
**OSEP/Westat Overlapping Part B and
Part C
Data Managers' Meetings**

**July 8-12, 2007
Bethesda, MD**

Planning Committee

In addition to Westat staff, members of the planning committee included the following:

Judi Angell, CA, Early Start
Scott Campbell Brown, OSEP
Jill Harris, OSEP
Jim Henson, MSRRC
Lisa Holden-Pitt, OSEP
Lynne Kahn, NECTAC and ECO
Ken Kienas, OSEP
Alicia Limke, Oklahoma, Part B
Jane Nell Luster, NCSEAM
Sandra McQuain, West Virginia, Part B
Alice Ridgway, Connecticut, Part C
Ruth Ryder, OSEP
Andrew Samson, New Jersey, Part B
Rex Shipp, OSEP
Dan Szczepaniak, Maryland, Part C

Contents

	Page
Agenda	vi
Monday, July 9	
Welcome Part B From OSERS/OSEP Lou Danielson, Director, RTP, OSEP.....	1
Washington Update for Part B Nancy Reder, NASDSE	1
Updates to the Part B Data Collections Lisa Holden-Pitt, OSEP/RTP; Carol Bruce and Danielle Crain, Westat	3
EDEN and ED<i>Facts</i>—Update Ross Santy, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development	4
Part B Concurrent Sessions	
Understanding the Part B Assessment Data Collection Cynthia Bryant, OSEP/MSIP; David Egnor and Susan Weigert, OSEP/RTP; Martha Thurlow and Jason Altman, NCEO Moderator: Carol Bruce, Westat.....	5
Preschool Educational Environments Categories—A Facilitated Discussion Nancy Treusch, OSEP/MSIP; Joy Markowitz, Westat.....	6
Collecting Data on Early Intervening Services— Report From the May Task Force Larry Wexler, OSEP/RTP; Roberta Garrison-Mogren, Westat.....	7
Moving the Measurement of Secondary Transition-Related Part B Indicators Through Collection of Reliable and Accurate Data, Analysis, and Use of Results Loujeania Bost and Matthew Klare, National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities; David Test, National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center; Jane Falls and Charlotte Alverson, National Post-School Outcomes Center Introduction: Selete Avoke, OSEP/RTP.....	9
Child Outcomes Data for Preschool (619)—Assuring Quality Kathy Hebbeler and Lynne Kahn, ECO.....	11
Part B Converse with the Crew OSEP (RTP and MSIP); Westat Staff.....	14

Contents (continued)

	Page
Tuesday, July 10	
An Introduction to Response Rates and Non-Response Bias: A Draft Document from NPSO Roberta Garrison-Mogren, Westat	14
Update from EIMAC Sandra McQuain, West Virginia, Chair of EIMAC.....	14
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	15
Dispute Resolution Data Dick Zeller, CADRE.....	17
EDEN/EDFacts—Challenges, Successes, and Developing Working Relationships Lisa Holden-Pitt, OSEP/RTP; Bobbi Stettner-Eaton, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development; Eileen Ahearn, Project Forum at NASDSE	20
6-21 Educational Environments Categories: Consistency/ Comparability and Developing Questions for Q and A Kristin Reedy, NERRC; Bruce Bull, EDSIS; Joy Markowitz, Westat	21
Welcome from OSERS/OSEP Patty Guard, Acting Director, OSEP; Larry Wexler, OSEP/RTP	22
Working Together To Ensure Quality Data Lisa Holden-Pitt, OSEP/RTP; Carol Bruce, Westat	26
Data Sharing for Tracking Children from C to B Nyle Robinson and Scott Beever, Illinois; Frank Miller, Pennsylvania Facilitator: Anne Lucas, NECTAC and WRRC	26
Wednesday, July 11	
National Early Intervention Longitudinal Study (NEILS) Kathy Hebbeler, SRI	29
Feedback on Annual Performance Reports and State Determinations Ruth Ryder, OSEP/MSIP	30

Contents (continued)

	Page
APR Plenary for Part B Ken Kienas, Sara Menlove, Ellen Safranek, (Ruth Ryder), OSEP/MSIP	30
APR Plenary for Part C Julia Martin, Alma McPherson, Virginia Sheppard, (Ruth Ryder), OSEP/MSIP	31
Updates to the Part C Data Collections Scott Campbell Brown, OSEP/RTP; Carol Bruce and Danielle Crain, Westat	33
Part C Concurrent Sessions	
Using the NCSEAM Part C Family Survey To Measure and Improve Family Outcomes Linda Goodman and Alice Ridgway, Connecticut; Randall Penfield, Consultant on NCSEAM Family Survey	34
Part C Settings—Implementation Solutions Scott Campbell Brown, OSEP/RTP; Carol Bruce and Danielle Crain, Westat	35
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	35
Part C Converse with the Crew OSEP (RTP and MSIP); Westat staff	37
Washington Update for Part C Sharon Walsh, Walsh/Taylor, Inc.	37
Ensuring Local Data Are Valid and Reliable Terry McCauley, North Carolina; Ryan Weir, Kansas.....	40
Participant List	43

Agenda

Sunday, July 8

2:00–3:00 **Part B Conference Registration**
Ballroom Foyer

3:00–4:30 **Orientation for New Part B Data Managers**
Embassy/Patuxent
Carol Bruce, Westat

This session will give new data managers an overview of the 2006-07 *IDEA* Section 618 data collections, problems in state reporting of these data, and Westat's technical assistance to states on the collection, reporting, and analysis of these data.

Monday, July 9

8:00–9:00 **Continental Breakfast and Part B Registration**
Ballroom Foyer

9:00–9:15 **Welcome to Part B, Review of Agenda, and General Announcements**
Haverford/Baccarat
Westat Staff

9:15–9:30 **Welcome Part B From OSERS/OSEP**
Haverford/Baccarat
Lou Danielson, Director, RTP, OSEP

9:30–10:15 **Washington Update for Part B**
Haverford/Baccarat
Nancy Reder, NASDSE
This session will present current activities of Congress and the Administration (e.g., appropriations, *NCLB*, reauthorization, Part C regulations).

10:15–10:30 **Break**

10:30–12:00 **Updates to the Part B Data Collections**
Haverford/Baccarat
Lisa Holden-Pitt, OSEP/RTP; Carol Bruce and Danielle Crain, Westat
This session will describe changes in the Part B data collections.

12:00–1:15 **Lunch (on own)**

1:15–2:00 **EDEN and ED*Facts*—Update**
Haverford/Baccarat
Ross Santy, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development
This session will be a summary of EDEN and ED*Facts* activities over the past year and plans for the future.

2:00–2:15 **Break**

Monday, July 9 continued

2:15–3:45

Part B Concurrent Sessions

Haverford/Baccarat

Understanding the Part B Assessment Data Collection

Cynthia Bryant, OSEP/MSIP; David Egnor and Susan Weigert, OSEP/RTP;

Martha Thurlow and Jason Altman, NCEO

Moderator: Carol Bruce, Westat

This session will be a panel discussion of four current topics of interest surrounding the Part B Assessment data collection. The main topics of discussion will be the *NCLB/IDEA* nexus in collecting and reporting assessment data, defining the assessment data collection universe, understanding alternate assessments, and exploring the utility of the assessment data.

Diplomat Room

Preschool Educational Environments Categories—A Facilitated Discussion

Nancy Treusch, OSEP/MSIP; Joy Markowitz, Westat

This session will provide an opportunity for state representatives to discuss with their peers how they have implemented the preschool educational environments categories. The facilitators will encourage participants to describe their successful solutions to challenges such as parent reporting on preschool classroom composition and calculating time in regular early childhood programs.

Judiciary Suite

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

Larry Wexler, OSEP/RTP; Roberta Garrison-Mogren, Westat

On May 30-31, 2007, Westat convened a task force of stakeholders to develop recommendations for states collecting data on EIS. This session will be a summary of the task force proceedings and an opportunity for participants to provide input on the topics discussed at the task force meeting.

Cabinet Suite

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

Loujeania Bost and Matthew Klare, National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities; David Test, National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center; Jane Falls and Charlotte Alverson, National Post-School Outcomes Center

Introduction: Selete Avoke, OSEP/RTP

This interactive session will address the collection, analysis, reporting, and use of data for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14 (Graduation, Dropout, Secondary Transition, and Post-School Outcomes). Presenters will engage attendees in problem-solving around how data managers can provide guidance and support to their states to analyze, interpret, and use the data for these indicators to identify technical assistance needs and guide program development.

Monday, July 9 continued

Ambassador Room

Child Outcomes Data for Preschool (619)—Assuring Quality Lynne Kahn, ECO

The presenter will describe the strategies that states may consider using to ensure the accuracy of the data on child outcomes that come from the local level. This will include state activities that occur before data are collected (e.g., training and TA supports), as well as strategies used once the data have been submitted to the state (e.g., possible data system flags and monitoring processes). Time will be allowed for discussion of the strategies and sharing among participants.

3:45–4:00

Break

4:00–5:00

Haverford/Baccarat

Part B Converse with the Crew

OSEP (RTP and MSIP); Westat Staff

Participants will have an opportunity to address questions to Westat and OSEP staff on topics related to data collection, analysis, and reporting. There will be no presentations.

Tuesday, July 10

7:45–8:45

Ballroom Foyer

Continental Breakfast and Part C Registration

7:45–8:45

Patuxent Suite

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

Roberta Garrison-Mogren, Westat

Westat, a subcontractor of the National Post-School Outcomes Center, drafted a technical assistance document to heighten awareness of the importance of reporting response rates and identifying and discussing non-response bias. While the document was created for the benefit of those state staff charged with writing about APR Indicator 14, the concepts covered apply equally to any of the APR indicators that rely on survey data. Please come to this session and help us improve and enhance the draft document.

8:45–9:00

Crystal Ballroom

Update from EIMAC

Sandra McQuain, West Virginia, Chair of EIMAC

9:00–10:30

Crystal Ballroom

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 will present the experiences of two Part B state agencies in involving stakeholders in the process of reviewing and analyzing state data, including monitoring data, to make recommendations and decisions important to the state's accountability system. After an introduction of the concepts of general supervision as a framework for the presentation, each state's data manager(s) and a member of the state's stakeholder group will share their experiences. There will be time for questions and answers as well as audience comments.

Tuesday, July 10 continued

10:30–10:45

Break

10:45–12:15

Patuxent Suite

Orientation for New Part C Data Managers

Carol Bruce and Danielle Crain, Westat

This session will give new data managers an overview of the 2006-07 *IDEA* Section 618 data collections, problems in state reporting of these data, and Westat's technical assistance to states on the collection, reporting, and analysis of these data.

10:45–12:15

Part B Concurrent Sessions

Ambassador Room

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

Loujeania Bost and Matthew Klare, National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities; David Test, National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center; Jane Falls and Charlotte Alverson, National Post-School Outcomes Center

Introduction: Selete Avoke, OSEP/RTP

This interactive session will address the collection, analysis, reporting, and use of data for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14 (Graduation, Dropout, Secondary Transition, and Post-School Outcomes). Additionally, presenters will engage attendees in problem-solving around how data managers can provide guidance and support to their respective states to analyze, interpret, and use the data for these indicators to identify technical assistance needs and guide program development.

Diplomat Room

Dispute Resolution Data

Dick Zeller, CADRE

CADRE will present a summary of verified dispute resolution data submitted by states as part of their APRs and SPPs for 2002-03 through 2005-06. The summary will include rates of activity per 10,000 enrolled special education students, changes over the 3-year period, and summary reports comparing the rates of activity among like states.

Haverford/Baccarat

EDEN/EDFacts—Challenges, Successes, and Developing Working Relationships

Lisa Holden-Pitt, OSEP/RTP; Bobbi Stettner-Eaton, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development; Eileen Ahearn, Project Forum at NASDSE

This session will explore some of the logistic, conceptual, technical, and political challenges encountered in the course of transitioning the *IDEA* data submissions to EDEN/EDFacts and highlight characteristics of a strong data team that help to ensure high data quality. Session leaders will receive questions and comments from session attendees, particularly input from States that have realized some success in overcoming early difficulties in making this transition. Project Forum findings from interviews with seven states on their implementation of EDEN/EDFacts for special education data also will be discussed.

Tuesday, July 10 continued

Overlapping Part B and Part C Sessions

Cabinet/Judiciary

6-21 Educational Environments Categories:

Consistency/Comparability and Developing Questions for Q and A

Kristin Reedy, NERRC; Bruce Bull, EDSIS; Joy Markowitz, Westat

The presenters will share results of a NERRC study of educational environments data collection practices across states in the northeast. Discussion will be held on difficult-to-classify scenarios—culminating in the generation of questions for a national Q&A guidance document for 6-21. Successful technical assistance strategies to provide data collection guidance to LEAs will also be discussed.

12:15–2:15

Regional Resource Center Luncheons for Part B and Part C

2:30–2:45

Crystal Ballroom

Welcome to Part C, Review of Agenda, and General Announcements

Westat Staff

2:45–3:15

Crystal Ballroom

Welcome from OSERS/OSEP

Patty Guard, Acting Director, OSEP; Larry Wexler, OSEP/RTP

3:15–3:30

Crystal Ballroom

Working Together To Ensure Quality Data

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

Increasingly in the education arena, states are being held accountable for the quality of data that they collect and report—to Congress, to the Department of Education, and to the general public. But, the importance of these data goes beyond what is mandated by legislative requirements. These data are important tools for helping agencies in both the public and private arenas, as well as private individuals with invested interests in children with disabilities, determine how best to meet their needs.

3:30–4:45

Crystal Ballroom

Data Sharing for Tracking Children from C to B

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

Two states will share their experiences in developing and implementing strategies for sharing data to track young children as they transition from Part C early intervention to Part B preschool special education services. Illinois and Pennsylvania will explain their protocols, the software they use, the content of their data sharing agreements, and the current and/or expected impact of these efforts on improving their state's performance in early childhood transition.

4:45–5:00

Crystal Ballroom

Data Managers' Meetings: A Retrospective

Guest Speaker

5:00–6:30

Concours Terrace

Reception for Part B and Part C—Light Snacks and Cash Bar

Poster Session—Six states will display examples of their reporting of SPP/APR data to the public.

Wednesday, July 11

7:45–8:45

Ballroom Foyer

Continental Breakfast

8:45–9:45

Crystal Ballroom

National Early Intervention Longitudinal Study (NEILS)

Kathy Hebbeler, SRI

NEILS followed 3,338 children and families who received Part C services through their experiences in early intervention and into elementary school. This session will be a summary of key findings from the 10-year study.

9:45–10:15

Crystal Ballroom

Feedback on Annual Performance Reports and State Determinations

Ruth Ryder, OSEP/MSIP

10:15

Crystal Ballroom

Closing Remarks for Part B

Westat Staff

10:15–10:45

Break (Part B checkout)

10:45–11:45

Crystal Ballroom

APR Plenary for Part B

Ken Kienas, Sara Menlove, Ellen Safranek, (Ruth Ryder), OSEP/MSIP

Cabinet/Judiciary

APR Plenary for Part C

Julia Martin, Alma McPherson, Virginia Sheppard, (Ruth Ryder), OSEP/MSIP

11:45–1:00

Lunch (on own)

1:00–1:45

Crystal Ballroom

Updates to the Part C Data Collections

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

This session will describe changes in the Part C data collections.

1:45–2:00

Break

2:00–3:30

Part C Concurrent Sessions

Crystal Ballroom

Child Outcomes Data—Assuring Quality (Repeated)

Kathy Hebbeler and Lynne Kahn, ECO

The presenters will describe the strategies that states may consider using to ensure the accuracy of the data on child outcomes that come from the local level. This will include state activities that occur before data are collected (e.g., training and TA supports), as well as strategies used once the data have been submitted to the state (e.g., possible data system flags and monitoring processes). Time will be allowed for discussion of the strategies and sharing among participants.

Wednesday, July 11 (continued)

Cabinet/Judiciary

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

Linda Goodman and Alice Ridgway, Connecticut; Randall Penfield, Consultant on NCSEAM Family Survey

Part C programs in many states are currently using the family survey developed by NCSEAM to provide data that address Indicator 4 of the SPP. In this session, which will draw extensively on Connecticut's experience using the NCSEAM Part C Family Survey, presenters will describe how data from the survey can be used to measure family outcomes, to provide the percentages that need to be reported to OSEP, and to guide program improvement efforts.

Diplomat/Ambassador

Part C Settings—Implementation Solutions (Repeated)

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

This session will review the new Part C Settings categories, arising from the 2004 reauthorization of *IDEA* and implemented in the 2005-06 and 2006-07 data collections. Drawing on their experiences in collecting these data, states will have the opportunity to raise issues or concerns, ask questions, and discuss challenges associated with the implementation of these new data requirements.

3:30–3:45

Break

3:45–5:15

Part C Concurrent Sessions Repeated

Crystal Ballroom

Child Outcomes Data—Assuring Quality

Kathy Hebbeler and Lynne Kahn, ECO

The presenters will describe the strategies that states may consider using to ensure the accuracy of the data on child outcomes that come from the local level. This will include state activities that occur before data are collected (e.g., training and TA supports), as well as strategies used once the data have been submitted to the state (e.g., possible data system flags and monitoring processes). Time will be allowed for discussion of the strategies and sharing among participants.

Cabinet/Judiciary

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

Linda Goodman and Alice Ridgway, Connecticut; Randall Penfield, Consultant on NCSEAM Family Survey

Part C programs in many states are currently using the family survey developed by NCSEAM to provide data addressing Indicator 4 of the SPP. In this session, which will draw extensively on Connecticut's experience using the NCSEAM Part C Family Survey, presenters will describe how data from the survey can be used to measure family outcomes, to provide the percentages that need to be reported to OSEP, and to guide program improvement efforts.

Wednesday, July 11 continued

Diplomat/Ambassador **Part C Settings—Implementation Solutions**

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

This session will review the new Part C Settings categories, arising from the 2004 reauthorization of *IDEA* 2004 and implemented in the 2005-06 and 2006-07 data collections. Drawing on their experiences in collecting these data, states will have the opportunity to raise issues or concerns, ask questions, and discuss challenges associated with the implementation of these new data requirements.

Thursday, July 12

8:00–9:00

Ballroom Foyer

Continental Breakfast

9:00–10:30

Haverford/Baccarat

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

This session will present the experiences of two state Part C lead agencies in involving stakeholders in the process of reviewing and analyzing state data, including monitoring data, to make recommendations and decisions important to the state's accountability system. After an introduction of the concept of general supervision as a framework for the presentation, each state's data manager and a member of the state's stakeholder group will share their experiences. There will be time for questions and answers as well as audience comments.

10:30–10:45

Break

10:45–11:30

Haverford/Baccarat

Part C Converse with the Crew

OSEP (RTP and MSIP); Westat staff

Participants will have an opportunity to address questions to Westat and OSEP staff on topics related to data collection, analysis, and reporting. There will be no presentations.

11:30–1:00

Lunch (on own) (Part C checkout)

1:00–1:45

Haverford/Baccarat

Washington Update for Part C

Sharon Walsh, Walsh/Taylor, Inc.

This session will provide an overview of the major changes being proposed to the Part C federal regulations through the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking published on May 9, 2007. Information will be provided on proposed changes that are likely to affect state data systems.

Thursday, July 12 (continued)

1:45–3:15

Haverford/Baccarat

Ensuring Local Data Are Valid and Reliable

Terry McCauley, North Carolina; Ryan Weir, Kansas

This session will provide an overview of the procedures used in two states to determine if data collection activities are producing valid and reliable data. The presenters will address processes, successful strategies, and challenges associated with determining the quality of local data in their respective states. Techniques for testing the reliability and validity of local data will also be discussed.

3:15–3:30

Haverford/Baccarat

Closing Remarks for Part C

Westat Staff

Presentations

Monday, July 9

Welcome From OSERS/OSEP

Lou Danielson, Director, OSEP/RTP

Dr. Danielson welcomed participants and noted that the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) began collecting data on students with disabilities 31 years ago when it was known as the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. Data, he stated, are central to the work that OSEP does. Dr. Danielson acknowledged that his message over the years has been that data collected but not used will never be high quality data – data quality will improve with use of the data. Currently, the focus is on getting data systems set up and collecting the data; both of these will need to become more routine. In the future, greater emphasis will be placed on using the data for program improvement. 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. He concluded by saying that the sustainability of the Data Meeting is proof of the growing importance of data.

Washington Update for Part B

Nancy Reder, Esq., Deputy Executive Director, National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE)

Ms. Reder first discussed the reauthorization of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (NCLB)*. Bills are anticipated to be introduced in the House in late July and in the Senate in early September. Both the House and the Senate are aiming for fall markups of their respective bills. Issues that will need to be resolved before a bill is passed include the following:

- Subgroup size;
- Adequate yearly progress (AYP) and AYP deadline of 2014;
- Growth models;
- Differentiated consequences for schools missing AYP;
- Assessments – annual, but flexibility as to how and when testing occurs;
- Highly qualified teachers versus highly effective teachers;
- Special education students (1% and 2%, use of the individualized education program (IEP) as assessment tool, and alignment of *IDEA/NCLB*);
- Assessing English language learner students in their native language;
- Standardization of “N” size;
- Responding to low-performing schools;
- National standards;
- Highly effective principals;
- “Ultimate flexibility” proposals;

- Title II and state role; and
- High school reform.

Approximately 130 organizations have submitted position statements or proposed language for the *NCLB* reauthorization. The Aspen Commission report is available at http://www.aspeninstitute.org/atf/cf/%7BDEB6F227-659B-4EC8-8F84-8DF23CA704F5%7D/NCLB_Book.pdf. The Forum on Educational Accountability (www.edaccountability.org) released a report, with 136 signers, on assessment and accountability. The Council of Chief State School Officers/National Governors Association/National Association of State Boards of Education have also issued a joint position statement on reauthorization.

In regard to where the members of Congress stand, numerous bills have been introduced ranging from block-granting the entire legislation to making it more stringent.

Below is a summary of the status of the FY08 Labor/HHS/Education appropriations bills.

IDEA	House Subcommittee	Senate Full Committee	FY 07 (current funding level)
Part B	10.9 billion	11.2 billion	10.78 billion
Part C	436.4 million	450.0 million	436.0 million
619	380.8 million	380.8 million	380.8 million
TA&D	48.9 million	48.9 million	48.9 million
State Personnel Development Grants	0	46.0 million	0
Personnel Preparation	89.7 million	89.7 million	89.7 million
Parent Centers	25.7 million	27.0 million	25.7 million

Reading First was cut in both the House and the Senate. Pell Grants were increased.

Other legislation moving forward includes the *Higher Education Act*, which just had an extension passed; *Mental Health Parity*; *Respite Care*, which passed but there is no appropriation; *Workforce Incentive Act*, which is stalled; and *STEM* (Science/Technology/Engineering/Math), which is on the fast track.

Ms. Reder then focused on *IDEA* implementation and other OSERS/OSEP initiatives. She discussed the Part C Notice of Proposed Rule Making; APRs and Determination Letters; the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid (CMS) that want to eliminate funding for administrative claiming and transportation for students with disabilities; data issues; highly qualified teachers; parentally placed private school students; and OSERS/OSEP's transition and response to intervention (RTI) initiatives. OSEP will be holding a conference on RTI in December 2007.

In regard to *NCLB*, about 50% of states are moving ahead with the 2% regulation. ED held a conference on supplemental services that addressed how to engage parents in knowing their rights regarding these services.

Ms. Reder briefly discussed some pertinent litigation, including *Winkelman v. Parma City School District*, *Board of Education of the City School District of the City of New York v. Tom F.*, and cases from Wisconsin and Connecticut on access to confidential information.

NASDSE has a transition initiative that is being undertaken by the *IDEA* Partnership Project in conjunction with three other Technical Assistance and Dissemination (TA&D) centers. NASDSE also has a juvenile justice initiative; for more information see www.edjj.org.

Ms. Reder concluded by mentioning the following five websites that data managers might find useful regarding the topics she discussed:

- <http://idea.ed.gov>;
- www.nasdse.org;
- www.ideapartnership.org;
- www.sharedwork.org; and
- www.projectforum.org.

Updates to the Part B Data Collections

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, which are expected to be implemented in 2007-08. These changes are detailed below.

The changes to Exiting (Table 4) include:

- Revised definition of *graduated with regular high school diploma* to specify that it does not include an alternative degree not fully aligned with a state's academic standards;
- Revised definition of *received a certificate* to specifically include an alternative degree not fully aligned with a state's academic standards;
- Revised definition of *dropped out* to include GED recipients, specifically, in cases where the state requires recipients to drop out of a secondary program to pursue a GED certificate; and
- Revised footnote 1 to specify that GED recipients who are not required to drop out of secondary education program should be reported as *received a certificate*.

The changes to Assessment (Table 6) include:

- Invalid results moved to nonparticipants section;
 - New grid for assessment based on modified academic achievement standards; and
 - Report of number of students included in 2% or 1% cap moved to performance section.

The changes to Dispute Resolution (Table 7) include:

- Language substitutions to better align with *IDEA* 2004 and ED regulations;
 - Replaced *hearing request* with *due process complaint*,
 - Replaced *sessions* with *meetings*,
- Three new definitions – *due process complaint*, *expedited due process complaint*, *resolution period*; and
- Added circumstances under which an SEA decision may be provided to a complainant within an extended timeline.

OSEP does not anticipate changes to Tables 1, 2 and 5, child count, personnel, and discipline for 2007-08.

There is one proposed definitional change to educational environments (Table 3); however, it would not be implemented until 2008-09. The definition of *regular early childhood program* would be changed to, “A program that includes at least 70% nondisabled children.” There will be a public comment period, and the form will go through OMB review.

The 2006-07 exiting, dispute resolution, personnel, and discipline data are due November 1. These are the same data states will report in their February 2008 SPPs/APRs.

At the conclusion of the session, Drs. Holden-Pitt and Bruce addressed specific questions and comments about the Part B data collections. Questions that were specific to the data collections will be incorporated into the updated Q & A documents.

EDEN and EDFacts—Update

Ross Santy, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development

Ross Santy summarized EDEN/*EDFacts* activities over the past year and plans for the future. In September 2006, OMB cleared the *EDFacts* 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 *EDFacts* as ED’s primary data collection method and established a 2-year transition to 100% data submission by states through *EDFacts*. Currently, 30 states are cleared to report their 618 child count, educational environments, and exiting data through EDEN/*EDFacts* only; 34 states are approved to submit at least one of their tables. ED is beginning to examine 618 personnel (including paraprofessionals and related service staff) and discipline tables for data submission through EDEN/*EDFacts* and has scheduled examination of 618 assessment tables for March 2008. Through regular meetings with OSEP leadership, ED also is exploring the role EDEN/*EDFacts* can play in SPPs/APRs. ED is looking to the future of *EDFacts* as a program management tool that will enable OSEP to look behind the data by indicators.

EDFacts has two basic components. First, state educational agencies (SEAs) build the files, a process managed by the state’s *EDFacts* coordinator. ED releases Annual File specifications and edit checks, and business rules are incorporated into the EDEN Submission System. Second, SEAs submit files to ED using the EDEN Submission System on an approved schedule that meets program office timelines for use of the data.

Additional EDEN/*EDFacts* transitions involve collecting non-fiscal National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Common Core of Data, consolidating SPPs, and exploring the potential role of SEAs and EDEN/*EDFacts* in future civil rights data collections.

For more information about *EDFacts*, visit www.ed.gov/EDFacts. For help from the Partner Support Center, email eden_ss@ed.gov.

Part B Concurrent Sessions

Understanding the Part B Assessment Data Collection

Cynthia Bryant, OSEP/MSIP; David Egnor and Susan Weigert, OSEP/RTP; Martha Thurlow and Jason Altman, National Center on Educational Outcomes; Moderator: Carol Bruce, Westat

This session was an overview of the legal and practical issues lead agencies confront as they collect, maintain, and report assessment data. The issues were broken into three separate topics:

Overview of NCLB and IDEA

David Egnor discussed the differences and similarities of *NCLB* and *IDEA* when it comes to reporting assessment data, focusing on how *IDEA* defines each type of assessment. The areas of focus for *NCLB* included the disaggregation within each state, local education agency (LEA), and school by gender, race/ethnicity, English proficiency status, migrant status, disability status, and economic disadvantage. Mr. Egnor also discussed the *NCLB* regulations relating to the 1% and 2% regulations.

Defining the Assessment Data Collection Universe: Who Should Be Reported and Why?

Cynthia Bryant collecting the participation and performance assessment data. Discussion included who should be counted as participants, who needed accommodations, who did not participate, who took an assessment, and all students with IEPs. The performance data discussion included who received valid scores and all the students with IEPs.

What Do the Part B 618 Table 6 Data Tell Us?

Martha Thurlow reported that each year, state data managers are required to compile information for APRs that include data, targets, and improvement activities related to the assessment of students with disabilities. In 2005-06, all states also provided assessment data with the APRs that they submitted. These two data sets have had an intertwined history, which was reviewed briefly in the presentation. In the early years of the APRs, the format for reporting data looked somewhat like the format now used for reporting assessment data. The historical alignment in development of APRs and Table 6 should be remembered when thinking about what and how to report.

David Altman discussed the preliminary results of this year's data collection. Analysis provided the following: (1) More students with disabilities take regular assessments and fewer take alternate assessments in elementary than in middle school and high school, with the total

participation rate approaching 100%. (2) The ability to collect and report data on the use of accommodations is improving; the 2005-06 data show that 41% (Reading) to 45% (Math) of students with disabilities take the regular assessment with accommodations. (3) Participation rates are nearly identical for both content areas (reading and math). (4) As grade level increases, fewer students with disabilities are proficient on regular assessments; the percentage proficient on alternate assessments stays about the same across grades. (5) More students are proficient in reading than in math as grade level increases. Mr. Altman also focused on the importance of being able to summarize data across all of the states—to be able to see the trends in participation and performance—and for the data in states' Table 6 to align to the information that they present in their APRs.

The data presented in Table 6 are the backbone of information provided in APR Indicator 3 and should be reflected in those data. Due to limitations in APR data (e.g., states do not need to report data for all of the grades), the data in Table 6 provide the only full and clear picture of yearly assessment participation and performance across both regular and unique states. The Table 6 data allow for national summaries to be developed by content, grade level, and type of assessment. NCEO first summarized the 2005-06 Table 6 data that were attached to the APRs to provide support for its analysis of APR data. From doing this, NCEO realized that there were some disconnects with the APR data. The alignment of the two is important, so this is something that needs to be attended to and resolved.

These results point to the importance of being able to summarize data across all of the states—to be able to see the trends in participation and performance—and for the data in states' Table 6 to align to the information that they present in their APRs. Data from Table 6 that states attached to their APRs for 2005-06 will be updated, so that any state revisions will be reflected in the final summary that NCEO places on its website at www.nceo.info.

Preschool Educational Environments Categories—A Facilitated Discussion **Nancy Treusch, OSEP/MSIP; Joy Markowitz, Westat**

This session was intended to provide an opportunity for state representatives to discuss with their peers how they have implemented the preschool educational environments categories (Part B – Table 3). However, due to the announcement that the definition of regular early childhood program *may* be changed from 50% to 70% children without disabilities, most of the discussion focused on this issue. Participants inquired as to how 70% was selected and voiced concern that there was not adequate discussion and communication about the change. For example, why was it not on the May 2007 EIMAC agenda and was there a recent task force? There was discussion as to how preschool varies within and among states because there is no universal preschool. Discussion also covered the impact of this fact on interpretation of national data by OSEP and others. States that have been working to ensure that their data reflect progress toward more inclusion at the preschool level are concerned that their guidance related to #6 on the *Questions and Answers on the Part B Educational Environments Data Collection for Children Ages 3 – 5* document will not be applicable, and inclusion efforts may be stymied due to frustration. In addition, participants said there will not be enough time to make this change for the 2007-08 data collection year.

Other discussion topics included:

-
- Is home de-valued as an educational environment by its position on the form? Rural areas have challenges related to inclusion opportunities and may be more likely to use the home environment.
 - States need more guidance on defining limited English proficiency for children ages 3 through 5.
 - There is no standard preschool day within a state (and among states), which means there is no standard denominator with which to calculate percent of time in the regular early childhood program. Arkansas has set 6 hours as the standard preschool day, and this seems to be working for that state.

States need more guidance on how to code a child who receives speech/language therapy in a small group at a public school, but does not attend a regular or special education program. Some states are coding this “service provider location” and others as “special class.”

Collecting Data on Early Intervening Services—Report From the May Task Force **Larry Wexler, OSEP/RTP; Roberta Garrison-Mogren, Westat**

In late May, Westat hosted a task force to explore issues related to collecting data on early intervening services (EIS) and to develop recommendations. During this session, Larry Wexler reviewed *IDEA 2004*’s requirements for EIS and answered questions from states about those requirements. Roberta Garrison-Mogren summarized the task force proceedings and recommendations for technical assistance for states related to the EIS data requirements of Section 613(f)(4) of *IDEA*.

LEAs may use not more than 15% of the funds received under Part B to provide early intervening services. Permitted activities include professional development and the provision of educational and behavioral evaluations, services, and supports, including scientifically-based literacy instructions. EIS funds may be used to carry out coordinated EIS aligned with activities funded by and carried out under the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)* so long as those funds supplement and do not supplant funds available under *ESEA*.

According to the Committee Report for *IDEA 2004*, EIS are intended “to reduce the need to label children as disabled in order to address the learning and behavioral needs of such children.” The law specifies that EIS are services provided to general education students—not special education students—in kindergarten through grade 12 who need additional academic and behavioral support to succeed in a general education environment. These services are not FAPE and do not limit or create a right to FAPE. Regardless of [whether an LEA uses funds for EIS](#), FAPE remains an entitlement.

Under *IDEA*, LEAs determined to have significant disproportionality must reserve the maximum amount (15% of Part B allocation) of funds to provide EIS to children in the LEA, particularly, but not exclusively, to those groups that were significantly overidentified. This requirement recognizes that significant disproportionality in special education may be the result of inappropriate regular education responses to academic or behavioral issues. Neither the law nor OSEP established a national standard for significant disproportionality. Each state has the discretion to define the term for the LEAs and for the state in general.

Dr. Wexler suggested that states give careful consideration to a number of issues related to EIS. For example, they should think about how they define significant disproportionality. They should also consider the question of how they will satisfy their audit responsibilities with regard to the use of funds for early intervening services. Procedural safeguard requirements and issues should also be addressed. Finally, states need to think through where the funds for EIS will come from when an LEA's allocation is essentially reduced by 15% (e.g., 15% goes to support children without disabilities); funds must still be identified to provide FAPE to all children with disabilities. In addition, if the LEA uses local funds to replace the 15% of Federal funds, there are maintenance of effort (MOE) implications.

IDEA 2004 requires LEAs providing EIS to report to the state on: (1) the number of children served under Section 613(f) and (2) the number served who received EIS and subsequently received special education and related services under Part B during the preceding 2-year period. Westat's task force in May focused on developing recommendations for states on how best to collect and report these data. The meeting was organized around several pivotal questions. Their conclusions are summarized, by question, below.

Who Should Be Counted?

- Task force members agreed that LEAs should count only students who received EIS.
- They should not count students who only received services provided to all students or students screened for services, but who did not subsequently receive services.
- LEAs should also not count students who received the incidental benefit of services provided to others.
- Where EIS funds are used for professional development, LEAs should identify and count the students who were intended to benefit from the professional development.
- LEAs should count all students who received EIS even if blended funds from IDEA and other sources were used to pay for services. However, if IDEA funds were used to pay for a particular service professional, then LEAs should only count those students who received that service.

What Should States Do With These Data?

Although there is no statutory requirement for states or LEAs to publish or use the required EIS data, task force participants observed that it is better to be proactive and manage the message. That way you can place the data in their proper context. However, the task force concluded that at this time it may be premature to report the required data. It might be better to instead start framing the context for public understanding of those data by reporting descriptive information such as how much was spent on EIS, why the money was spent, and possibly how many children received EIS. Eventually, states and LEAs will want to be able to demonstrate whether there was benefit even if there was no reduction in the number of children in special education. Demonstrating benefit requires anticipating the questions you will want to answer (e.g., did the state identification rate change? Was disproportionality reduced? Were children identified earlier?) and ensuring that you have the data needed to answer those questions. Demonstrating benefit could be challenging given the differences in types of services provided by LEAs and the possibility that equivalent services are provided, but not counted EIS.

What Should a State EIS Data Collection Look Like?

Task force participants recommended that states keep the data collection simple. They should not add unnecessary burden. However, they also observed that the specific EIS data requirements of *IDEA* will not tell much about the success of EIS. States should limit themselves to data that are useful. That will mean thinking about what the public will want to know (e.g., how much money, how many students, what kinds of services, how long provided, what results) and planning the data collection accordingly. Task force members acknowledged that states may face constraints on the collection of additional data no matter how useful; either because they lack an individual student record system or because there are statutory constraints on the introduction of new data collections.

What Kinds of Technical Assistance Would Be Beneficial to States Regarding the Collection of the Required Data?

OSEP made clear that it cannot provide guidance on what is not in statute. However, task force members identified a number of areas where they felt OSEP could assist states through technical assistance materials. These included collecting and sharing promising examples of EIS programs and EIS data collections; question and answer documents, including the questions addressed by the task force and its recommendations; a list of useful data elements for demonstrating the effectiveness of EIS; technical assistance (TA) on making the data useful as well as TA on compliance with the law; and advice for states with aggregate data systems.

Moving the Measurement of Secondary Transition-Related Part B Indicators Through Collection of Reliable and Accurate Data, Analysis, and Use of Results **Loujeania Bost and Matthew Klare, National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities; David Test, National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center; Jane Falls and Charlotte Alverson, National Post-School Outcomes Center Introduction: Selete Avoke, OSEP/RTP**

Selete Avoke introduced the panel members and outlined the reasons behind the formation of each of the centers. He stated that the three centers worked with states as one unit to improve post-school outcomes.

Within the Part B indicators, four items directly relate to secondary transition:

- Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the state graduating with a regular diploma;
- Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the state dropping out of high school;
- Indicator 13: Percent of youth ages 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the child to meet postsecondary goals; and
- Indicator 14: Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who are competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within 1 year of leaving high school.

This session described a process for collecting, reporting, and using the secondary transition indicator data to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. To do this, the session described the relationship between the four indicators in terms of the following questions:

What are your post-school outcomes (Indicator 14)?

- Are they good or not so good?
- Why or why not?

What are your graduation (Indicator 1) and dropout (Indicator 2) rates?

- Are they good or not so good?
- Why or why not?

What is the quality of the student IEPs (Indicator 13)?

- Are they good or not so good?
- Why or why not?

Answering these questions will require states to go beyond looking at each indicator in isolation to looking across indicators with a wide angle lens.

Next, the Tree of Influence (2007) developed by the Western Regional Resource Center was presented. This model extends the cross-indicator coordination to all Part B indicators.

Finally, participants could respond to the following focus questions in three areas:

Collecting and Analyzing Indicator Data

- Describe the characteristics of your state's data collection system:
 - Who is responsible for designing data collection in your state for each of the transition indicators?
 - What methods are used to collect data for each of the indicators (e.g., what are the information sources and how is the information collected; is a unique identifier used to link all indicators)?
 - Who is responsible for actual data collection?
 - Who is responsible for data analysis?
 - What challenges and/or opportunities do your answers in Question 1 present for connecting and/or coordinating data collection around the indicators?
 - How can data collection and analysis be improved and/or coordinated to facilitate reporting and using data to foster program improvement?

Reporting Indicator Data

- What data do you need to report?
 - What is the purpose of reporting the data (e.g., accountability, program development, program evaluation)?
 - Who are the intended audiences for each piece of data?
 - How will you tailor the message to each particular audience?
 - What are the best formats and/or media for conveying the information to your various audiences?
 - What changes are needed?

Using Indicator Data To Foster Improvement

- How do your staff (e.g., data managers, program staff, monitoring staff) collaborate to use the indicator data for:
 - data-based decisionmaking?
 - professional development?
 - policy analysis and change (including resource allocation)?
 - technical assistance?

Child Outcomes Data for Preschool and Part C—Assuring Quality **Kathy Hebbeler and Lynne Kahn, ECO**

This session reviewed the requirements for SPP/APR Indicators C3 and B7, national trends in approaches to measuring child outcomes, and common challenges to and strategies for ensuring high-quality data. This presentation was offered as both a Part B and Part C concurrent session; this summary covers both.

OSEP's reporting requirements for child outcomes address three areas: the percentage of children who demonstrate improved (1) positive social emotional skills, including positive social relationships; (2) acquisition and use of knowledge and skills across domains, including early language/communication and early literacy; and (3) use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

There are five OSEP reporting categories for each of the three child outcome areas. The percentage of children who:

- a. Did not improve functioning. (This means there were no gains or no new skills acquired. The expectation is that this will be a very small percentage of children.)
- b. Improved functioning, but not sufficiently to move nearer to functioning comparably to same-aged peers. (This means there was growth in functioning but the rate of growth was not faster than before the child received services.)
- c. Improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but not achieving that level. (This means the rate of growth was faster, but did not reach that of same-aged peers.)
- d. Improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers. (This means the child's functioning reached the level of same-aged peers by exit from services.)

-
- e. Maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers. (This means the children were functioning and developing at a rate similar to same-aged peers at both entry and exit.)

In order to determine a child's progress, states will need to compare a child's data at two points in time. OSEP requires an entry and exit data point if the child has been in the program for at least 6 months. States may use the ECO Child Outcome Summary Form (COSF) to summarize multiple sources of data, a single assessment tool, an on-line assessment system with the capacity to report data to OSEP, or other approaches.

An analysis of the February 2007 SPPs/APRs provided information about state trends in approaches to measurement for preschool (Section 619) and Part C child outcomes. For preschool, 34 states are using or will use the COSF, 11 states are using one assessment tool statewide, 5 states are using on-line assessment systems, and 7 states are using unique approaches. For Part C, 40 states are using or will use the COSF, 8 states are using one assessment tool, 3 states are using on-line assessment systems, and 5 states are using unique approaches.

The criteria for same-aged peers were discussed for preschool and Part C.

Preschool

- For states using the COSF, 6 or 7 on the 7-point rating scale is defined as “age-expected”;
- Publishers’ on-line analyses are based on standard deviations/empirically based standard scores;
- Single tools statewide use standard deviation/standard scores, developmental quotients or age-based benchmarks/cut-off scores; and
- Other states use early learning guidelines, comparison groups and team consensus.

Part C

- For states using the COSF, 6 or 7 on the 7-point rating scale is defined as “age-expected”;
- Publishers’ on-line analyses are based on standard deviations/empirically based standard scores;
- Other states use standard deviation/standard scores, developmental quotients, percent delay, age-based benchmarks/cut-off scores, family or team determination, or rating on a 3-point scale.

Entry data as of the February 2007 SPPs/APRs were presented. The percentage of children entering preschool services “below age expectations” in each of the three outcome areas was:

- Social relationships 62%
- Knowledge and skills 71%
- Meets needs 59%

The percentage of children entering Part C services “below age expectations” in each of the three outcome areas was:

- Social relationships 55%
- Knowledge and skills 71%
- Meets needs 64%

More than 30 states (preschool and Part C) reported working on data system improvements related to the capacity to store and analyze child outcome data. Many states with systems in place reported the need to improve local training on how to enter and report data, build in error checks, and link other data elements for analysis and quality assurance capabilities, and match entry and exit data. Six states for preschool school and six states for Part C are sampling.

Drs. Hebbeler and Kahn pointed out that the validity of data is tied to the use and purpose of the data. They also presented and discussed a number of questions related to accountability systems and child outcome data. How can states ensure that the data are valid? Are the data sufficiently trustworthy to lead to sound decisions? How much error is acceptable?

Strategies being used across the country to improve the quality of child outcomes data include analyzing data to identify anomalies (comparing data across districts/programs and state data to national data), building in data checks, and reviewing data as part of monitoring procedures (individual record review and systematic analyses).

States should examine their commitment to the data collection. Do providers understand the importance of the activity? Has the system been designed so providers (and families) will receive benefit from collecting and providing data? Do providers know someone will be checking on what they are doing? A lot of data are collected very fast, which affects the quality of the data. States need to ensure that the process has been designed to make it as easy as possible and to take as little time as possible. And there must be a way for data collectors to get their questions answered in a timely manner (on-going technical assistance).

States are encouraged to look at best practices for data collection. The presenters reviewed and summarized a number of strategies to improve the quality of data. Scoring and data entry errors involve human error, so it is helpful to have an online scoring system with error checks. Other strategies include verification of the data for accuracy and completeness, timely feedback to data providers, analysis of data to identify anomalies, examination of aggregate data, and review of child outcome data as part of local district/program monitoring.

In summary, to ensure quality data, states have to be committed to the data collection and provide technical assistance. States should strive to keep errors from occurring in the first place, catch errors when they occur, and provide ongoing feedback to programs and providers.

Part B Converse With the Crew **OSEP (RTP and MSIP); Westat Staff**

During this unstructured session, meeting participants presented questions and comments to the OSEP and Westat staff. Topics covered included SPP/APR feedback, timelines, and indicators; use of funds (15%) for early intervening services; and the proposed change to the regular early childhood program definition on the educational environments form (Part B—Table 3). Questions and comments will be used to inform decision making about future technical assistance to states. At the end of the session, panel members queried the participants about the nature of the collaborations between data managers and EDEN coordinators in their states.

Tuesday, July 10

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

Roberta Garrison-Mogren, Westat

Under contract with the National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO), Westat developed a document introducing the concepts of response rates and nonresponse bias. The forthcoming document was discussed during a well-attended early bird session on Tuesday, July 10. According to Ms. Garrison-Mogren, the response rate document builds on concepts introduced in previous NPSO technical documents about sampling. Specifically, it assumes the reader understands the importance of representativeness.

The response rate document was written in order to heighten awareness of the importance of reporting response rates and identifying and discussing nonresponse bias. It is not a “how to” statistical cookbook. 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 answers provided in the document are practical by necessity. States must use their post-school outcomes data even when their response rates are lower than those acceptable for federally funded research studies and even when the data are known to have measurable nonresponse bias.

Although the document was designed for use by those state staff responding to SPP/APR Indicator 14, the concepts covered apply equally to any of the SPP/APR indicators that rely on survey data. NPSO plans to publish the document on its website (www.npsocenter.org).

Update From EIMAC

Sandra McQuain, West Virginia, Chair of EIMAC

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 and advises SEA chiefs and staff on national data issues; collaborates in the planning of national data initiatives by building partnerships with national data collectors and Federal program offices; provides feedback on national data collections, reports, assessments, and related research studies; facilitates networking among SEAs, Federal

program offices, and data collectors; and provides professional development opportunities for SEA directors and managers of data and assessment, as well as resources and leadership to states in building student-level data systems. EIMAC's subcommittees include General Statistics, Special Education, Assessment, and Longitudinal Data Systems. General Statistics and Special Education have permanent standing task forces to address EDEN issues.

Two EIMAC meetings are held each year, in October and May, and travel is provided for three people per member state. 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 618 data collections, SPP/APR proposals, *EDFacts* issues, and updates on *IDEA*. At the May meeting, EIMAC made recommendations in the following areas: *IDEA* reauthorization; advance notice for data collection changes; state collaboration with OSEP, OESE, and *EDFacts* to align Federal reporting; involvement in data collection proposals prior to OMB submission; review of existing and proposed data collections for reliability, validity and usefulness; and involvement of all parties on the *EDFacts* submission calendar. For more information go to http://www.ccsso.org/Projects/education_information_management_advisory_consortium/5788.cfm.

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. The session was introduced and moderated by NCSEAM, and representatives from Wisconsin and Louisiana each gave their state's perspective.

Alan Coulter began the session with ideas on how to use data to improve special education systems. An overview of the eight components for general supervision accountability that lead to improved results was presented. They are: (1) State Performance Plan, (2) Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation, (3) Integrated Monitoring Activities, (4) Fiscal Management, (5) Data on Processes and Results, (6) Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions, (7) Effective Dispute Resolution, and (8) Targeted Technical Assistance and Professional Development. The question was then raised, how do special education requirements fit into the larger general education requirement? General supervision is one piece, and special education is another piece. How do states make the puzzle pieces fit? Even more specifically, each state has collected the 618 required data, but each state has collected it in a somewhat different way. Finally, what data are generated by monitoring and other data collection processes, at both the state and local levels, and are these data accurate and integrated? In part, the answer is to actively involve stakeholders in the process. The SPP is the blueprint for change, and active involvement of stakeholders leads to improved results.

Next, Priscilla Baker, from the Louisiana Department of Education, described the state's data collection process. The Department meets with stakeholders twice a year. In 2005, the state began using a web-based application that is continuously open and that can be accessed from any location. The application captures student-level data, all the SPP components, child count, and

the compliance process (e.g., transition from IFSP to IEP and IEP compliance). Currently, 12 years of data can be accessed. One-time or occasional data are captured on Excel spreadsheets.

Some of the issues Louisiana is working on are related to personnel and discipline as well as double entries that are a result of multiple data collection sources. To minimize problems, an oversight committee was established. SPP indicators are assigned to the program leads, and Ms. Baker addresses Indicator 20, the accuracy and timeliness of the data.

Wanda Trahan, also from the Louisiana Department of Education, described her role in the process. She acts as the “translator” between the program and data staff by learning what programmatic questions need to be asked. She submits the questions as a data request to the data managers. To determine what steps need to be taken beyond the SPP requirements, a set of questions is asked to the stakeholders. The SPP Oversight Committee and the Steering Committee review the results and make additional recommendations.

The final speaker from Louisiana was Sandra Beech, a Steering Committee member and a parent of a young man receiving special education services. She stated that her role is to explain to the committee how the effects of data affect her son. Through her work on the committee, she has learned the special education system from the Federal to the local level and understands the foundation of the law. She uses this knowledge to advocate for families. By going into an IEP meeting with data, she is able to show that, “Data show reality. Reality brings vision, and vision brings change.”

Anita Castro, Nissan Bar-Lev, and Nancy Furman, from the Department of Instruction in Wisconsin, explained how their state involves stakeholders in the data process. In 2003, a Focused Effective Continuous Monitoring Stakeholder (FECMS) group was created. Their Steering Committee meets two to four times a year and is monitored by NCSEAM. It consists of 24 members, many of whom have been on the committees since its inception. The committee focuses on two priorities: (1) the eighth-grade reading gap and (2) the graduation gap. Using the data, two different sets of targets were presented to the stakeholders. A consensus was reached, in part because the stakeholders’ involvement is considered to be important, as is the atmosphere of the meeting. They strive to have an environment that “allows disagreement in order to reach agreement.”

Examples of how the state worked with the stakeholders on Indicator 8, Parent Involvement, and Indicator 9, Disproportionality, were then discussed. The state used the NCSEAM Survey to set the Parent Involvement targets and brought in an expert to define Disproportionality. The state also uses data retreats for districts that are out of compliance. The data retreats focus on Indicators 1 through 6 and Indicator 12 and use a prescribed process for analyzing data.

Wisconsin has devised a “one click” reporting system that is web-based and stores their longitudinal data. It has helped the state improve their data collection efforts. An example of EDEN data was shown. Users can choose from a wide variety of graphs for analysis and reporting. Comparisons can be conducted at the state, district, and school levels.

Part B Concurrent Sessions

Dispute Resolution Data

Richard W. Zeller, CADRE

This presentation addressed the context of dispute resolution (DR), development of the CADRE ADR database, State verification of DR data, national and state summaries of DR data reported through the APR/SPP process, CADRE's plans for publishing DR data on the web, and improving the accuracy of the DR data collection for 2006-07.

CADRE and the Context of Dispute Resolution

Different states and communities experience different patterns of DR use for a variety of reasons. These reasons are referred to in aggregate as the "context of dispute resolution." Factors in "context" include the quality of educational programs, culture with respect to contention, community or school district size, Part C and early intervention (EI) system, awareness and availability of legal representation, parental education/socioeconomic status variables, Parent Teacher Institute (PTI)/SEA or PTI/Lead Agency relationships, organizational or political will, and investment in a "continuum of DR options."

The last of these (the "continuum") is at the heart of CADRE's work: formal DR processes are used when methods of reaching agreement fail. These formal options will be more effectively used only when states and local communities invest in ways to help schools and families collaborate to reach agreement. More can be found on "the continuum" on the CADRE website: www.directionservice.org/cadre/continuum.

DR Database Development

CADRE is charged by OSEP to develop a national database on DR use in the states and entities. The data for the National Dispute Resolution Database are drawn from APR and SPP Attachment 1 and Table 7 for Part B (Attachment 1 and Table 4 for Part C). A total of 26 data elements are reported by each state on written complaints, mediation, due process hearings, resolution meetings, and expedited hearings. From these reported values, SPP/APR Indicators 16, 17, 18, and 19 are calculated (for Part C, Indicators 10, 11, 12, and 13).

State Data Verification

During May and June 2007, states were given the opportunity to review and verify (or, if needed, amend) DR data reported for school years 2003-04, 2004-05, and 2005-06. Reports based on these verified data will be available on the CADRE website (www.directionservice.org/cadre) in August 2007. Further national and regional comparative reports and analyses will follow publication of these basic reports.

National and State Summaries

Summaries were provided as a part of this presentation on the “big events” in DR, including state-reported raw numbers and per capita calculations of complaints filed, mediations held, hearings requested, hearings held, and resolution meetings held.

Dr. Zeller also provided national summaries of performance indicators. The tables below summarize state performance by displaying the number of states that reported performance within the indicated percentage ranges. The total number of states/entities in each instance is 57 (freely associated states have reported almost no activity in 3 years and are not included in the summaries). While these represent the best data available nationally on DR, the preliminary observations that follow about trends at this point are very tentative.

Indicator 16: Percent of Complaints Completed Within Timelines

	2004-05	2005-06
100% on time	29	33
90% to < 100%	13	9
75% to < 90%	7	7
50% to < 75%	4	1
Less than 50%	3	4
Blank or no activity	1	3

Improvement from 2004-05 appears to be occurring for states that were at or near the target for Indicator 16 (1005). For states that may have been struggling, performance appears to have remained about the same or declined.

Indicator 17: Percent of Hearings Completed Within Timelines

	03-04	04-05	05-06
100% on time	26	34	29
90% to < 100%	2	6	7
75% to < 90%	7	7	2
50% to < 75%	9	3	6
Less than 50%	5	1	3
Blank or no activity	8	6	10

The timeliness of hearings may have slipped from 2004-05 to 2005-06 due to the implementation of the resolution meeting process. There may also be an increase in the number of states that resolved hearing requests without going to a hearing.

Indicator 18: % Resolution Settlement Agreements, and Indicator 19: % Mediation Agreements

	B18 05-06	B19 03-04	B19 04-05	B19 05-06
100%	7	13	5	3
85% to <100%	4	7	13	9
75% to < 85%	2	11	14	19
65% to < 75%	4	8	11	9
50% to < 65%	13	10	8	7
35% to < 50%	6	1	0	2
Less than 35%	13	2	4	2
Blank or no activity	8	5	2	6

Please note that the mean state-reported rate for resolution settlement agreements is around 50%, while mediation agreement rates seem to be moving toward the 75% to 85% range. The definition of a mediation agreement is substantially broader than that for a resolution agreement. The latter must occur within 30 days of the due process filing and must resolve the basis of the hearing request. The percentage of “resolved without a hearing” (that is, hearing requests that are settled without going to a hearing) remains at about 80%, suggesting that many hearing requests are resolved through mediation or other later “settlement agreement” processes prior to hearing.

National summaries of Part C data were included in the presentation. Part C activity is minimal and not appropriate for state-to-state comparisons.

Next Steps in Publishing DR State Data

CADRE will begin publishing state identifiable DR data on its website in August 2007. Additional summaries and analyses will be made available as they are completed. While CADRE has made every effort possible to ensure that the data to be published are accurate and have been verified by the states, CADRE will work with any state to add data notes as appropriate or to correct any data that the state finds to be in error.

Data Collection 2006-07

Future data collection for DR will become part of Section 618 data reporting for the 2006-07 school year. While there have been some clarifications in the instructions and fine-tuning of the definitions for Table 7 (Part B) and Table 4 (Part C), no changes have been made in these data reporting standards from last year. The CADRE error checkers for Part B and Part C are, therefore, still useful to states to check the accuracy of their data reports prior to submission. These can be located on the CADRE website at: <http://www.directionservice.org/cadre/sppresources.cfm>

Questions about the CADRE National Dispute Resolution Database may be addressed to Richard Zeller, at rwzeller@directionservice.org or by calling 541-686-5060.

EDEN/EDFacts—Challenges, Successes, and Developing Working Relationships

Lisa Holden-Pitt, OSEP/RTP; Bobbi Stettner-Eaton, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development; Eileen Ahearn, Project Forum at NASDSE

This presentation focused on the goals of the EDEN/EDFacts initiative, the U.S. Department of Education's progress toward meeting those goals, the challenges encountered as the Department and states transition from the Data Analysis System (DANS) to EDEN/EDFacts (the repository for State submissions of required data), the successes achieved to date, and the data collections next in line to be incorporated into EDFacts.

Eileen Ahearn began the presentation with an observation that, while there is a lot of knowledge about EDEN/EDFacts (now generally referred to as EDFacts) within the data management community, there is limited knowledge outside the community. This is evidenced by the fact that it was listed as an issue of high interest for more information by state directors of special education and other groups in the process used by Project Forum to select the topics to be covered in its policy research documents. In seven state telephone interviews, state staff in special education and data divisions provided information on the status of their implementation of EDEN/EDFacts. Project Forum has compiled the results of that survey in a document that will be disseminated through the website www.projectforum.org in September 2007. The Project Forum dissemination network includes over 5,000 individuals and organizations with interest in areas related to special education.

The EDFacts initiative centralizes data for all K through 12 educational programs. It allows these data to be combined with other relevant information to support policy development, planning, and management in the U.S. Department of Education. In addition, it increases efficiency and consistency across data collection efforts within the Department. For the special education data, the Department's goals are to bring into EDFacts, wherever feasible, the data that for many years have been collected through the OSEP-specific data system, DANS; to maintain and improve data accuracy through (or as result of) the process of transitioning from the legacy data system (DANS) to EDFacts; and to yield accurate data for Federal and public access in a timely way.

Bobbi Stettner-Eaton, of the EDFacts team, reported that for the IDEA, Section 618 data collections, as of July 2007:

- 35 states had been approved to submit the Part B Child Count to EDFacts only;
- 32 states had been approved to submit Part B Educational Environments data to EDFacts only; and
- 34 states had been approved to submit Part B Exiting data as EDFacts only.

In order for a state to be approved to submit data for a given collection exclusively to EDFacts, those data must be deemed (through comparative analysis) to be sufficiently consistent with the data as would be submitted through the traditional system, DANS. Dr. Holden-Pitt reviewed the basic procedures the Department is using to evaluate the state data for congruency between the data provided to through the two submission avenues. She impressed the factors considered in determining sufficient congruency. She also displayed examples of various common error patterns observed in the data submissions.

Challenges to the Department include ensuring consistency in reporting instructions and clear communication of requirements to states. The Department has learned that what works is effective collaboration between *EDFacts* and OSEP team members; open, clear, and ongoing communication among all parties with data responsibilities; and strong commitment to successfully transitioning from *DANS* data reporting to *EDFacts* data reporting and production of quality data products. Moving states toward timely submission of accurate and updated data, and correcting errors requires effective collaboration between *IDEA* data managers and *EDFacts* coordinators.

Challenges at the state level include staffing changes that compromise consistency, resistance to change in the state data system, clarifying and resolving incongruencies among the data, and time requirements to build data files and submit data. To make a successful transition to *EDFacts*, the Department and states need knowledgeable resources with well-defined roles and an understanding of when to call for technical assistance. Informed technical supports already in place include technical assistance from *DANS*, Westat, and the *EDFacts* Partner Support Center (PSC).

Three special education data collections are next in line for incorporation into *EDFacts*: personnel, discipline, and assessment. As the Department moves into the next phase of transition to *EDFacts*, it is looking for *EDFacts*-only states to provide advice to states still early in the process and information about state concerns, potential problems, and constructive suggestions to the Department.

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

Kristin Reedy, NERRC; Bruce Bull, EDSIS; Joy Markowitz, Westat

The Northeast Regional Resource Center presented the results of a study on 6-21 educational environments data collection practices across states in the northeast. This work was funded by OSEP via a Westat 2006 State Analysis Grant.

This study investigated the degree of consistency with which placement classifications are applied to difficult-to-code scenarios by different raters within and across northeast states. Possible explanations for state-to-state variation in placement patterns were explored. The study investigated whether circumstances other than differences in service delivery models might affect the data. Additional questions were asked about availability, utilization, and perceived value of state-delivered training and technical assistance relative to use of the educational environments categories.

The study found both inter-regional and intra-state inconsistency in the way respondents classified the same difficult-to-code scenario. The large variation in educational environments data suggests that states may be prudent to thoroughly investigate these data. Also, respondents in most states were inconsistent with respect to their knowledge of what technical assistance and trainings were available from their SEA related to this data collection. States should take steps to improve technical assistance and supports to increase the reliability of local educational environments data. The panel provided recommendations as to how to assist special education

administrators, at multiple levels, increase the accuracy of collection and reporting of educational environments data.

Given the importance and use of the national educational environments data, the remainder of the session was spent generating and discussing difficult-to-classify scenarios and providing input for a Q & A on this data collection. Westat will use the scenarios in September to develop a Q & A guidance document.

Participants also shared and discussed technical assistance strategies that have been used successfully to assist LEAs with the collection of educational environments data.

Welcome From OSERS/OSEP

Patty Guard, Acting Director, OSEP; introduced by Larry Wexler, OSEP/RTP

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 substantial input from the field regarding the change, is submitting the change to OMB, and there will be a 60-day public comment period.

Moving to her prepared remarks, 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. The sophistication of data has grown. States are using data to document the need for change and to show that change has occurred.

OSEP's core mission is to improve results for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. OSEP values making a difference in the field based on outcomes, data-based decisions, connecting with experts, education, commitment, and continuous improvement.

Ms. Guard reported that OSEP has five priorities:

- Beginning at birth, providing EI programs and services to ensure long-term gains for infants and toddlers with disabilities;
- Partnering with parents to improve results for children with disabilities;
- Integrating *IDEA* and *NCLB* to improve results for students with disabilities;
- Preparing American's children for global competition, through response to intervention and early intervening services; and
- Ensuring success in postsecondary education, employment, and independent living for students with disabilities.

Early Intervention Programs

OSEP's goal is to ensure that children enter school ready to learn. To this end, OSEP is looking for comprehensive, coordinated, multidisciplinary interagency activities for all children with disabilities that bring about positive results. The role of families is recognized in all the priorities.

To ensure that effective early childhood services are available, states need an integrated early childhood infrastructure that ensures early referral, timely provision of services, and interagency coordination. Second, states should take a transdisciplinary approach to child find and family services. Services must be comprehensive and provided to children in environments with their typically developing peers. Also important, states need to have effective general supervision systems.

The following practices will ensure long-term gains:

- Effective leadership and oversight at both the Federal and state levels;
- Services provided by high-quality teachers and related personnel;
- Successful collaborative teaming;
- Involvement of families in decisionmaking;
- Development of school readiness skills;
- Clear transition practices that involve data and accountability systems that ensure a seamless system; and
- Technology that enhances children's participation in EI and preschool services.

Three of OSEP's EI (Part C) SPP/APR indicators are:

- Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive EI services in the home or in programs for typically developing children.
- Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved (a) positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships), (b) acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication), and (c) use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs; and
- Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday.

Partnering with Parents

This concept is important because parents can improve child achievement and outcomes, increase access for children with disabilities to the general education curriculum, and change systems to improve results for children with disabilities.

To promote parent involvement, states need a systematic, multi-level approach that values parents' skills and knowledge and that provides information, education, and training for improved involvement in partnership at the child, school, district, state, and national levels.

Practices that support parent partnership include the following:

- Joint parent and professional training that focuses on relationship building and conflict resolution;
- Parent training on child-specific issues such as the law, regulations, and systemic change; and

-
- Mentoring.

OSEP's SPP/APR indicator dealing with parent partnerships is the percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that the school facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

Integrating IDEA and NCLB To Improve Results

NCLB and *IDEA* are interconnected in several ways. Under each act, all students are held to and assessed against high standards; students with disabilities are included in state assessments; results of assessments for students with disabilities must be used in calculating adequate yearly progress (AYP); and all teachers must be highly qualified.

Several provisions in *NCLB* and *IDEA* are aligned:

- Accountability for all children;
- Assessments;
- Reporting to parents;
- Alignment of SPP goals with states' definitions of AYP;
- Early intervening services;
- High quality teachers; and
- Use of scientifically based practices.

OSEP's SPP/APR indicators for this issue are:

- Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the state graduating with a regular diploma;
- Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the state dropping out of high school; and
- Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments.

Response to Intervention

RTI is a way of screening children early in their school life to help schools identify children who are not responding to instruction and may be at risk for school failure. RTI allows schools to get services to those children before they fail.

To implement RTI, states need a model that is based on high-quality research and instruction in the general education arena. States need a way to systematically monitor students' progress and develop targeted instruction that is progressively more intense—instruction delivered in tiers, the last of which is special education services.

Practices to implement RTI include the following:

- Schoolwide foundation of quality;
- Scientifically based core instruction;

-
- High-quality supports and services;
 - Increasingly intense intervention that becomes individualized instruction implemented with fidelity;
 - Emphasis on early literacy and numeracy;
 - Qualified personnel;
 - Data-based documentation and monitoring;
 - Collaborative teaming and staff review; and
 - Professional development to sustain implementation.

The SPP/APR indicators regarding graduation, dropout, disproportionality, and assessment address this priority.

Transition Planning and Services

Such services represent a long-range, coordinated process in which individuals explore and identify appropriate postsecondary goals for education, employment, and independent living that facilitate an individual's movement from school to postschool activities.

Transition needs to include long-range range planning and coordinated activities, access to the general education curriculum, continuous and ongoing involvement of students and families, and collaboration across agencies.

Transition planning and services is supported by:

- Student-centered assessments sensitive to cultural diversity;
- Student-centered focused planning for vocational training that includes the student, family, and agency personnel on the planning team;
- Self-determination and self-advocacy;
- Use of assessment information;
- Functional and daily living skills training and opportunities for paid and unpaid work experience; and
- Social skills training.

OSEP's SPP indicators on transition and employment reflect this priority:

- Percent of youth ages 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals; and
- Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within 1 year of leaving high school.

In conclusion, Ms. Guard pointed out that OSEP has numerous technical assistance resources and has aligned each of its technical assistance centers with one of the 20 indicators

under Part B and the 14 indicators under Part C. More information about the technical assistance centers can be found at www.rfcnetwork.org/content/view/137/192.

Working Together To Ensure Quality Data

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

Dr. Holden-Pitt stated that the past year had been one of considerable transition. Several data collection forms were revised for the 2006-07 reporting period; many states submitted at least some Part B data through EDEN; and many states are obtaining data through new or restructured data systems. Data accuracy, timeliness, and documentation remain essential. She noted a trend toward more accurate and timely data—a trend that can be continued through further collaborative efforts. Dr. Holden-Pitt then described how the offices within ED have adapted as they have transitioned their data systems into EDEN, particularly in regard to establishing a collaborative atmosphere, while still maintaining primary ownership and responsibility for the quality of their data. In the same spirit, data managers must also maintain the same level of ownership and responsibility for the quality of data within their own states and districts. This goal is best accomplished through collaborations among data managers, representatives from ED's RTP and EDEN offices, the states' MSIP state contacts, Westat, states' *EDFacts* state coordinator, and district data providers. She also encouraged the development of within-state partnerships between special education data management staff and representatives from state offices responsible for assessment and personnel data. High-quality data are vital for accountability.

Dr. Carol Bruce followed up Dr. Holden-Pitt's comments by emphasizing the importance of all of the entities cited by Dr. Holden-Pitt working together to make these data of the highest quality possible. She outlined three things that the states can expect from Westat in support of their efforts to ensure good data quality: (1) timely and relevant information; (2) forums for input to the data collection process; and (3) ongoing feedback, communication, and support in the data collection process. She then outlined four things that Westat expects of the states in ensuring the best data quality: (1) states will use the resources that Westat makes available to them in supporting the data collections; (2) states will maintain ongoing communication with Westat; (3) states will hold their districts to the highest possible data quality standards; and (4) states will remain aware that these data represent them in multiple public venues in regard to what they are doing to serve the educational needs of children with disabilities. Dr. Bruce concluded by expressing her appreciation for the hard work that the data managers do to sustain these data collections and assuring them that Westat is committed to supporting them in those efforts and that it shares their goals in regard to improving data quality and ultimately improving services to children with disabilities.

Data Sharing for Tracking Children From C to B

Nyle Robinson and Scott Beever, Illinois; Frank Miller, Pennsylvania

Facilitator: Anne Lucas, NECTAC and WRR

Data sharing across agencies and initiatives has been a national focus in recent years, especially for states that need to improve performance on SPP/APR Indicators C-8 and B-12 regarding the transition of young children from Part C to Part B. Data sharing can be challenging where there are different lead agencies. Issues of confidentiality, data sharing agreements, and

matching children across programs are common challenges that must be addressed. Illinois and Pennsylvania are two states that 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.

The Illinois Experience: In 2002, Illinois' Part C Program, which is in the Department of Human Services, identified that less than half of the children exiting Part C at age 3 had completed the eligibility determination process for early childhood special education services. As a result, a number of steps were implemented that improved performance on transition significantly; however, performance stalled. To take the next step, Part C entered into a collaborative data sharing agreement with the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) to track children transitioning to Part B.

Illinois is currently piloting the data sharing process with a number of LEAs. The process is based on the successful identification of the appropriate school district and includes the following:

- A monthly listing is developed of all children who turn 27 months of age or who enter Part C after 27 months of age. Geocoding mapping software assigns a school district. The Part C central data system provides the remaining child find information. Geocoding software provides a school district in 95% of cases. Using Yahoo Maps and hand matching, the proportion of children assigned to school districts increases to over 99%.
- The Part C Lead Agency transmits the monthly geocoded data (e.g., Part C identification number, date of birth, address, phone, EI program, county, school district number) to the ISBE under the auspices of the 'Part C Notification Requirement' (without parental consent) in accordance with the provisions of the OSEP Letter to Elder, February 11, 2004 ("Letter to Texas").
- Part C also sends a monthly matrix of all open IFSPs organized by school district and by children's ages as well as a list of children who exited Part C with the reasons for their termination.
- When ISBE receives the monthly data from the Part C Lead Agency, it sends individual child data (children age 29 months) to the respective school districts. LEAs are responsible for matching the list with children who are in the transition process.
- Illinois Part C service coordination agencies also complete a "transition tracking form" that is forwarded to the receiving LEA. If the parent does not consent, the form includes only the child find elements listed in the "Letter to Texas."
- During transition, the LEA completes the transition tracking form documenting eligibility determination for Part B. A copy of the completed form is sent to the service coordination agency and to ISBE. ISBE matches the monthly data transfer list with the electronic lists they receive.
- The service coordination agency enters the eligibility status from the LEAs' completed transition tracking forms into the Part C database.
- ISBE follows up with LEAs on failed transitions based on data received from the Part C Lead Agency (data entered in the Part C database from the transition tracking form).

Illinois has developed a data sharing agreement delineating each agency's responsibilities. Both Part C and Part B lead agencies anticipate improvement in performance on transition following statewide implementation of the data-sharing procedures. In addition, both Part C and Part B include local performance in transition as a component of their status determination process.

The Pennsylvania Experience: Similar to Illinois in structure, Pennsylvania had separate lead agencies for Part C and B, two separate databases, and two different agencies at the local level responsible for providing services to children in EI and in preschool special education. In 2006, following a comparison of data regarding children transitioning from Part C to Part B, a protocol was developed to improve overall performance in early childhood transition. The following steps were implemented:

- With parent consent, county EI programs send a notification letter to the Mutually Agreed Upon Written Arrangement (MAWA) holder (LEA) when children are between 26 and 32 months old. These data are entered in the Part C database.
- On a monthly basis, the state Part C office compiles data on children (e.g., name, address, date of birth, school district number, EI number) who were referred to MAWAs in the preceding month and sends the data to the SEA.
- The SEA transmits the Part C child data to the respective MAWA on a monthly basis.
- The MAWA reviews the data to ensure that information is received for all children listed as being referred to Part B. If the data do not match, the MAWA contacts the county EI program to reconcile discrepancies and correct data as appropriate. If the data match, the MAWA uses the data to populate the MAWA database and submits the data to the SEA.
- The SEA notifies the Part C office as to whether data were reconciled at the local level. For those for which reconciliation was not possible, the SEA identifies each child by the county in which he/she resides.
- The Part C office follows up with the county EI program to ensure discrepancies are corrected within 10 days. A revised listing with clarification as to whether the name should be edited or deleted is submitted to the SEA with the next month's data.

Since the implementation of these data-sharing procedures, 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: 1) increased communication at the local level before transition, 2) better consistency between data systems, and 3) increased compliance with SPP/APR Indicators (B-12 and C-8). In the past 6 months, Pennsylvania's EI program was merged with other early childhood programs into the Office of Child Development and Early Learning. The impact of this change is not yet apparent, but it is anticipated that increased collaboration between EI and early childhood special education will occur.

Wednesday, July 11

National Early Intervention Longitudinal Study (NEILS)

Kathy Hebbeler, SRI

The National Early Intervention Longitudinal Study (NEILS) was the first national study with a nationally representative sample of the Part C 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 and followed from entry into EI until kindergarten. Dr. Kathy Hebbeler described the study and presented data about the characteristics of the children and their families, the services they received, and the child and family outcomes they experienced at age 3 and in kindergarten. Dr. Hebbeler also discussed the implications of the NEILS findings. Selected findings from the presentation are summarized below.

EI staff provided 305 different terms to characterize why children were eligible for EI services. The most frequent reasons for eligibility were speech/communication delay or impairment (41%), prenatal/perinatal abnormalities (19%), motor delay or impairment (18%), global delayed development (12%), and congenital disorder (9%). Children in EI fell into the following three eligibility categories: developmental delay (64%), diagnosed condition (20%), and at risk (16%).

Children in EI were in poorer health than the general population of infants and toddlers— at entry, 16% were in fair or poor health versus 2.3% for the general population. Children in EI were more likely to have been born at low birth weight—32% versus 8%. Children in EI were more likely to be boys (61%), from minority racial/ethnic groups (47% versus 39% in the general population) and more likely to be poor (43% with household incomes less than \$25,000 versus 21% for the general population).

Children and families received a variety of EI services, with the most common being service coordination (78%), speech/language therapy (52%), special instruction for the child (43%), occupational therapy (39%), developmental monitoring (37%), physical therapy (37%), and family training (19%). The average number of services received was 4.1, and the median amount of services scheduled was about 1.5 hours per week. Most families (76%) received services in the home. On average, 23% of the services scheduled were missed.

Of the children who received EI, 64% exited at 36 months to early childhood special education (ECSE); 20% exited at 36 months but did not enter ECSE; and 16% exited before 36 months. At kindergarten, 58% of children who received EI had a disability and an IEP; 32% had no disability; and 10% had a disability but no IEP.

In terms of outcomes at kindergarten, when language, literacy, behavior, and social skills were examined, the children without IEPs as a group look strong academically and socially. The lack of an IEP at kindergarten reflects real developmental differences across groups. Some children continue to have serious health problems.

Feedback from families about EI was positive. More than half of families rated the quality of help received during EI as *excellent* at three time points—enrollment (57%), 36 months (56%), and kindergarten (61%). When asked how help and information provided by EI affected the family, 48% said *much better* at enrollment, 60% at 36 months, and 64% at kindergarten. In terms of family outcomes, the percentage of families that *strongly agreed* they knew how to help their child learn and develop was 64% at 36 months and 67% at kindergarten. At 36 months, 65% of families *strongly agreed* they knew how to work with professionals and advocate for what their child needs; 50% *strongly agreed* at kindergarten. For more information about NEILS, go to <http://www.sri.com/neils>. For a copy of Dr. Hebbeler’s PowerPoint from this presentation, go to: <http://www.sri.com/neils/present.html>.

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, (Ruth Ryder), 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’ SPPs/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. There are clarifications to the data source and measurement of Indicators 5, 6, 9, 10, and 20 and clarifications to the instructions for indicators/measurement for all 20 indicators. Indicator 4 is proposed for deletion; however, states are still required to examine LEA data for significant discrepancies in rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year, including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity.

There are proposed changes in wording of four indicators—Indicators 5, 6, 11, and 16. New wording for Indicator 5 is consistent with 618 language in regard to the amount of time spent in regular classes. New wording for Indicator 6 matches Table 3 – Educational Environments (618 data collection), which became effective for the 2006-07 school year. For Indicator 11, states that establish a timeframe within which initial evaluations can be conducted must specify what that timeframe is. New Indicator 16 wording makes it clear that an acceptable reason to extend the timeline for resolution of signed written complaints is parent and public

agency agreement to extend the time so they can pursue alternative means of dispute resolution available in the state.

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. As defined on the rubric, a state’s data submission is timely if “All data for the APR are submitted on or before February 1, 2008. Data for tables 618 are submitted on or before each table’s due date.” There are no exceptions to the requirements. States may receive extensions for submitting data, but, per Indicator 20, their submissions will not be timely. For APR data, the rubric defines what OSEP means by valid data, correct calculations, and followed instructions. For 618 data, the rubric defines what OSEP means by complete data, passed edits checks, and responded to data note requests. States can provide feedback by emailing Ken.Kienas @ed.gov.

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. This was especially problematic for Indicators 8, 9, 10, and 15. OSEP recommends having someone who has not worked on the SPP/APR review each indicator against the measurement table requirements. Second, for Indicators 7, 9, 10, 12, 15, and 20 especially, it was difficult to locate the state’s raw data, and there were calculation errors. OSEP recommends putting the raw data in their own section in the measurement boxes, providing calculations used, and making sure raw data in the narrative match raw data in the calculations. Third, for Indicators 3, 5, and 6, APR data were inconsistent with 618 data. OSEP added reminders in the indicator and measurement instructions where indicator data should match specific 618 tables (e.g., Table 6 data for Indicator 3 and Table 3, Columns A, C, and D/E/F for Indicators 5A, 5B, and 5C, respectively). If the data do not match, states must explain why and provide a process for fixing the data for the following year. Fourth, for indicators such as 8, 12, and 20, states reported specific data issues such as whether response rates were representative, but did not explain what the state did or was planning to do to correct the problem.

APR Plenary for Part C

Julia Martin, Alma McPherson, Virginia Sheppard, (Ruth Ryder), OSEP/MSIP

Ms. Alma McPherson began the plenary with general comments about the SPPs/APRs due February 2007. OSEP was impressed with the depth and amount of information submitted by states. Issues concerning specific indicators were then discussed. Specifically:

- OSEP found calculation errors in Indicators 1, 7, 8, and 9. All calculations need to be checked, and Ms. McPherson suggested that a second person conduct a recheck.
- For Indicator 9, states should disaggregate the data by the number of findings. Currently, some states incorrectly disaggregated by the number of programs.
- Similarly, for Indicators 1, 7, and 8, states are allowed to disaggregate the data for families who delay because of exceptional family circumstances. However, if these families are included, they must be represented in both the numerator and denominator of the measurement.

-
- To clarify the reports, if the state is including raw data for Indicators 7, 8, and 9, the data should be included in a table or a box and not in the narrative of the report.

Next, Ms. Julia Martin reviewed the changes that are proposed for each indicator. For most indicators, the changes are clarifications to the instructions. However, for a few indicators, there are proposed changes to the measurement. The changes are summarized below:

- Indicators 1 and 7: States must “Indicate the range of delays and reasons for the untimely receipt of services due to causes other than documented exceptional family circumstances.” States may choose to include in the calculation children for whom the state has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record. If included, these numbers must be included in the numerator and denominator. Clarifications and minor changes are proposed for the instructions.
- Indicator 2: The number of options has been reduced from five to two settings. The new options are home and community-based settings. The instructions clarify that states are to report 618 data that were collected on a date between October 1 and December 1, 2007, and due on February 1, 2007.
- Indicator 3: In FY 2006 and 2007, states provided progress data for all five measurements of each of the three sub-indicators. Established baselines and targets are to be provided in the FY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010.
- Indicator 4: States must include a description of how they ensured that the data were representative of the demographics of the state, regardless of whether the data are collected through sampling or census.
- Indicators 5 and 6: The instructions clarify that states are to report 618 data that were collected on a date between October 1 and December 1, 2007, and due on February 1, 2007.
- Indicator 8: The 8C measurement was clarified to include “at least 90 days prior to the child’s third birthday.” The instructions were clarified in Indicator 8B to include: “If the state has adopted a written policy that requires the Lead Agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with and IFSP of the impending notification to the LEA under *IDEA* and permits the parent within a specified time period to ‘opt-out’ of the referral, the state is not required to include these children in the calculations under 8B. Include in the discussion of the data the numbers of parents who opted out.” Written policy must be on file with OSEP. In 8C, the state may choose to include in calculation children for whom the state has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record. If included, these numbers must be included in the numerator and denominator. Clarifications and minor changes were made to the instructions. The state must provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance.
- Indicator 9: Clarifications were made to the instructions. When presenting the compliance data, the findings must be disaggregated by the components of the state’s general supervision system. Findings must also be disaggregated by the SPP/APR indicator. The state must provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance.

-
- Indicator 10: The instructions were clarified to include that states must provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance.
 - Indicator 11: The instructions now require states to include a discussion as to whether the state has adopted the Part C due process hearing procedures and to provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance.
 - Indicators 12 and 13: The instructions were clarified to include a reminder to attach Table 4 of Information Collection 1820-0678.
 - Indicator 14: In 14A, personnel data were dropped from the requirements, and a February 1 due date was added for APRs. In 14B, “including any accuracy issues with 618 state-reported data or indicator data in the States APR” was added. The instructions were clarified to include that states must provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance.

Ms. Virginia Sheppard concluded the session by presenting 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 everyone to use it. The rubric consists of two tables. The first table is for APR data and lists each indicator in the left-hand column. It has three column headers across the top: valid data, correct calculation, and followed instructions. The second table is for 618 state-reported data and has the four tables listed in the left-hand column. Across the top are four column headers: timely, complete data, passed edit check, and responded to data note questions.

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. There are 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.

The changes to dispute resolution (Table 4) include:

- Language substitutions to better align with *IDEA* 2004 and ED regulations;
 - Replaced *hearing request* with *due process complaint*
 - Replaced *sessions* with *meetings*;
- Three new definitions – *due process complaint*, *expedited due process complaint*, *resolution period*; and
- Added circumstances under which the SEA decision may be provided to complainant within an extended timeline.

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

Linda Goodman and Alice Ridgway, Connecticut; Randall Penfield, Consultant on NCSEAM Family Survey

Part C programs in many states are currently using the family survey developed by NCSEAM to provide data addressing Indicator 4 of the SPP. In this session, Connecticut described its experience using the NCSEAM Part C Family Survey, including how data from the survey have been used to measure family outcomes, provide the percentages that need to be reported to OSEP, and guide program improvement efforts.

Alice Ridgway and Linda Goodman from the Part C Program in Connecticut along with Randy Penfield, a measurement expert from the University of Miami, gave this session as an interactive team. The session began with a discussion of Indicators 4A, B, and C and how they are defined using the NCSEAM Survey.

The NCSEAM Survey is divided into two scales: Impact of Early Intervention Services on the Family (22 items) and Family-Centered Services (25 items). To analyze the data, a Rasch analysis was used, and a quick explanation was given. Items from the survey have a calibration. The calibration value of an item is determined by how much positive impact is needed to yield agreement with the item. Therefore, a high calibration value means that a higher level of positive impact is required to generate an agreeable response to the item. Indicator 4A has a calibration of 539, 4B has a calibration of 556, and 4C has a calibration of 516 and is the easiest calibration to attain. These values have become the standards, and states report the percentage of families that meet or exceed these standards. The item calibrations are based on a pilot study of 1,700 families from eight states. When the calibrations were examined separately for different subgroups (e.g., families in different states or of different ethnicities) the calibrations were highly similar. The instrument is psychometrically sound.

Connecticut created survey forms in English and Spanish and merged unique IDs from its Part C data system onto the forms. In 2006, surveys were hand delivered to 1,561 families who were currently eligible and mailed to 1,151 families who had exited the system. In 2007, surveys were sent to all currently eligible families (2,712) who had been receiving services for at least 6 months. The state also contracted with an on-line survey company in 2006 and used SurveyMonkey.com in 2007 to put the survey on line. The returns from the online survey have been very small. In 2007, 699 of the 2,712 surveys were returned with Impact on Family Services responses. From this data set, 384 records were randomly selected to be representative based on the races/ethnicities in the most recent 618 tables.

The findings show that approximately 90-95% of families agreed, with approximately two-thirds of families expressing strong or very strong agreement, that EI helped them: “Feel that they can handle the challenges of parenting a child with special needs”; “know about their child’s and family’s rights concerning early intervention services”; and “do things with and for their child that are good for their child’s development.” Results were reported locally, and each program was given its data and statewide results. As needed, during focused monitoring local results were reviewed. The results were also used to set measurable and rigorous targets. Since there is no exact formula for setting targets, the presenters recommended that determinations be

made in consultation with stakeholders. Connecticut set targets based on statistical significance. Currently, the same targets are set for FFY 2005 through FFY 2010. The state plans to revise targets as needed each year.

The state is still clarifying issues surrounding public reporting and local representativeness. A University of Miami graduate student is using Connecticut's data for her dissertation. Finally, Dr. Randy Penfield is providing technical assistance on Rasch analysis and random-representativeness of samples to state staff so they can do the analysis and sampling in future years.

Part C Settings—Implementation Solutions

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

This session was an overview of the implementation issues surrounding the Part C settings data collection. Dr. Brown began the session with an overview and history of this data collection, followed by a discussion about the new categories implemented for the 2006-07 year and their implications. Dr. Brown also discussed the reasoning behind the changes. Dr. Bruce continued the session with a review of the existing question-and-answer document that is posted on IDEAData.org. The final portion of the session was an opportunity for participants to ask questions about the settings data collection.

The majority of the questions centered around how to handle situations that are not quite clear in terms of which setting to report for the child. One example was where do states report children who have a service provider for both the child and the mother. The answer is to report the setting that is on the IFSP. This is the correct answer for most situations. The state should always refer to the IFSP first for settings information.

There was also a lengthy discussion about *reverse inclusion*. This refers to settings intended only for children with disabilities, but the settings also include typically developing children. The discussion centered on how a state would know if a setting is community-based or other (i.e., *not* a natural environment). Dr. Brown said this is an ongoing issue and advised discretion. He also said that the burden of proof is on the state when reporting a setting as community-based.

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

This session described the conceptual framework for a Part C state's system of general supervision and the role that data play in the stakeholder process. Two states, Ohio and Idaho, participated in the panel and described their experiences. The system of general supervision is minimally described as having eight essential components, with data playing a key role in informing a state and its stakeholders about compliance and results of program implementation. Stakeholders become consumers of data about state performance (quantifiable measures of compliance and results) and actively participate in recommending and evaluating rigorous and

measurable targets. Throughout the time span of an SPP (6 years), stakeholders review data as part of their role in advising the state on what is working, what needs to be changed, and new priorities.

Ms. Crayton and Ms. Deibel stated that Part C in Ohio is one of three programs in the state's Help Me Grow System (HMG). HMG provides services to children birth to 3 under 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 state has a web-based data system with over 2,000 users. The Monitoring Stakeholder Group has met three times and has provided valuable feedback on Ohio Part C's revision of its General Supervision System. This revision included the monitoring indicators matrix and the state's plan to use monitoring activities such as data desk audits, self-assessment, family survey, child assessment, and onsite visits. The stakeholders also provided feedback on the new self-assessment tool and advice on the formula to be used for the local determination process. Both panel members described the value of stakeholders' input in informing the process with necessary practical implementation implications.

The Ohio Part C Stakeholder Group will meet again in fall 2007 to discuss:

- Feedback on ways to measure Indicator 14 to ensure valid and reliable data;
- The corrective action plan process;
- Ways to improve reporting of data to all stakeholders;
- Results of the pilot focused onsite visiting process;
- Results of the pilot on the self-assessment process;
- Data on compliance indicators; and
- A report on county progress regarding data.

In addition, the state plans to add more local personnel to the Monitoring Stakeholders Group, move to using stakeholders for output (not just input), focus on translating state practice to the local level to help counties realize what the data can do to assist in program improvement work, and assist local programs to implement focused monitoring on the county level.

The Idaho Part C panel members provided information about the state's Part C system. Idaho is the third fastest growing state in the country after Nevada and Arizona. The Census Bureau classifies the state as "frontier" and "profoundly rural." The Part C system is organized according to seven regions that are responsible for providing EI services to eligible children and their families. The child count continues to grow significantly. It increased from 1,666 children to 3,464 in the last 10 years. Mr. Peterson discussed the 2005 SPP and APR process. This discussion also covered the submission of the revised SPP to address all indicators, including the "new indicators" (3, 4, and 12) and any modifications that were made to the previous SPP. Idaho's FY 2005 APR contains performance data from FY 2005 (July 5-6, 2006) and other responsive APR information for the remaining indicators. The panel shared and described the regional data profiles that have been posted on the state's website 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 the policy entities such as the state legislature.

The Monitoring Stakeholder Group process was discussed, including the meeting held on May 23-24, 2007, during which data were provided to stakeholders to present the status of performance of the state system. 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 2007-08. The panel members also discussed the onsite desk audit hypothesis meeting held in Boise in June, during which individuals reviewed all available data related to the region scheduled for an onsite visit in September 2007. This visit will be the first onsite focused monitoring visit in Idaho and will focus on the provision of quality services. The panel described the process of analyzing available data to determine what is known about the region, the process of developing hypotheses addressing regional performance, and the development of interview questions and other monitoring tools to be used on the upcoming regional visit.

Part C Converse With the Crew OSEP (RTP and MSIP); Westat Staff

During this unstructured session, meeting participants presented questions and comments to the OSEP and Westat staff. Topics covered were general supervision; definition of noncompliance and findings; use of 618 data for the SPPs/APRs, and sample size and representativeness of samples. Questions and comments will be used to inform decision making about future technical assistance to states.

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

This session discussed 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. Comments were due on or before July 23, 2007. Numerous changes are being proposed based on *IDEA '04*, *IDEA '97*, some OSEP Policy Letters and other sources. 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.

The NPRM package includes discussion of proposed changes and the proposed regulations. Selected proposed changes were discussed with participants, including:

Changes would be made to the definition of EI services such as:

- The definition of assistive technology device would now include “The term does not include a medical device that is surgically implanted, including cochlear implants, or the optimization (e.g., mapping) or the maintenance or replacement of that device”;
- The terms “nursing services” and “nutrition services” would be deleted from types of services;
- “Provision of sign language, cued language, and auditory/oral language services, which, as used with respect to infants and toddlers with disabilities who are hearing impaired, includes services to the infant or toddler with a disability and the family to teach sign language, cued language, and auditory/oral language, as well as to provide

-
- oral transliteration services, sign language, and cued language interpreting services,” would be added to the definition of speech-language pathology;
- “Registered dietician” and “vision specialists, including ophthalmologists and optometrists” would be added to the list of providers;
 - “Including teachers of children with hearing impairments (including deafness) and teachers of children with visual impairments (including blindness)” would be added to “special educators”;
 - In the definition of health services, language “during the time that the child is receiving the other” EI services would be changed to “during the time that the child is eligible to receive” other EI services;
 - The definition of “multidisciplinary” would be changed to “multidisciplinary, with respect to evaluation and assessment of a child, an IFSP team, or IFSP development under subpart D of this part, means the involvement of two or more individuals from separate disciplines or professions or one individual who is qualified in more than one discipline or profession.”
 - A change would occur that referral would be required “as soon as possible after the child has been identified” instead of the current 2 working day requirement.
 - States would be permitted to include procedures for screening children referred to determine if the child is “suspected of having a disability,” including procedures that if a screening indicates the child is suspected of having a disability, the child must be evaluated. If the agency believes, based on screening and other available information, that the child is not suspected of having a disability, the lead agency must provide notice to the parent. Further, if the agency determines the child is not suspected of having a disability, but the parent of the child requests an evaluation, the child must be evaluated.
 - New definitions of evaluation and assessment would also be used, including “An evaluation is the method used to review the assessments of the child and the family to determine a child's initial and continuing eligibility under this part, consistent with the definition of infant or toddler with a disability in Sec. 303.21.” Assessment means “reviewing available pertinent records that relate to the child's health status and medical history and conducting personal observation and assessment of the child in order to identify the child's unique strengths and needs, including an identification of the child's level of functioning in each of the following developmental areas: cognitive development; physical development, including vision and hearing; communication development; social or emotional development; and adaptive development based on objective criteria, which must include informed clinical opinion.” Further, “If the child meets the definition of infant or toddler with a disability, an assessment of the service needs of the infant or toddler with a disability and the child's family must include a review of the evaluation (including the assessment of the child and family) and available pertinent records and conducting personal observation and assessment of the infant or toddler with a disability in order to identify the EI services appropriate to meet the child's unique needs in each of the developmental areas identified in paragraph (b)(1) of this section.”
 - Assessment of the family would mean “identification of the family's resources, priorities, and concerns, and the supports and services necessary to enhance the

-
- family's capacity to meet the developmental needs of its infant or toddler with a disability, as determined not just through the use of an assessment tool, but through a voluntary personal interview with the family.”
- New language would be included as follows: “Qualified personnel must use their informed clinical opinion to assess a child's present level of functioning in each of the developmental areas; and the lead agency must ensure that informed clinical opinion may be used by qualified personnel to establish a child's eligibility under this part even when other instruments do not establish eligibility, but informed clinical opinion may not negate the results of assessment instruments used to establish eligibility.”
 - According to the NPRM “The evaluation of the child (including any assessments of the child and family) and assessment of service needs, as well as the initial IFSP meeting, must be completed within 45 days from the date the lead agency obtains parental consent to conduct an evaluation of the child and lead agencies must ensure that parental consent to conduct an evaluation is obtained as soon as possible once a child is referred for evaluation under this part.”
 - No significant changes were proposed to procedures for developing an initial IFSP, reviewing and revising the IFSP, accessibility and convenience of IFSP meetings, accountability, or interim IFSPs.

Changes were proposed to the IFSP including:

- The term “measurable results or measurable outcomes” would be used throughout the IFSP;
- The language “based on peer-reviewed research (to the extent practicable), that are necessary to meet the unique needs of the child and the family to achieve the results or outcomes” would be added to EI services;
- Language on “length” and “duration” would be added;
- A new provision would be added “The determination of the appropriate setting for providing EI services to an infant or toddler with a disability, including any justification for not providing a particular EI service in the natural environment for that child and service, must be: (1) Made by the IFSP team (which includes the parent and other team members); (2) Consistent with the provisions in Sec. 303.13(a)(8), 303.25, and 303.126; and (3) Based on the child's outcomes that are identified by the IFSP team in paragraph (c).”
- Language would be changed to “other services” to read “Identify medical and other services that the child or family needs or is receiving through other sources, but that are neither required nor funded under this part;”
- Requirement to include “funding sources to be used in paying for those services” would be deleted but the requirement to “include a description of the steps the service coordinator or family may take to assist the child and family in securing those other services” would be retained.

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

North Carolina

The presentation highlighted the implementation of Early Intervention in North Carolina, which has resulted in the need for data that are both valid and reliable, as well as the implementations made by the state that have resulted in improved data. In an effort to improve its data, North Carolina has implemented the Comprehensive Exceptional Children Accountability System (CECAS), which is a database that is used by both Part C and Part B. The state has been able to measure compliance indicators as required by OSEP by using the database as well as to report data for the December 1 child count for children ages birth to 1 and birth to 3 and for settings.

North Carolina has implemented various ways of ensuring that data reported to OSEP are valid and reliable. This portion of the presentation highlighted the methods used by the state, including generating reports from the state office that are then sent to the local Children's Developmental Services Agencies (CDSAs) across the state for verification. In addition, a random order selection of records is also generated, and these are then verified by the CDSAs, as well as the state level regional consultants. Ongoing data cleaning activities are required by the state office, and a quality assurance process is used at the local CDSA level. This portion of the presentation concluded with a discussion regarding the challenges that North Carolina continues to face as it improves the collection and verification of valid and reliable data.

Kansas

The data program used in Kansas includes four components: (1) precise data entry at the local level, (2) accurate data collection at the state level, (3) relevant data analysis and reporting, and (4) meaningful data utilization for continuous improvement.

For data input purposes, Kansas uses a web-based, real-time database that collects core data required by the state and OSEP (including child find, referrals, evaluation/eligibility, services, IFSP development, timelines, parent complaints, justifications (valid and noncompliant), cumulative counts, and December 1 counts by network). Local programs can customize their databases for additional purposes to fit their unique needs. Furthermore, the database is accessible to state staff at any time and easy to query for special reports.

Measurement error can create reliable data that are not valid, because reliability does not guarantee validity. In contrast, data cannot be valid without being reliable. Therefore, ensuring validity requires first ensuring reliability. In order to be valid, data must measure that which they are intended to measure. To do so, an agreed-upon measurement system must be in place.

Reliable data produce the same results for a given case when the data measure is applied several different times. Reliability of data is primarily a concern for data that involves a random selection process. Most Kansas data sources are not random, but rather are universal. If the data system is reliable, then universal data collected at the state are also reliable.

In cases where the entire universe of Part C children are not represented, Kansas uses two methods to determine reliability:

- **Test-Retest Method of Determining Reliability:** State staff apply the same measure to the same sample set at more than one point in time. This method is reliable to the extent that results are stable over time, but time and knowledge can affect the results. In terms of relevance to data entry, if a local data manager imputes an error into the database, subsequent views of the file (at a maximum of every 6 months) will identify the error.
- **Alternative Forms Method of Determining Reliability:** Kansas applies different forms of data measures to a sample set of the universe (e.g., program performance from a parent and provider perspective). Entrance/exit parent surveys are disbursed to all parents at initial IFSP and transition; random surveys (constructed with 99% confidence, +/-3% margin for error) measure all questions in the entrance/exit survey, plus other functional questions; and a provider survey asks providers the same questions as the random survey, but from a provider perspective. Combined, these three data sources function to eliminate test effect because they measure the same concepts three different ways.

Kansas measures validity through three methods:

- **Pragmatic Data Validation:** State staff check the results obtained from the use of the database in imputing data against results of other indicators that are known to be valid measures of the data set. This is accomplished through reviews of renewal contracts, semi-annual report data sheets, and entrance/exit parent surveys.
- **Predictive Data Validation:** State staff test the predictive validity of the infant-toddler database by predicting 618 results and cumulative count results in advance of their actual submission. State staff predict December 1 counts and cumulative counts based on child find data and trends identified in semi-annual reports, both locally and statewide.
- **Construct Data Validation:** State staff infer the validity of 618 data from evidence accumulated and compared to 6-month cumulative count data, annual cumulative count data, screenings data, and evaluation data. The goal is identification of levels of deviation in these indicators statewide, as well as in each local program.

For Kansas, the two biggest challenges are local timeliness in submittal of 618 tables, and ensuring that locals maintain an updated database, which is required for random parent surveys to be distributed and random IFSP's to be collected in a scientific process.

Questions:

How does Kansas determine the representativeness of the population for parent surveys?
Kansas uses a member number and a child number in a header, so the state knows where the response is coming from.

Are either Kansas or North Carolina systems forward compatible?

In North Carolina, the child has a unique ID because originally the system was developed for Part B.

In Kansas, there are two separate systems, but they use a common identifier so that transition is seamless.

Who pays for the special data requests in Kansas; for example, if a district requests information for United Way, etc.?

Each local agency can contact the data system provider for an update. The system itself is paid for the state.

In Kansas, if the system is in real time, why do you use quarterly updates? The state looks only at the quarterly data.

Participant List

Alabama

Kathryn Adams
Education Specialist
Alabama Department of Education
50 N. Ripley Street
P.O. Box 302101
Montgomery, AL 36130
Telephone: 334-242-8114
Fax: 334-242-9192
E-mail: kadams@alsde.edu

Amy Blakeney
Data Manager/Child Find Specialist
Alabama Department of Rehabilitation Services
2129 East South Blvd.
Montgomery, AL 36111
Telephone: 334-215-5033
Fax: 334-215-5035
E-mail: Amy.Blakeney@rehab.alabama.gov

Deborah Kyzer
Education Administrator
Alabama Department of Education
225 Fourth Retreat
Eclectic, AL 36024
Telephone: 334-242-8114
Fax: 334-242-9192
E-mail: dkyzer@alsde.edu

Alaska

Linda Borghols
Health Program Manager II
State of Alaska, DHSS/OCS/EI/ILP
3601 C Street, Suite 978
P.O. Box 240249
Anchorage, AK 99524
Telephone: 907-269-3403
Fax: 907-269-3497
E-mail: linda_borghols@health.state.ak.us

Patricia Macklin
Analyst/Programmer
State of Alaska, Department of Education
P.O. Box 110500
Juneau, AK 99811
Telephone: 907-465-3826
Fax: 907-465-8676
E-mail: patricia_macklin@eed.state.ak.us

Sharon Schumacher
SIG Director/Special Projects Manager
State of Alaska/EED/TLS/SPED
801 W. 10th Street, Suite 200
P.O. Box 110500
Juneau, AK 99811
Telephone: 907-465-2824
Fax: 907-465-2806
E-mail: sharon.schumacher@alaska.gov

Ken Smith
Analyst Programmer
Alaska Department of Health and Social
Services
3601 C Street, Suite 978
P.O. Box 240249
Anchorage, AK 99524
Telephone: 907-269-3494
Fax: 907-269-3497
E-mail: kdsmith@health.state.ak.us

Arizona

Molly Madigan
Technical Assistance Specialist
Arizona Program
1371 W. Copper Creek Place
Tucson, AZ 85737
Telephone: 520-498-5185
Fax: 520-498-2483
E-mail: mmadigan@azdes.gov

Arizona (continued)

Forster Okoli
Data Analyst/Program Specialist
Exceptional Students Services
Arizona State Department of Education
1535 W. Jefferson Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007
Telephone: 602-542-5101
Fax: 602-364-0887
E-mail: fokoli@ade.az.gov

Arkansas

Jean Chen
Statistician
IDEA Data & Research/UALR
2801 S. University Avenue
CASE/Ed 209
Little Rock, AR 72204
Telephone: 501-683-7219
Fax: 501-569-8238
E-mail: cychen@ualr.edu

Jody Fields
Director, *IDEA* Data & Research/Data Manager
UALR/ADE
2801 S. University Avenue
CASE/Ed 209
Little Rock, AR 72204
Telephone: 501-683-7219
Fax: 501-569-8238
E-mail: jafiels@ualr.edu

Carol Parker
Data Manager
DHHS, DDS
P.O. Box 1437, Slot N504
Little Rock, AR 72203
Telephone: 501-682-8699
Fax: 501-682-8890
E-mail: carol.l.parker@arkansas.gov

Benjamin Wiley
Education and Training Consultant/LEA
DHHS/DDS
P.O. Box 1437, Slot N504
Little Rock, AR 72203
Telephone: 501-682-8041
Fax: 501-682-8890
E-mail: Ben.Wiley@arkansas.gov

California

Kevin Brown
Section Chief
Department of Developmental Services
1600 9th Street, Room 330
Sacramento, CA 95814
Telephone: 916-654-2767
E-mail: kbrown5@dds.ca.gov

Chris Drouin
Administrator I
Department of Education, Special Education
1430 N Street, Suite 2401
Sacramento, CA 95814
Telephone: 916-445-4578
Fax: 916-327-3730
E-mail: cdrouin@cde.ca.gov

Rick Ingraham
Branch Manager
Department of Developmental Services
1600 9th Street, MS 3-22
Sacramento, CA 95814
Telephone: 916-654-2205
Fax: 916-654-3352
E-mail: ringraha@dds.ca.gov

Andrew Waskiewicz
Research Analyst II
Department of Education, Special Education
1430 N Street, Suite 2401
Sacramento, CA 95814
Telephone: 916-445-4578
Fax: 916-327-3637
E-mail: awaskiew@cde.ca.gov

Colorado

Andrej Birjulin
Senior Consultant, Research & Evaluation
Colorado Department of Education
ESLU - Rm 106
201 E. Colfax Avenue
Denver, CO 80203
Telephone: 303-866-6812
Fax: 303-866-6811
E-mail: birjulin_a@cde.state.co.us

Charm Paulmeno
Director
Center for Exceptional Student Services &
At-Risk Education
Colorado Department of Education
201 E. Colfax Avenue
Denver, CO 80203
Telephone: 303-866-6689
Fax: 303-866-6477
E-mail: paulmeno_c@cde.state.co.us

Christy Scott
Program Quality Coordinator/Data Manager
CDHS/Division for Developmental Disabilities
Early Childhood Connections
3824 W. Princeton Circle
Denver, CO 80236
Telephone: 303-866-7270
Fax: 303-866-7680
E-mail: christy.scott@state.co.us

Candace Vargas
Principal Consultant
Colorado Department of Education
Special Education Finance and Data
201 E. Colfax Avenue, #202
Denver, CO 80203
Telephone: 303-866-6691
Fax: 303-866-6477
E-mail: vargas_c@cde.state.co.us

Connecticut

Norman Booth
Tech Analyst
State of Connecticut DMR
Connecticut Birth to Three System
460 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, CT 06106
Telephone: 860-418-6054
Fax: 860-418-6003
E-mail: norman.booth@po.state.ct.us

Daniel Cardoso
Education Consultant
Connecticut State Department of Education
165 Capitol Avenue, Room 350
P.O. Box 2219
Hartford, CT 06145
Telephone: 860-713-6953
Fax: 860-713-7033
E-mail: diane.murphy@ct.gov

Linda Goodman
Part C Coordinator
Connecticut Birth to Three System
460 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, CT 06106
Telephone: 860-418-6147
Fax: 860-418-6003
E-mail: linda.goodman@po.state.ct.us

Amarildo Monsalve
Part B Data Manager: Table 5 Discipline
CT/CSDE
165 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, CT 06106
Telephone: 860-713-6877
Fax: 860-713-7033
E-mail: amarildo.monsalve@ct.gov

Diane Murphy
Education Consultant
Connecticut Department of Education
165 Capitol Avenue, Room 350
P.O. Box 2219
Hartford, CT 06145
Telephone: 860-713-6891
Fax: 860-713-7033
E-mail: Diane.Murphy@ct.gov

Connecticut (continued)

Alice Ridgway
Quality Assurance Manager
Connecticut Birth to Three System
195 Alvord Park Road
Torrington, CT 06778
Telephone: 860-496-3073
Fax: 860-496-3087
E-mail: alice.ridgway@po.state.ct.us

Delaware

Susan Campbell
Assistant Part C Coordinator
Birth to Three Early Intervention System
1901 N. Dupont Highway, Main Building
New Castle, DE 19720
Telephone: 302-255-9137
Fax: 302-255-4407
E-mail: susan.campbell@state.de.us

Lisa Marcum
Data Manager
Delaware Department of Education
401 Federal Street, Suite 2
Dover, DE 19901
Telephone: 302-735-4217
Fax: 302-739-2388
E-mail: lmarcum@doe.k12.de.us

Florida

Karen Denbroeder
Section Administrator
Florida Department of Education
325 W. Gaines Street, Suite 614
Tallahassee, FL 32399
Telephone: 850-245-0475
Fax: 850-245-0953
E-mail: karen.denbroeder@fldoe.org

Sally Golden-McCord
Service Delivery Unit Director
Department of Health
4052 Bald Cypress Way, Bin A06
Tallahassee, FL 32399
Telephone: 850-245-4200
Fax: 850-921-8138
E-mail: Sally_Golden-McCord@doh.state.fl.us

Janice Kane
Bureau Chief
Department of Health
4052 Bald Cypress Way, Bin A06
Tallahassee, FL 32399
Telephone: 850-245-4200
Fax: 850-921-8138
E-mail: Janice_Kane@doh.state.fl.us

Kenneth McCain
Data Manager
Department of Health
4052 Bald Cypress Way, Bin A06
Tallahassee, FL 32399
Telephone: 850-245-4200
Fax: 850-921-8138
E-mail: Kenneth_McCain@doh.state.fl.us

Georgia

Bonnie Dye
Part B Data Manager
Georgia Department of Education
1870 Twin Towers East
Atlanta, GA 30334
Telephone: 404-463-1713
Fax: 404-651-6457
E-mail: bodye@doe.k12.ga.us

Bob Herrin
Program Consultant
Division of Public Health
2 Peachtree Street, NW, Room 11-212
Atlanta, GA 30303
Telephone: 404-657-2742
Fax: 404-657-2763
E-mail: bherrin@dhr.state.ga.us

Zelphine Smith-Dixon
Education Program Specialist
Georgia Department of Education
1870 Twin Towers East
Atlanta, GA 30334
Telephone: 404-463-0411
Fax: 404-651-6457
E-mail: zsmith@doe.k12.ga.us

Hawaii

Adam Baron
Part C Data Manager
Hawaii Early Intervention Section
1350 South King Street, Suite 200
Honolulu, HI 96814
Telephone: 808-594-0012
Fax: 808-594-0015
E-mail: adam.baron@doh.hawaii.gov

Harvey Ouchi
Educational Specialist
Hawaii Department of Education
637 18th Avenue, Room C206
Honolulu, HI 96816
Telephone: 808-733-4837
Fax: 808-733-4475
E-mail: harvey_ouchi@notes.k12.hi.us

Idaho

Charles Peterson
Sr. Research Analyst
Idaho Department of Health and Welfare
450 W. State Street, 5th Floor
Boise, ID 84720
Telephone: 208-334-5517
Fax: 208-332-7330
E-mail: peterso3@dhw.idaho.gov

Rene Rohrer
Quality Assurance Coordinator
Idaho State Department of Education
650 W. State Street
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720
Telephone: 208-332-6869
Fax: 208-334-4664
E-mail: lrrohrer@sde.idaho.gov

Lester Wyer
Funding & Accountability Coordinator
Idaho State Department of Education
650 W. State Street
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720
Telephone: 208-332-6916
Fax: 208-334-4664
E-mail: LDWyer@sde.idaho.gov

Illinois

Scott Beever
Principal Consultant
Illinois State Board of Education
100 N. 1st Street
Springfield, IL 62777
Telephone: 217-782-5589
Fax: 217-782-0372
E-mail: sbeever@isbe.net

Brent Engelman
Data Systems Programmer
Illinois State Board of Education
100 N. 1st Street
Springfield, IL 62777
Telephone: 217-558-3666
Fax: 217-524-2300
E-mail: bengelma@isbe.net

Nyle Robinson
Statewide Data Manager
Illinois Department of Human Services
Div. of Comm. Health & Prevention
535 W. Jefferson
Springfield, IL 62702
Telephone: 217-524-6615
Fax: 217-524-2491
E-mail: nyle.robinson@illinois.gov

Indiana

Tracie Curtis
Director
The CODA Project
8550 Woodfield Crossing Blvd.
Indianapolis, IN 46240
Telephone: 317-205-3381
Fax: 317-205-3384
E-mail: tcurtis@msdwt.k12.in.us

Dawn Downer
Part C Coordinator
FSSA
402 W. Washington Street, W386
Indianapolis, IN 46204
Telephone: 317-233-9229
Fax: 317-233-6093
E-mail: dawn.downer@fssa.in.gov

Indiana (continued)

Cathy Robinson
Human Services Consultant
FSSA
402 W. Washington Street, W386
Indianapolis, IN 46204
Telephone: 317-233-6094
Fax: 317-233-6093
E-mail: cathy.robinson@fssa.in.gov

Iowa

Shelley Ackermann
Consultant
Iowa Department of Education
Grimes State Office Bldg.
400 E. 14th Street
Des Moines, IA 50319
Telephone: 515-281-8634
Fax: 515-242-6019
E-mail: Shelley.Ackermann@iowa.gov

John Lee
Consultant
Iowa Department of Education
Grimes State Office Bldg.
400 E. 14th Street
Des Moines, IA 50319
Telephone: 515-281-5733
Fax: 515-242-6019
E-mail: John.Lee@iowa.gov

Mary Sullivan
Consultant
Iowa Department of Education
Grimes State Office Bldg.
400 E. Grand Avenue
Des Moines, IA 50319
Telephone: 515-281-5471
Fax: 515-242-6019
E-mail: Mary.Sullivan@iowa.gov

Michelle Tressel
IMS Project Manager
Grant Wood AEA
4401 Sixth Street, SW
Cedar Rapids, IA 52404
Telephone: 319-399-6868
Fax: 319-399-6457
E-mail: mtressel@aea10.k12.ia.us

Amy Williamson
Consultant
Iowa Department of Education
Grimes State Office Bldg.
400 E. 14th Street
Des Moines, IA 50319
Telephone: 515-281-6273
Fax: 515-242-6019
E-mail: Amy.Williamson@iowa.gov

Kansas

Colleen Riley
State Director Special Education
Kansas State Department of Education
120 SE 10th Avenue
Topeka, KS 66612
Telephone: 785-291-3097
Fax: 785-296-6715
E-mail: criley@ksde.org

Mason Vosburgh
KSDE Special Education Data Manager
Kansas Department of Education
120 SE 10th Avenue
Topeka, KS 66612
Telephone: 785-296-4945
Fax: 785-296-1413
E-mail: mvosburgh@ksde.org

Ryan Weir
Program Analyst
Kansas Department of Health and Environment
1000 SW Jackson, Suite 220
Topeka, KS 66612
Telephone: 785-296-6134
Fax: 785-296-8396
E-mail: rweir@kdhe.state.ks.us

Kentucky

Brenda Curry-White
Data Manager
University of Louisville
426 W. Bloom Street
Louisville, KY 40242
Telephone: 502-852-8135
Fax: 502-852-1249
E-mail: bwhite@louisville.edu

Betsy Kennedy
Financial Administrator
Kentucky Department for Public Health
275 E. Main St., HS2W-C
Frankfort, KY 40621
Telephone: 502-564-3756
Fax: 502-564-8389
E-mail: betsy.kennedy@ky.gov

Sammie Lambert
Attorney
Kentucky Department of Education
Capital Tower Plaza, 8th Floor
Frankfort, KY 40601
Telephone: 502-564-4970
Fax: 502-564-6721
E-mail: sammie.lambert@education.ky.gov

Chris Thacker
Systems Consultant IT
Kentucky Department of Education
500 Mero Street
816 CPT
Frankfort, KY 40601
Telephone: 502-564-4970
Fax: 502-564-4970
E-mail: chris.thacker@education.ky.gov

Louisiana

Priscilla Baker
Education Information Consultant
Louisiana Department of Education
P.O. Box 96064
5th Floor
Baton Rouge, LA 70804
Telephone: 225-342-6215
Fax: 225-342-1912
E-mail: Priscilla.Baker@LA.gov

Sandra "Sam" Beech
Parent
The Arc Caddo Bossier
351 Jordan Street
Shreveport, LA 71101
Telephone: 318-221-8392, ext. 254
Fax: 318-221-4262
E-mail: sbeech@thearccaddobossier.org

Jacqueline Bottoms
Coordinator of Data Management
East Baton Rouge Parish School System
6550 Seven Oaks
Baton Rouge, LA 70806
Telephone: 225-929-8740
Fax: 225-929-8790
E-mail: jbottoms2@ebrpss.k12.la.us

Ellen Spears
Education Consultant
Louisiana Department of Education
P.O. Box 94064
Baton Rouge, LA 70804
Telephone: 225-342-3661
Fax: 225-342-3281
E-mail: ellen.dunlap@la.gov

Wanda Trahan
Education Research Analyst
Louisiana Department of Education
P.O. Box 94064
Baton Rouge, LA 70804
Telephone: 225-342-3513
Fax: 225-219-7370
E-mail: Wanda.Trahan@la.gov

Maine

Bruce Armstrong
Data Manager
Child Development Services
146 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
Telephone: 207-624-6660
Fax: 207-624-6661
E-mail: bruce.armstrong@maine.gov

Maine (continued)

Dana Duncan
Statistician/Data Manager
Maine Department of Education
23 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
Telephone: 207-624-6615
Fax: 207-624-6651
E-mail: dana.duncan@maine.gov

Pamela Rosen
Director of Special Projects
Maine Department of Education
23 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
Telephone: 207-624-6648
Fax: 207-624-6615
E-mail: pam.rosen@maine.gov

George Smith
Data Analyst
Maine Department of Education
186 Holmes Road
Winthrop, ME 04364
Telephone: 207-377-3605
Fax: 207-624-6651
E-mail: smithphd@pivot.net

Maryland

Ned Featherston
Technology System Analyst
Maryland State Department of Education
200 W. Baltimore Street, 9th Floor
Baltimore, MD 21201
Telephone: 410-767-0252
Fax: 410-333-8165
E-mail: nfeatherston@msde.state.md.us

Sally Slade
Part B Data Manager
Maryland State Department of Education
200 W. Baltimore Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
Telephone: 410-767-0063
Fax: 410-333-0298
E-mail: sslade@msde.state.md.us

Thomas Stengel
Section Chief
Maryland State Department of Education
Maryland Infants & Toddlers Program
200 W. Baltimore Street, 9th floor
Baltimore, MD 21201
Telephone: 410-767-0261
Fax: 410-333-8165
E-mail: tstengel2@msde.state.md.us

Dan Szczepaniak
Part C Data Manager
Maryland State Department of Education
200 W. Baltimore Street, 9th Floor
Baltimore, MD 21201
Telephone: 410-767-0261
Fax: 410-333-8165
E-mail: dszczepa@msde.state.md.us

Massachusetts

Vivian Vidal
Part B Data Manager
Massachusetts Department of Education
350 Main Street
Data Analysis & Reporting (3rd Floor)
Malden, MA 02148
Telephone: 781-338-6862
Fax: 781-338-6850
E-mail: vvidal@doe.mass.edu

Craig Weller
Research Analyst III
Massachusetts Department of Education
350 Main Street
Malden, MA 02148
Telephone: 781-338-6863
Fax: 781-338-6850
E-mail: cweller@doe.mass.edu

Michigan

Allan Knapp
Analyst
Interagency Information Systems
1644 Sunnyside
Lansing, MI 48910
Telephone: 517-485-8181
Fax: 517-485-8182
E-mail: akzoom@aol.com

Michigan (continued)

Fran Loose
Supervisor, Program Improvement
Michigan Department of Education
Office of Special Education and Early
Intervention Services
P.O. Box 30008
Lansing, MI 48909
Telephone: 517-241-4414
Fax: 517-373-7504
E-mail: LooseF@michigan.gov

Mary Schrader
Data Project Manager
Michigan Department of Education
51678 Fuller Road
Mendon, MI 49072
Telephone: 269-496-5885
Fax: 269-496-5885
E-mail: mschrader@mi-iis.com

Darren Warner
Education Research Consultant
Michigan Department of Education
608 W. Allegan
P.O. Box 30008
Lansing, MI 48909
Telephone: 517-241-0786
Fax: 517-373-7504
E-mail: warnerd@michigan.gov

Minnesota

Lisa Backer
ECSE Specialist
Minnesota Department of Education
1500 Highway 36 West
Roseville, MN 55124
Telephone: 651-329-5978
Fax: 651-582-8427
E-mail: lisa.backer@state.mn.us

Nancy Larson
Data Manager
Minnesota Department of Education
1500 Highway 36 West
Roseville, MN 55113
Telephone: 651-582-8596
Fax: 651-582-8729
E-mail: nancy.larson@state.mn.us

Marty Smith
Part C Coordinator
Minnesota Department of Education
1500 W. Highway 36
Roseville, MN 55113
Telephone: 651-582-8883
Fax: 651-582-8729
E-mail: marty.smith@state.mn.us

Mississippi

Ellen Davis Burnham
Lead Business Systems Analyst
Mississippi Department of Education
359 N. West Street
P.O. Box 771, Suite 335
Jackson, MS 39205
Telephone: 601-359-3498
Fax: 601-359-2198
E-mail: eburnham@mde.k12.ms.us

John Newman
Data Manager
Mississippi Department of Health
570 East Woodrow Wilson, A-107
Jackson, MS 39216
Telephone: 601-576-7771
Fax: 601-576-7540
E-mail: john.newman@msdh.state.ms.us

Missouri

Bill Connelly
Part C Data Manager
Missouri Department of Elementary and
Secondary Education
P.O. Box 480
Jefferson City, MO 65102
Telephone: 573-526-4995
Fax: 573-526-5946
E-mail: Bill.Connelly@dese.mo.gov

Mary Corey
Director
Data Coordination
205 Jefferson Street, P.O. Box 480
Jefferson City, MO 65102
Telephone: 573-751-8165
Fax: 573-526-5946
E-mail: mary.corey@dese.mo.gov

Missouri (continued)

Jackie McKim
Planner
Missouri Division of Special Education
P.O. Box 284
Holts Summit, MO 65043
Telephone: 573-751-0993
Fax: 573-526-5946
E-mail: jackie.mckim@dese.mo.gov

Montana

Jackie Emerson
Part C Data Manager
Developmental Disabilities Program
111 Sanders, Room 306
P.O. Box 4210
Helena, MT 59604
Telephone: 406-444-4088
Fax: 406-444-0230
E-mail: jemerson@mt.gov

Anne Rainey
Part B Data and Accountability Manager
Office of Public Instruction
P.O. Box 202501
1300 11th Avenue
Helena, MT 59620
Telephone: 406-444-5661
Fax: 406-444-3924
E-mail: arainey@mt.gov

Floy Scott
Research Analyst
Office of Public Instruction
4310 21st Avenue
Missoula, MT 59803
Telephone: 406-243-2892
Fax: 406-243-2349
E-mail: fscott@mt.gov

Rebecca Wiegand
SPED Computer Analysis
Office of Public Instruction
1227 11th Avenue
Helena, MT 59601
Telephone: 406-444-9870
Fax: 406-444-3680
E-mail: rwiegand@mt.gov

Nebraska

Sara Farrand
Data Manager
Nebraska Department of Education
301 Centennial Mall South
P.O. Box 94987
Lincoln, NE 68509
Telephone: 402-471-4305
Fax: 402-471-5022
E-mail: sara.farrand@nde.ne.gov

Nevada

Vicki Huffman
Consultant
Nevada Department of Education
5416 67th Street, NE
Marysville, WA 98270
Telephone: 360-658-1344
Fax: 866-352-9607
E-mail: Vickihuffman@Verizon.Net

Jane Splean
Special Education Consultant
Nevada Department of Education
700 E. Fifth Street, Suite 113
Carson City, NV 89701
Telephone: 775-687-9148
Fax: 775-687-9123
E-mail: jsplean@doe.nv.gov

Melanie Whitney
Program Officer/Data Manager
Bureau of Early Intervention Services
3427 Goni Road, Suite 108
Carson City, NV 89706
Telephone: 775-684-3488
Fax: 775-684-3486
E-mail: mwhitney@health.nv.gov

New Hampshire

Jane Iarussi
Program Planner / Review
BDS
105 Pleasant Street
Concord, NH 03301
Telephone: 603-271-5117
Fax: 603-271-5166
E-mail: jiarussi@dhhs.state.nh.us

Jan Skoby
Program Specialist
DHHS/BDS
105 Pleasant Street
Concord, NH 03301
Telephone: 603-271-5036
Fax: 603-271-5166
E-mail: jan.t.skoby@dhhs.state.nh.us

Ralph Tilton
Program Specialist IV
New Hampshire State Department of Education
Bureau of Special Education
101 Pleasant Street
Concord, NH 03301
Telephone: 603-271-3839
Fax: 603-271-1099
E-mail: rtilton@ed.state.nh.us

New Jersey

Oliver Giller
CMO Coordinator (Data Manager)
Department of Health & Senior Services
NJEIS
P.O. Box 364
Trenton, NJ 08625
Telephone: 609-777-7734
Fax: 609-292-0296
E-mail: oliver.giller@doh.state.nj.us

Terry Harrison
Part C Coordinator
Department of Health & Senior Services
NJEIS
P.O. Box 364
Trenton, NJ 08625
Telephone: 609-777-7734
Fax: 609-292-0296
E-mail: terry.harrison@doh.state.nj.us

Ajaya Katta
Data Analyst
New Jersey Department of Education
P.O. Box 500
Trenton, NJ 08625
Telephone: 609-439-1351
Fax: 609-984-8422
E-mail: ajaya.kumari-katta@doe.state.nj.us

Andrew Samson
Data Manager
New Jersey Office of Special Education
Programs
New Jersey Department of Education
P.O. Box 500
Trenton, NJ 08625
Telephone: 609-633-6972
Fax: 609-984-8422
E-mail: Andrew.Samson@doe.state.nj.us

New Mexico

Albert Ericson
Part C Data Manager
New Mexico Department of Health/DDSD/FIT
1190 Saint Francis Drive
P.O. Box 26110
Santa Fe, NM 87502
Telephone: 505-827-1711
Fax: 505-827-2455
E-mail: albert.ericson@state.nm.us

Adolfo Vasquez
Data and Fiscal Program Manager
New Mexico Public Education Department
120 S. Federal Place, Room 206
Santa Fe, NM 87501
Telephone: 505-827-3599
Fax: 505-954-0001
E-mail: adolfo.vasquez@state.nm.us

New York

Inderjit (Inni) Barone
Manager
New York State Education Department
Office of VESID
99 Washington Avenue
Albany, NY 12234
Telephone: 518-486-4678
Fax: 518-408-3363
E-mail: ibarone@mail.nysed.gov

Denise Berletic
Unit Manager-Program Development & Data
Analysis
NYSDOH - Bureau of Early Intervention
Empire State Plaza
Corning Tower, Room 287
Albany, NY 12237
Telephone: 518-473-7016
Fax: 518-486-1090
E-mail: dab08@health.state.ny.us

Mycroft Sowizral
Associate Biostatistician
NYSDOH - Bureau of Early Intervention
Empire State Plaza
Corning Tower, Room 287
Albany, NY 12237
Telephone: 518-473-7016
E-mail: mjs15@health.state.ny.us

North Carolina

Malcolm Alexander
IT Project Manager
North Carolina Department of Public
Instruction
301 N. Wilmington Street
3rd Floor South # 3224A
Raleigh, NC 27699
Telephone: 919-807-3299
Fax: 919-807-3998
E-mail: aharrison@dpi.state.nc.us

Brenda Gilchrest
State Consultant
North Carolina Department of Public
Instruction
301 N. Wilmington Street
6th Floor N, # 6017
Raleigh, NC 27699
Telephone: 919-807-3299
Fax: 919-807-3998
E-mail: aharrison@dpi.state.nc.us

Bobbie Grammer
State Consultant
North Carolina Department of Public
Instruction
6356 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-6356
Telephone: 919-807-3980
Fax: 919-807-3998
E-mail: bgrammer@dpi.state.nc.us

Ashley Herring
Business Analyst
North Carolina Department of Public
Instruction
301 N. Wilmington Street
3rd Floor South # 3224A
Raleigh, NC 27699
Telephone: 919-807-3299
Fax: 919-807-3998
E-mail: aharrison@dpi.state.nc.us

Nancy Johnson
State Consultant
North Carolina Department of Public
Instruction/UNC-Charlotte
9201 University City Blvd.
College of Education, Room 152
Charlotte, NC 28223
Telephone: 704-687-8824
Fax: 704-687-6484
E-mail: ntjohnso@uncc.edu

North Carolina (continued)

Terry McCauley
Data Manager
DHHS - Early Intervention Branch
1916 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699
Telephone: 919-707-5529
Fax: 919-870-4834
E-mail: Terry.McCauley@ncmail.net

Tony Mitchell
State Consultant
North Carolina Department of Public
Instruction
301 N. Wilmington Street
6th Floor North, # 6024
Raleigh, NC 27699
Telephone: 919-807-3299
Fax: 919-807-3998
E-mail: aharrison@dpi.state.nc.us

Quentin Parker
IT Manager
North Carolina Department of Public
Instruction
301 N. Wilmington Street
3rd Floor South # 3224A
Raleigh, NC 27699
Telephone: 919-807-3299
Fax: 919-807-3998
E-mail: aharrison@dpi.state.nc.us

Ira Wolfe
State Consultant
North Carolina Department of Public
Instruction
6356 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-6356
Telephone: 919-807-3976
Fax: 919-807-3998
E-mail: iwolfe@dpi.state.nc.us

North Dakota

Guy McDonald
Special Education Regional Coordinator
North Dakota Department of Public Instruction
600 E. Blvd. Avenue, Dept. 201
Bismarck, ND 58505
Telephone: 701-328-2277
Fax: 701-328-4149
E-mail: dgmcdonald@nd.gov

Ohio

Sondra Crayton
Assistant Chief
Ohio Department of Health
246 N. High Street
Columbus, OH 43125
Telephone: 614-728-9183
Fax: 614-728-9163
E-mail: sondra.crayton@odh.ohio.gov

Thomas Lather
Associate Director
Ohio Department of Education
25 S. Spring Street
Columbus, OH 43215
Telephone: 614-466-2650
Fax: 614-387-0967
E-mail: natuscat@sbcglobal.net

Anne Skaggs
Data Administration Manager
Ohio Department of Education
25 S. Front Street
Columbus, OH 43209
Telephone: 614-728-7850
Fax: 614-752-1429
E-mail: anne.skaggs@ode.state.oh.us

Jonathan Thomas
Researcher
Ohio Department of Health
246 N. High Street
Columbus, OH 43215
Telephone: 614-728-9622
Fax: 614-728-9163
E-mail: Jonathan.Thomas@odh.ohio.gov

Ohio (continued)

Kara Waldron
Researcher
Ohio Department of Education
25 S. Front Street
2nd Floor, Mail Stop 202
Columbus, OH 43215
Telephone: 614-728-1105
Fax: 614-752-1429
E-mail: kara.waldron@ode.state.oh.us

Oklahoma

Cheryl Bruner
I.S. Application Specialist II
Oklahoma State Department of Education
2500 N. Lincoln Blvd., Suite B-17
Oklahoma City, OK 73105
Telephone: 405-522-3306
Fax: 405-522-4264
E-mail: cheryl_bruner@sde.state.ok.us

Fran Ferrari
Programs Manager
Oklahoma Commission on Children & Youth
500 N. Broadway
Oklahoma City, OK 73102
Telephone: 405-606-4911
Fax: 405-528-0455
E-mail: fferrari@okkids.org

Kim Nickerson
Project Coordinator
Oklahoma State Department of Education
2500 North Lincoln Blvd., Room 412
Oklahoma City, OK 73105
Telephone: 405-521-4869
Fax: 405-522-1590
E-mail: Kim_Nickerson@sde.state.ok.us

Cynthia Valenzuela
Administrator-Data Manager
Oklahoma State Department of Education
2500 North Lincoln Blvd.
Oklahoma City, OK 73105
Telephone: 405-521-4872
Fax: 405-522-1590
E-mail:
cynthia_bernardi-valenzuela@sde.state.ok.us

Oregon

Marina Merrill
Education Specialist
Oregon Department of Education (ODE)
255 Capitol Street, NE
Salem, OR 97310
Telephone: 503-947-5612
Fax: 503-378-5156
E-mail: Marina.Merrill@ode.state.or.us

Arlene Russell
Reporting and Evaluation Coordinator
Western Regional Resource Center
1268 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97402
Telephone: 541-346-0349
Fax: 541-346-0322
E-mail: arbender@uoregon.edu

Steve Smith
IDEA Data Manager
Oregon Department of Education
255 Capitol Street, NE
Salem, OR 97310
Telephone: 503-947-5711
Fax: 503-378-5156
E-mail: steve.w.smith@state.or.us

Ty Zeller
Special Education Consultant
Eugene School District
200 N. Monroe
Eugene, OR 97402
Telephone: 541-687-3151
Fax: 541-687-3688
E-mail: zeller@4j.lane.edu

Pennsylvania

John Cica
Consultant
John T. Cica Consultant Services
6100 Bryant Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15206
Telephone: 412-661-3981
Fax: 412-661-9852
E-mail: c-jcica@state.pa.us

Pennsylvania (continued)

Sue Copella
Director
Pennsylvania State Data Center
Penn State Harrisburg
777 W. Harrisburg Pike
Middletown, PA 17057
Telephone: 717-948-6427
Fax: 717-948-6754
E-mail: sdc3@psu.edu

Frank Miller, Jr.
Division Chief
Office of Child Development and Early Learning
PA Department of Public Welfare
Bureau of Early Intervention Services
333 Market Street, 6th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333
Telephone: 717-346-0374
Fax: 717-772-0012
E-mail: fmiller@state.pa.us

Jodi Rissinger
Data Manager
Pennsylvania Department of Education
333 Market Street, 7th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17126
Telephone: 717-783-6911
Fax: 717-783-6139
E-mail: JRissinger@state.pa.us

Victor Rodriguez-Diaz
Educational Consultant
Pennsylvania Department of Education
6340 Flank Drive, Suite 600
Harrisburg, PA 17112
Telephone: 717-541-4960
Fax: 717-541-4968
E-mail: vrodriguez@pattan.net

Puerto Rico

Irving Feliciano
Director Aux
Department of Education
P.O. Box 190759
San Juan, PR 00919
Telephone: 787-556-1899
Fax: 787-753-0015
E-mail: irvingfeliciano@gmail.com

Sergio Maldonado
IT-Data Manager
Department of Health
P.O. Box 70184
San Juan, PR 00936
Telephone: 787-274-5757
Fax: 787-274-3301
E-mail: smaldonado@salud.gov.pr

Salvador Noguera
Data Manager
Department of Education
Special Education
P.O. Box 190759
San Juan, PR 00919
Telephone: 787-773-8902
Fax: 787-753-0015
E-mail: noguera_s@de.gobierno.pr

Lourdes Rodriguez
Executive Director
Puerto Rico Department of Education
P.O. Box 190759
San Juan, PR 00919
Telephone: 787-753-2208
Fax: 787-751-2874
E-mail: rodriguez_lo@de.gobierno.pr

Rhode Island

Charlene Gilman
Data Manager
Rhode Island Department of Education-Special Pops
Shepard Building
255 Westminster Street
Providence, RI 02903
Telephone: 401-222-8327
Fax: 401-222-6030
E-mail: Charlene.Gilman@ride.ri.gov

Christine Robin
Data Manager
State of Rhode Island Dept. of Human Services
Center for Child and Family Health
600 New London Avenue
Cranston, RI 02920
Telephone: 401-462-6355
Fax: 401-462-6353
E-mail: crobin@dhs.ri.gov

South Carolina

Rebecca Davis
Education Associate
South Carolina Department of Education
1429 Senate Street
Rutledge Bldg. 808 I
Columbia, SC 29201
Telephone: 803-734-8342
Fax: 803-734-4824
E-mail: bcdavis@ed.sc.gov

Cedric Harrison
South Carolina Account Manager
Global Education Technologies Inc.
112 Opage Way
Lexington, SC 29073
Telephone: 803-218-8588
Fax: 803-223-9000
E-mail: cedrich@excent.com

Lori James
Education Associate
South Carolina Department of Education
1429 Senate Street
Rutledge Bldg. 808 I
Columbia, SC 29201
Telephone: 803-734-8221
Fax: 803-734-4824
E-mail: lajames@ed.sc.gov

Cheryl Waller
Acting State Part C Coordinator
South Carolina Dept Health & Environ Control
1751 Calhoun Street
Columbia, SC 29201
Telephone: 803-898-0789
Fax: 803-898-0613
E-mail: wallercj@dhec.sc.gov

South Dakota

Melissa Flor
Part B Program Specialist
South Dakota Department of Education
700 Governor's Drive
Pierre, SD 57501
Telephone: 605-773-3678
Fax: 605-773-3782
E-mail: melissa.flor@state.sd.us

Steve Livermont
Policy/Data Analyst
South Dakota Department of Education
700 Governor's Drive
Pierre, SD 57501
Telephone: 605-773-6603
Fax: 605-773-6139
E-mail: steve.livermont@state.sd.us

Tennessee

Sandy Countermine
Coordinator
Tennessee's Early Intervention System
Box 70434
East Tennessee State University
Johnson City, TN 37614
Telephone: 423-439-7557
Fax: 423-439-7561
E-mail: counterm@etsu.edu

Catherine Goodwin
Part C Monitoring Coordinator
Tennessee State Department of Education
7th Floor, Andrew Johnson Tower
710 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, TN 37243
Telephone: 615-253-4521
Fax: 615-532-9412
E-mail: catherine.goodwin@state.tn.us

Jamie Kilpatrick
Director of Early Childhood Services
Tennessee Department of Education
7th Floor, Andrew Johnson Tower
710 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, TN 37243
Telephone: 615-741-3537
Fax: 615-532-9412
E-mail: jamie.kilpatrick@state.tn.us

Terry Long
Director of Data Services
Tennessee Dept. of Education
Division of Special Education
710 James Robertson Parkway, AJT, 7th Floor
Nashville, TN 37243
Telephone: 615-532-3262
Fax: 615-532-9412
E-mail: terry.long@state.tn.us

Tennessee (continued)

Roy Su
Consultant
Tennessee Department of Education
9505 Knollcrest Blvd.
Alpharetta, GA 30022
Telephone: 678-549-9899
Fax: 317-324-0013
E-mail: roy.su@yahasoftware.com

Texas

David Carrales
Program Specialist
Texas Education Agency
1701 N. Congress Avenue
Austin, TX 78701
Telephone: 512-463-9414
Fax: 512-463-9560
E-mail: david.carrales@tea.state.tx.us

Nelson Loconi
Systems Analyst
Texas Education Agency
1701 N. Congress Avenue
Austin, TX 78701
Telephone: 512-463-9282
Fax: 512-463-9560
E-mail: nelson.loconi@tea.state.tx.us

Robin Nelson
Director, Program Evaluation and Analysis
DARS- Early Childhood Intervention
MC 3029
4900 N. Lamar Blvd.
Austin, TX 78751
Telephone: 512-424-6807
Fax: 512-424-6834
E-mail: Robin.Nelson@dars.state.tx.us

Utah

Lynne MacLeod
Research Analyst
Utah Baby Watch Early Intervention
UDOH, 44 N. Medical Drive
P.O. Box 144720
Salt Lake City, UT 84144
Telephone: 801-584-8259
Fax: 801-584-8496
E-mail: lmacleod@utah.gov

Calvin Newbold
Special Education Data Manager
Utah State Office of Education
250 East 500 South
P.O. Box 144200
Salt Lake City, UT 84114
Telephone: 801-538-7724
Fax: 801-538-7991
E-mail: cal.newbold@schools.utah.gov

Janet Wade
Data Manager
Baby Watch Early Intervention - Utah
44 North Medical Drive
P.O. Box 144720
Salt Lake City, UT 84114
Telephone: 801-584-8201
Fax: 801-584-8496
E-mail: janetwade@utah.gov

Vermont

Michael Bailey
Child Count Coordinator / Statistician
Vermont Department of Education
120 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05620
Telephone: 802-828-3132
Fax: 802-828-0573
E-mail: mike.bailey@state.vt.us

Vermont (continued)

Kathy Boulanger
Part C Data Manager
Vermont Agency of Human Services
DCF - 2 North
103 South Main Street
Waterbury, VT 05671
Telephone: 802-241-3602
Fax: 802-241-1220
E-mail: kathy.boulanger@ahs.state.vt.us

Dave Phillips
Business Analyst
Department of Education
120 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05620
Telephone: 802-828-5936
Fax: 802-828-0573
E-mail: david.phillips@state.vt.us

Peg Boyle Single
Database Consultant
University of Vermont
Mann Hall, Room 204b
208 Colchester Avenue
Burlington, VT 05405
Telephone: 802-656-8533
E-mail: PegBoyle.Single@uvm.edu

Virginia

David Mills
Data Manager
DMHMRSAS
P.O. Box 1797
Richmond, VA 23218
Telephone: 804-371-6593
Fax: 804-371-7959
E-mail: david.mills@co.dmhmrzas.virginia.gov

Paul Raskopf
Director, Finance and Data Services
Office of Special Education and Student
Virginia Department of Education
P.O. Box 2120
Richmond, VA 23218
Telephone: 804-225-2080
Fax: 804-371-8796
E-mail: paul.raskopf@doe.virginia.gov

Anu Upadhyaya
Special Education Data Specialist
Virginia Department of Education
101 North 14th Street
P.O. Box 2120
Richmond, VA 23218
Telephone: 804-786-9022
Fax: 804-371-8796
E-mail: anu.upadhyaya@doe.virginia.gov

Washington

Sandy Grummick
Program Specialist
OSPI
P.O. Box 47200
Olympia, WA 98504
Telephone: 360-725-6075
Fax: 360-586-0247
E-mail: sandy.grummick@k12.wa.us

Sandy Loerch Morris
Washington Part C Coordinator
(Project Director)
Infant Toddler Early Intervention
Program, DSHS
P.O. Box 45201
Olympia, WA 98504
Telephone: 360-725-3516
Fax: 360-725-3533
E-mail: Loercsk@dshs.wa.gov

Richard Sanders
ITEIP Data Manager
DSHS/ITEIP
P.O. Box 45201
Olympia, WA 98504
Telephone: 360-725-3501
Fax: 360-725-3523
E-mail: SandeRL@dshs.wa.gov

Karen Walker
Assistant Program Director
DSHS/ITEIP Services
P.O. Box 45201
Olympia, WA 98504
Telephone: 360-725-3503
Fax: 360-725-3523
E-mail: WalkeKJ@dshs.wa.gov

West Virginia

Sharon Canterberry
Data Analyst/CQI Coordinator
West Virginia Birth to Three Program
350 Capitol Street, Room 427
Charleston, WV 25526
Telephone: 304-558-5388
Fax: 304-558-2183
E-mail: sharoncanterberry@wvdhhr.org

Sandra McQuain
Coordinator
West Virginia Department of Education
Bldg. 6, Room 304
1900 Kanawha Blvd E.
Charleston, WV 25305
Telephone: 304-558-2696
Fax: 304-558-3741
E-mail: smcquain@access.k12.wv.us

Wisconsin

Nissan Bar-Lev
CESA #7
530 West Main Street
Chilton, WI 53014
Telephone: 920-849-9384
Fax: 920-849-9385
E-mail: nbarlev@wi.rr.com

Anita Castro
Assistant Director, Special Education
Department of Public Instruction, State of
Wisconsin
125 South Webster Street
Madison, WI 53707
Telephone: 608-266-1781
Fax: 608-267-3746
E-mail: anita.castro@dpi.state.wi.us

Nancy Fuhrman
Special Education Data Coordinator
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
125 S. Webster Street
P.O. Box 7841
Madison, WI 53707
Telephone: 608-267-9243
Fax: 608-267-3746
E-mail: nancy.fuhrman@dpi.state.wi.us

Dani Scott
Data Consultant
Department of Public Instruction, State of
Wisconsin
125 South Webster Street
P.O. Box 7841
Madison, WI 53707
Telephone: 608-267-2349
Fax: 608-267-3746
E-mail: danielle.scott@dpi.state.wi.us

Theresa Walske
Children's Data & Fiscal Specialist
Wisconsin Department of Health & Family
Services
1 W. Wilson Street
Madison, WI 53702
Telephone: 608-267-7844
Fax: 608-261-6752
E-mail: walsktm@dhfs.state.wi.us

Beth Wroblewski
Manager Children's Services
Wisconsin Department of Health and Family
Services
1 W. Wilson Street
Madison, WI 53702
Telephone: 608-266-7469
Fax: 608-261-6752
E-mail: wroblbm@dhfs.state.wi.us

Wyoming

Michael Harris
Education Consultant
Wyoming Department of Education
320 W. Main Street
Riverton, WY 82501
Telephone: 307-777-2577
Fax: 307-777-2556
E-mail: mharri@educ.state.wy.us

Robert Lynch
Consultant
Division of Developmental Disabilities
6101 Yellowstone, Suite 186E
Cheyenne, WY 82002
Telephone: 307-777-6047
Fax: 307-777-6047
E-mail: rlynch@state.wy.us

Wyoming (continued)

Ann McNees
Data Collection
Wyoming Department of Education
320 West Main
Riverton, WY 82501
Telephone: 307-777-6224
Fax: 307-777-2556
E-mail: amcnee@educ.state.wy.us

Outlying Areas

American Samoa

Vaouli Muasau
Data Manager
DOE Special Education Division
P.O. Box 5996
Pago Pago, AS 96799
Telephone: 684-633-1323
Fax: 684-633-7707
E-mail: speddata@yahoo.com

Sue Scanlan
Data Manager
Part C Program of American Samoa
P.O. Box 7477
Pago Pago, AS 96799
Telephone: 684-699-4990
Fax: 684-699-4984
E-mail: sescanlan@hotmail.com

Central Northern Mariana Islands

Elaine Eclavea
Data Manager for CNMI Part C
CNMI PSS - Early Intervention Program
Office of Academic Vice President
UOG Station
Mangilao, GU 96923
Telephone: 671-735-2466
Fax: 671-734-2448
E-mail: eeclavea@ite.net

Nora Fujihira
Part B Data Clerk
CNMI Public School System
P.O. Box 501370
Saipan, MP 96950
Telephone: 670-237-3082
Fax: 670-664-3774
E-mail: fujihiran@pss.cnmi.mp

Joanne Nicholls
Secondary Transition Coordinator
CNMI Public School System
P.O. Box 501370
Saipan, MP 96950
Telephone: 670-237-3012
Fax: 670-664-3774
E-mail: nichollsj@pss.cnmi.mp

Doreen Tudela
SpED Director/AACSP
CNMI Public School System
P.O. Box 501370
Saipan, MP 96950
Telephone: 670-237-3026
Fax: 670-664-3774
E-mail: tudelad@pss.cnmi.mp

Federated States of Micronesia

Arthur Albert
Project Manager
FSM Special Education Program
P.O. Box P
Kolonias
Pohnpei, FM 96941
Telephone: 691-320-8982
Fax: 691-320-5404
E-mail: aralbert@mail.fm

Guam

Nerissa Bretania-Shafer
Assistant Superintendent
Guam Public School System
P.O. Box DE
Hagatna, GU 96932
Telephone: 671-475-0555
Fax: 671-472-2241
E-mail: nbshafer@gdoe.net

Guam (continued)

Catherine Cardenas
SPP/APR Coordinator
Guam Public School System
P.O. Box DE
Hagatna, GU 96932
Telephone: 671-475-0559
Fax: 671-475-0562
E-mail: cacardenas@gdoe.net

Cecille Cesa
Computer Systems Analyst
Guam Public School Systems
P.O. Box DE
Hagatna, GU 96913
Telephone: 671-475-0479
Fax: 671-475-9666
E-mail: cmcesa@gdoe.net

Terese Crisostomo
SPED Federal Projects Coordinator
GPPS Division of Special Education
P.O. Box DE
Hagatna, GU 96932
Telephone: 671-475-0549/0554
Fax: 671-475-0562
E-mail: tdcrisostomo@gdoe.net

June De Leon
Associate Director
Guam CEDDERS
University of Guam CEDDERS
Dean's Circle, HS #18 UOG Station
Mangilao, GU 96923
Telephone: 671-735-2494
Fax: 671-735-2496
E-mail: jdeleon@ite.net

Patricia Mantanona
Program Coordinator, Part C
Guam Public School System
P.O. Box DE
Hagatna, GU 96932
Telephone: 671-735-2414
Fax: 671-735-2439
E-mail: ppmantanona@gdoe.net

Marshall Islands

Frank Horiuchi
Special Education Specialist/Data Manager
Special Education Program
P.O. Box 395
P.O. Box 3179
Majuro, MH 96960
Telephone: 692-625-8398
Fax: 692-625-3861
E-mail: fahoriuchi@yahoo.com

Ruthiran Lokeijak
Special Education Director
RMI Special Education Program
P.O. Box 3179
Majuro, MH 96960
Telephone: 692-625-4043
Fax: 692-625-3861
E-mail: rlokeijak@yahoo.com

Virgin Islands

Carrie Johns
State Director Special Education
Department of Education
2133 Hospital Street
Christiansted, VI 00820
Telephone: 340-719-7682
Fax: 340-774-0817
E-mail: droberta@usviosep.org

Kathleen Merchant
Federal Grants & Program Manager
Department of Education/Division of Special
Education
2133 Hospital Street
Christiansted, St. Croix, VI 00820
Telephone: 340-719-7396
Fax: 340-719-7785
E-mail: kmerchant@usviosep.org

Resource Centers

Wayne Ball
Program Specialist
Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center
5137 NCR 11
Fort Collins, CO 80524
Telephone: 970-227-8234
Fax: 970-484-2716
E-mail: Professuop@aol.com

Cesar D'Agord
Educational Consultant
Western Regional Resource Center
1268 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403
Telephone: 541-346-0387
Fax: 541-346-0322
E-mail: cdagord@uoregon.edu

Eric Dickson
Program Specialist
Southeast Regional Resource Center
P.O. Box 244023
Montgomery, AL 36105
Telephone: 334-244-3116
Fax: 334-244-3101
E-mail: edickson@mail.aum.edu

Cynthia Glimpse
Coordinator - TAcmmunities
Federal Resource Center
1825 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20009
Telephone: 202-884-8203
Fax: 202-884-8441
E-mail: cglimpse@aed.org

James Henson
Field Staff
Mid-South Regional Resource Center
One Quality Street, Suite 722
Lexington, KY 40507
Telephone: 859-948-2625
Fax: 859-257-4353
E-mail: jhenson@uky.edu

Kara Johnson
Data Coordinator
North Central Regional Resource Center
University of Minnesota
150 Pillsbury Drive, SE, Room 5 Pattee Hall
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Telephone: 612-624-1157
Fax: 612-624-9344
E-mail: john3856@umn.edu

Grace Kelley
Consultant
Southeast Regional Resource Center
7051 Senators Drive
Montgomery, AL 73120
Telephone: 405-843-1420
Fax: 405-843-1420
E-mail: gkelley3@cox.net

Jim Leinen
Educational Consultant
Western Regional Resource Center
1268 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403
Telephone: 541-346-0370
Fax: 541-346-0322
E-mail: jsleinen@uoregon.edu

Kristin Reedy
Director
Northeast Regional Resource Center
Learning Innovations at WestEd
20 Winter Sport Lane
Williston, VT 05495
Telephone: 802-951-8218
Fax: 802-951-8222
E-mail: kreed@wested.org

Michael Sharpe
Director
North Central Regional Resource Center
University of Minnesota
150 Pillsbury Drive SE, 12 Pattee Hall
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Telephone: 612-626-8155
Fax: 612-624-9344
E-mail: sharp004@umn.edu

Federal Participants

Pat Abeyta
Part B Data Manager
Bureau of Indian Education
1011 Indian School Road, NW
Suite 332
Albuquerque, NM 87104
Telephone: 505-563-5272
Fax: 505-563-5281
E-mail: pabeyta@bia.edu

Selete Avoke
Senior Program Specialist
US Department of Education
550 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7260
Fax: 202-245-7619
E-mail: selete.avoke@ed.gov

Scott Campbell Brown
OSERS/OSEP/RTP
US Department of Education
550 12th Street, SW
PCP, Room 4076
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7282
E-mail: scott.brown@ed.gov

Cynthia Bryant
Education Program Specialist
US Department of Education
550 12th Street, SW, Room 4022
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7284
Fax: 202-245-7618
E-mail: cynthia.bryant@ed.gov

Gregg Corr
Associate Division Director
US Department of Education, OSEP
550 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7309
Fax: 202-245-7614
E-mail: gregg.corr@ed.gov

Louis Danielson
OSERS/OSEP/RTP
US Department of Education
550 12th Street, SW, Room 4160
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7250
E-mail: Louis.Danielson@ed.gov

Laura Duos
Office of Policy and Planning
US Department of Education, OSERS
550 12th Street, SW, Room 5122
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-6772
Fax: 202-245-7636
E-mail: Laura.Duos@ed.gov

David Egnor
Program Specialist
Office of Special Education Programs
550 12th Street SW, Room 4078
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7334
Fax: 202-245-7615
E-mail: david.egnor@ed.gov

Susan Falkenhan
Program Specialist
OSERS/OSEP/MSIP
US Department of Education
550 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7242
Fax: 202-245-7616
E-mail: susan.falkenhan@ed.gov

Sheila Friedman
Education Program Specialist
US Department of Education
550 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 410-956-2446
Fax: 202-245-7614
E-mail: sheila.friedman@ed.gov

Federal Participants (continued)

Patricia Guard
US Department of Education, OSERS
550 12th Street, SW, Room 4131
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7459
E-mail: Patty.Guard@ed.gov

Lisa Holden-Pitt
Education Research Analyst
Office of Special Education Programs
US Department of Education
550 12th Street, SW
PCP, Room 4072
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7379
Fax: 202-245-7617
E-mail: Lisa.Holden-Pitt@ed.gov

Gail Houle
Associate Division Director
Office of Special Education Programs
US Department of Education
550 12th Street, SW, Room 4061
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-841-9036
Fax: 202-245-7617
E-mail: gail.houle@ed.gov

Debra Jennings
Education Program Specialist
US Department of Education, OSEP
550 12th Street, SW, Room 4020
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7389
Fax: 202-245-7618
E-mail: jenningsdoj@aol.com

Ken Kienas
Education Program Specialist
US Department of Education, OSEP
550 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7621
Fax: 202-245-7614
E-mail: ken.kienas@ed.gov

Charlie Kniseley
Education Program Specialist
US Department of Education, OSEP/MSIP
550 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7322
Fax: 202-245-7618
E-mail: charles.kniseley@ed.gov

Julia Martin
Education Program Specialist
US Department of Education, OSEP
550 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7431
Fax: 202-245-7618
E-mail: julia.martin@ed.gov

Marie Mayor
Education Program Specialist
US Department of Education, MSIP/OSEP
550 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7433
Fax: 202-245-7616
E-mail: Marie.Mayor@ed.gov

Angela McCaskill
Education Program Specialist
US Department of Education, OSEP
550 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7435
E-mail: Angela.McCaskill@ed.gov

Alma McPherson
Education Specialist
US Department of Education
550 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-254-7443
Fax: 202-245-7614
E-mail: alma.mcpherson@ed.gov

Federal Participants (continued)

Sara Menlove
State Contact
US Department of Education, OSEP
550 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7447
Fax: 202-245-7616
E-mail: Sara.Menlove@ed.gov

Kimberly Mitchell
Education Program Specialist
US Department of Education
550 12th Street, SW, PCP 4010
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7453
Fax: 202-245-7614
E-mail: kimberly.mitchell@ed.gov

Lisa Pagano
Education Program Specialist
US Department of Education, OSEP
550 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7413
Fax: 202-245-7614
E-mail: lisa.pagano@ed.gov

Sheryl Parkhurst
Education Program Specialist
Office of Special Education Programs
US Department of Education
550 12th Street, SW, Room 4168
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7472
Fax: 202-245-7614
E-mail: sheryl.parkhurst@ed.gov

Hugh Reid
Office of Special Education Programs
US Department of Education
550 12th Street, SW, Room 4001
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7491
Fax: 202-245-7614
E-mail: Hugh.Reid@ed.gov

Margaret Romer
Education Program Specialist
US Department of Education, OSEP
550 12th Street, SW, Room 4019
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7501
Fax: 202-245-7518
E-mail: margaret.romer@ed.gov

Ruth Ryder
Director, MSIP
Office of Special Education Programs
US Department of Education
550 12th Street, SW, Room 4-144
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7513
Fax: 202-245-7614
E-mail: ruth.ryder@ed.gov

Ellen Safranek
Education Specialist
US Department of Education
550 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7515
Fax: 202-245-7614
E-mail: ellen.safranek@ed.gov

Ross Santy
US Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 7W110
Washington, DC 20202
Telephone: 202-401-3554
Fax: 202-260-7741
E-mail: ross.santy@ed.gov

Ginger Sheppard
State Contact
US Department of Education, OSEP
550 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7353
Fax: 202-245-7614
E-mail: virginia.sheppard@ed.gov

Federal Participants (continued)

Rex Shipp
Education Program Specialist
Office of Special Education Programs
US Department of Education
550 12th Street, SW, Room 4-178
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7523
Fax: 202-245-7614
E-mail: rex.shipp@ed.gov

Rhonda Spence
Education Program Specialist
US Department of Education, OSEP
550 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7382
Fax: 202-245-7614
E-mail: Rhonda.Spence@ed.gov

David Steele
Education Program Specialist
US Department of Education
OSEP
550 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-6520
Fax: 202-245-7618
E-mail: david.steele@ed.gov

Bobbi Stettner-Eaton
Program & Management Analyst - EDFacts
US Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW (6W222)
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-401-3281
Fax: 202-260-7216
E-mail: bobbi.stettner-eaton@ed.gov

Kala Surprenant
Attorney, Office of the General Counsel
US Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 6E-110
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-401-0441
Fax: 202-260-2972
E-mail: kala.surprenant@ed.gov

Nancy Treusch
Preschool Grants Coordinator
US Department of Education, OSEP
400 Maryland Avenue, SW, 4176 PCP
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7553
Fax: 202-245-7614
E-mail: nancy.treusch@ed.gov

Jacquelyn Twining-Martin
Education Program Specialist
US Department of Education, MSIP
550 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7558
Fax: 202-245-7614
E-mail: Jacquelyn.Twining@ed.gov

Becca Walawender
Education Program Specialist
US Department of Education, OSEP
550 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7399
Fax: 202-245-7616
E-mail: rebecca.walawender@ed.gov

Susan Weigert
Education Program Specialist
US Department of Education
550 12th Street SW, 4th Floor
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-6522
Fax: 202-245-7617
E-mail: susan.weigert@ed.gov

Larry Wexler
Associate Division Director
US Department of Education, OSEP
PCP 550 12th Street, SW, Room 4054
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7571
Fax: 202-245-7617
E-mail: Larry.Wexler@ed.gov

Federal Participants (continued)

Linda Whitsett
Education Program Specialist
US Department of Education, OSEP
550 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7573
Fax: 202-245-7614
E-mail: Linda.Whitsett@ed.gov

Mary Williams
Education Program Specialist
US Department of Education
OSERS/OAS/OPP
550 12th Street, SW, Room 5118
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7586
Fax: 202-245-7636
E-mail: mary.williams@ed.gov

Tony Williams
OSEP State Contact
US Department of Education, OSEP/MSIP
550 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: 202-245-7577
Fax: 202-245-7618
E-mail: tonyg.williams@ed.gov

Gloria Yepa
Supervisory Education Specialist
Bureau of Indian Education
1011 Indian School Road, NW, Suite 332
Albuquerque, NM 87103
Telephone: 505-563-5264
Fax: 505-563-5281
E-mail: gyepa@bia.edu

NASDSE

Eileen Ahearn
Project Director
NASDSE
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 320
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone: 703-519-3800
Fax: 703-519-3808
E-mail: eileen.ahearn@nasdse.org

Paula Burdette
Project Director
NASDSE
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 320
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone: 703-519-3800 x335
Fax: 703-519-3808
E-mail: paula.burdette@nasdse.org

Nancy Reder
Deputy Executive Director
NASDSE
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 320
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone: 703-519-3800
Fax: 703-519-3808
E-mail: nancy.reder@nasdse.org

NECTAC

Lynne Kahn
Associate Director
NECTAC and ECO
UNC-CH, Campus Box 8040
Chapel Hill, NC 27599
Telephone: 919-962-2781
Fax: 919-966-7463
E-mail: lynne_kahn@unc.edu

Anne Lucas
TA Specialist
NECTAC
Campus Box 8040, UNC-CH
Chapel Hill, NC 27599
Telephone: 804-379-3833
Fax: 919-966-7463
E-mail: Anne_Lucas@unc.edu

NCSEAM

W. Alan Coulter
Director
NCSEAM
1900 Gravier Street
SAHP, Room 8B9
New Orleans, LA 70112
Telephone: 504-556-7559
Fax: 504-556-7584
E-mail: acoulter@lsuhsc.edu

NCSEAM (continued)

Jane Nell Luster
Director of Data
NCSEAM
PMB 615
3154 B College Drive
Baton Rouge, LA 70808
Telephone: 225-267-4024
Fax: 225-267-4228
E-mail: jluste@lsuhsc.edu

Sandra Schmitz
Director of Technical Assistance
NCSEAM
105 NW Cedarwood Drive
Ankeny, IA 50021
Telephone: 515-964-3889
Fax: 504-556-7584
E-mail: sschmi@lsuhsc.edu

Sharon Walsh
Consultant for Part C
NCSEAM
6129 Calico Pool Lane
Burke, VA 22015
Telephone: 703-250-4935
Fax: 504-556-7584
E-mail: swalsh@lsuhsc.edu

Other Participants

Jason Altman
Coordinator
NCEO
350 Elliot Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Telephone: 612-624-8561
Fax: 612-624-0879
E-mail: altma014@umn.edu

Charlotte Alverson
KD Assistant
NPSO University of Oregon
5260 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97405
Telephone: 541-346-1390
Fax: 541-346-1411
E-mail: calverso@uoregon.edu

Lori Barrett
Director, Global Health Services
Covansys
7701 College Blvd., Suite 200
Overland Park, KS 66210
Telephone: 913-469-8700
Fax: 913-469-5814
E-mail: lbarrett@covansys.com

Tim Berens
KSTARS Project Member
NEKESC
13905 W. 149th Terrace
Olathe, KS 66062
Telephone: 913-538-7250
Fax: 785-296-6715
E-mail: tberens@nekesc.org

Loujeania Bost
Director
NDPC-SD
209 Martin Street
Clemson University
Clemson, SC 29631
Telephone: 864-656-6976
Fax: 864-656-0136
E-mail: lbost@clemson.edu

Bruce Bull
Director
EDSIS
325 13th Street
Salem, OR 97301
Telephone: 503-589-9660
Fax: 503-328-7093
E-mail: bruce.bull@edsis.org

Cec Deibel
Project Director
Help Me Grow
Stark County, Ohio
800 Market Avenue, North, Suite 1500A
Canton, OH 44702
Telephone: 330-455-1225 x307
Fax: 330-492-6940
E-mail: cecd@starkmhb.org

Other Participants (continued)

Jane Falls
Coordinator
National Post-School Outcomes Center
1268 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403
Telephone: 541-346-0354
Fax: 541-346-0322
E-mail: jafalls@uoregon.edu

Vince Forcier
Product Manager
Covansys
7701 College Blvd., Suite 200
Overland Park, KS 66210
Telephone: 913-469-8700
Fax: 913-469-5814
E-mail: vforcier@covansys.com

Kathy Hebbeler
Program Manager
SRI International
600 Mockingbird Place
Davis, CA 95616
Telephone: 530-758-7483
Fax: 530-753-0832
E-mail: kathleen.hebbeler@sri.com

Bryan Higgins
Research Associate
RMC Arlington
1501 Wilson Blvd., #1250
Arlington, VA 22209
Telephone: 703-558-5611
Fax: 703-558-4823
E-mail: higginsb@rmcarl.com

Sonia Jurich
Research Associate
RMC Arlington
1501 Wilson Blvd., #1250
Arlington, VA 22209
Telephone: 888-762-4200
E-mail: jurichs@rmcarl.com

Jeffrey Kay
Senior Information Tech. Project Coordinator
Central Susquehanna Interm. Unit
90 Lawton Lane
Milton, PA 17847
Telephone: 570-523-1155
Fax: 570-524-7104
E-mail: jkay@csiu.org

Matthew Klare
Project Coordinator
NDPC-SD
209 Martin Street
Clemson, SC 29631
Telephone: 864-656-1253
Fax: 864-656-0136
E-mail: mklare@clemson.edu

Beverly Mattson
Senior Research Associate
RMC Research Corporation
1501 Wilson Blvd., #1250
Arlington, VA 22209
Telephone: 703-558-4808
Fax: 703-558-4823
E-mail: mattsonb@rmcarl.com

Mike Owens
Practice Manager
Covansys
7701 College Blvd., Suite 200
Overland Park, KS 66210
Telephone: 913-469-8700
Fax: 913-469-5814
E-mail: mowens@covansys.com

Randall Penfield
Professor
University of Miami
312 Merrick Building
P.O. Box 248065
Coral Gables, FL 33124
Telephone: 305-284-8340
Fax: 305-284-3003
E-mail: penfield@miami.edu

Other Participants (continued)

Ty Taylor
Account Manager
Covansys
7701 College Blvd., Suite 200
Overland Park, KS 66210
Telephone: 913-469-8700
Fax: 913-469-5814
E-mail: ttaylor@covansys.com

David Test
Project Co-Director
NSTTAC
Special Education Program, UNCC
9201 University City Blvd.
Charlotte, NC 28223
Telephone: 704-687-8853
Fax: 704-687-2916
E-mail: dwtest@uncc.edu

Martha Thurlow
Director
NCEO
350 Elliott Hall
75 E. River Road
Minneapolis, MN 55113
Telephone: 612-624-4826
Fax: 612-624-0879
E-mail: thurl001@umn.edu

Nadine Tyler
Account Manager
Covansys
7701 College Blvd., Suite 200
Overland Park, KS 66210
Telephone: 913-469-8700
Fax: 913-469-5814
E-mail: ntyler@covansys.com

Deanne Unruh
Asst. Professor
National Post-School Outcomes Center
University of Oregon
204 Clinical Services Building
5260 UO
Eugene, OR 97403
Telephone: 541-346-1424
Fax: 541-346-1411
E-mail: dkunruh@uoregon.edu

Mike Vogel
Account Manager
Covansys
7701 College Blvd., Suite 200
Overland Park, KS 66210
Telephone: 913-469-8700
Fax: 913-469-5814
E-mail: lbarrett@covansys.com

Richard Zeller
Senior Policy Analyst
CADRE
Direction Service, Inc.
P.O. Box 51360
Eugene, OR 97405
Telephone: 541-284-4740
Fax: 541-686-5063
E-mail: rwzeller@directionservice.org

Westat

Julie Bollmer
Research Analyst
Westat
1650 Research Blvd., RA1208
Rockville, MD 20850
Telephone: 301-517-8094
Fax: 301-294-4475
E-mail: juliebollmer@westat.com

Marsha Brauen
Vice President
Westat
1650 Research Blvd., RA1210
Rockville, MD 20850
Telephone: 301-738-3668
Fax: 301-294-4475
E-mail: marshabrauen@westat.com

Carol Bruce
OSEPTA, Task Leader, Data Collection and
Analysis
Westat
1650 Research Blvd., RW2574
Rockville, MD 20850
Telephone: 301-610-4892
Fax: 301-315-5934
E-mail: carolbruce@westat.com

Westat (continued)

Evarilla Cover
Writer/Editor
Westat
1650 Research Blvd., RA1209
Rockville, MD 20850
Telephone: 301-294-2808
Fax: 301-294-4475
E-mail: evarillacover@westat.com

Danielle Crain
Research Analyst
Westat
1650 Research Blvd.
Rockville, MD 20850
Telephone: 301-610-8805
Fax: 301-294-4475
E-mail: daniellecrain@westat.com

Mary Job
Research Assistant
Westat
1650 Research Blvd., RA1203
Rockville, MD 20850
Telephone: 301-315-5939
Fax: 301-610-4905
E-mail: maryjob@westat.com

Roberta Garrison-Mogren
Research Analyst
Westat
1650 Research Blvd., RA1204
Rockville, MD 20850
Telephone: 301-517-4109
Fax: 301-294-4475
E-mail: robertagarrison-mogren@westat.com

Yong Lee
Programmer
Westat
1650 Research Blvd., RW2526
Rockville, MD 20850
Telephone: 301-610-4830
Fax: 301-315-5934
E-mail: yonglee@westat.com

Linda Lynch
Senior Research Associate
Westat
1650 Research Blvd., RA 1216
Rockville, MD 20850
Telephone: 301-251-4280
Fax: 301-292-4475
E-mail: LindaLynch@Westat.com

Joy Markowitz
Associate Project Director
Westat
1650 Research Blvd., RA 1206
Rockville, MD 20850
Telephone: 301-315-5952
Fax: 301-294-4475
E-mail: joymarkowitz@westat.com

Claire McDonnell
Conference Staff
Westat
1009 Slater Road, Suite 110
Durham, NC 27703
Telephone: 919-474-0909
Fax: 919-474-8048
E-mail: clairemcdonnell@westat.com

Elizabeth Zimmerman
Conference Coordinator
Westat
1650 Research Blvd., RA1231
Rockville, MD 20850
Telephone: 301-294-3942
Fax: 301-294-4475
E-mail: elizabethzimmerman@westat.com