 2004 and spoke of the important role stakeholders, especially parents, can play when they have data to advocate for change with policy entities such as the state legislature. As part of the evolving focused monitoring process in Idaho, the group reviewed the statewide data, discussed the implications of the data, and selected priority focus areas for onsite monitoring for school year 2007-08.

Part C Converse With the Crew

OSEP RTP/MSIP and Westat Staff

The Part C question and answer session discussed the following topics:

- Addressing findings of noncompliance and start of the 1-year timeline;
- Distribution of verbal information presented at the conference;
- Multiple data updates/submissions and relationship of number of updates to accuracy;

-
- The definition of a “finding”;
 - State reporting on low-performing LEAs;
 - Exclusion of family reasons for noncompliance;
 - Visiting LEAs that are in compliance;
 - The next cycle of verification visits; and
 - Available guidance on sample size and representativeness.

Washington Update for Part C **Sharon Walsh, Walsh/Taylor, Inc.**

This session was a review of the current Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) on Part C regulations that was published in the May 9, 2007, *Federal Register* and changes that are being proposed by the U.S. Department of Education. The organization of the regulations has been changed to align with the order of language in the statute. All “notes” are being deleted, and applicable language from Part B regulations is being incorporated into Part C regulations.

Selected proposed changes were discussed with participants, including:

- Changes to the definition of early intervention services;
- Deletion of the terms “nursing services” and “nutrition services”;
- Change to the definition of “multidisciplinary”;
- Change to the referral timeframe;
- States would be permitted to include procedures for screening children referred to determine if the child is “suspected of having a disability”;
- New definitions of evaluation and assessment; and
- The timeline for the evaluation of the child and assessment of service needs.

Several language changes proposed to the IFSP and other proposed changes to procedural safeguards, monitoring, transition, and other areas were also discussed.

Ensuring Local Data Are Valid and Reliable **Terry McCauley, North Carolina; Ryan Weir, Kansas**

Terry McCauley described the Comprehensive Exceptional Children Accountability System (CECAS), which is a database used by both Part C and Part B in North Carolina. Through this system, North Carolina has been able to measure compliance indicators and report data as required by OSEP. To ensure validity and reliability, NC generates reports from the state office and distributes them to local Children’s Developmental Services Agencies (CDSA), randomly selects some records for CDSA review, and engages in ongoing data cleaning.

Ryan Weir described Kansas' data system, which includes data entry at the local level, accurate data collection at the state level, relevant data analysis and reporting, and meaningful data utilization for continuous improvement. The system is a web-based, real-time database that collects core data required by the state and OSEP. Kansas uses the Test-Retest Method and Alternative Forms Method to determine reliability. Validity is measured through Pragmatic Data Validation, Predictive Data Validation, and Construct Data Validation. Kansas' two biggest challenges are local timeliness in submittal of 618 tables and ensuring that locals maintain an updated database.