

Sharing Data for C8 and B12: Conversations with States

Frank Miller - Pennsylvania

Margy Hornback and Ryan Weir - Kansas

Nyle Robinson and Scott Beever - Illinois

Anne Lucas - NECTAC/WRRC

Jim Leinen - WRRC

Expected Outcomes

- Understand (broadly) how three states have approached data sharing between Parts C and B to improve performance on SPP/APR Indicators C8 and B12
- Discuss other states' data sharing strategies
- Identify common challenges related to data sharing and successful strategies that have been used to address these challenges

2006 APR Analysis: B12

- 16 states report data sharing (to various degrees) with Part C (CA, CT, DC, FL, GA, GU, IL, IN, KS, KY, MS, MT, ND, RI, SD, SC and TN)

Other states may share data but not mentioned in APRs

- 3 more states are in process of developing their systems for data sharing (OH, UT AND WI)
- 4 have unique identifiers (CT, KS, KY, TN) and 2 more are planning to create them (OH, RI)

Pennsylvania Data Sharing Process

Frank Miller

Pennsylvania Departments of
Education

and Public Welfare

Office of Child Development and
Early Learning

Pennsylvania's Early Intervention Service System

- Birth to Three administered at a local level through 48 County Mental Health/Mental Retardation Programs
 - Use Early Intervention Reporting System for data management and monthly data reporting
- Three to School Age administered at local level through 34 Mutually Agreed Upon Written Arrangement holders, typically IU, School Districts
 - Each uses own data base system and for monthly data reporting to Penn Data

Children Served

- FY 05-06
 - 28,522 Birth to Three
 - 37,638 Three to School Age
- FY 06-07
 - 29,848 Birth to Three
 - 39,477 Three to School Age
- Numbers continue to grow annually

Background

- In June 2006, the Early Intervention lead agencies conducted a comparison of the data regarding those children aging out of the Part C program and transitioning to the Part B program
 - Of the 4,343 children that transitioned during the review period 1,400 were not found in the PennData database
 - Through manual review this number was eventually reduced to 403
 - The resulting confidence percentage was 90.7%.

Lack of Reconciliation

- If reconciliation was not possible, PennData will forward within 5 business days a listing, by county, of those children to the OCD point of contact
 - the OCD point of contact, will then follow-up with OCD, County EI Program, and EIRS support staff so that any discrepancies are corrected within 10 business days
 - A revised listing with clarification whether the name should be edited or deleted, will be submitted to PennData with the subsequent month's text file

EIRS-PennData Transition Data Protocol

- Although there was time/labor investment, the benefits are significant:
 - Increased communications before transition meeting
 - Better consistency between data systems, e.g. less discrepancies.
 - Improved compliance with OSEP indicators, specifically.....

EIRS-PennData Transition Data Protocol

- In March 2007, we again conducted the June 2006 data comparison: regarding those children transitioning to the Part B program for the first half of FY06-07
 - Of the **3,093** [4343] children that transitioned during the review period, approximately **631** [1400] were not found in the PennData database during the preliminary review
 - Upon manual review, this number was reduced to **213** [403] with further resolution likely upon additional review
 - The resulting confidence percentage was **93.1%** [90.7]

EIRS-PennData Transition Data Protocol

Improvement Strategies:

- Inclusion of EIRS Child# in PennData
- Establishing standard data entry practices regarding first name, last name, and DOB
- Promoting continued teamwork as we work through reorganization

Office of Child Development and Early Learning (OCDEL)

- Established in October 2004, formally dually appointed in PA Department of Education as well as DPW, December 2006
- Brought Early Intervention and other Early Childcare and Education programming together
- Currently pursuing combining data into current Home and Community Services Information System (HCSIS)

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Office of Child Development &
Early Learning
333 Market Street, 6th Floor
PA Department of Education
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

Frank Miller
(717) 346-0374
fmiller@state.pa.us

Kansas Data Sharing Process

Ryan Weir

Kansas Department of Health and
Environment

Margy Hornback
University of Kansas

Background

- Different Lead Agencies for Part C and Part B 619
 - Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE) State Lead Agency for Part C
 - Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) State Lead Agency for Part B
- Received General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG) in 2002 with Goal:
 - Develop and deploy methods for the exchange of individual child data between the Part C and Part B database system
- Developed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for Sharing Data
 - Complex process with multiple reviews by agency attorneys but this process has enabled agencies to use it over time

MOU Content

- KDHE and KSDE Agree
 - Access to educational records solely for audit/evaluation of Federal or State supported education program
 - Personally identifiable student information must be protected
 - To develop and define list of data fields to share
 - To annually transmit and share data fields

- Uploads transition information to KSDE annually:
 - KIDS ID #
 - School District Number where child was referred
 - Referring Agency Code (Network ID)
 - Part C Exit Category

KSDE

- Uses district #s to send Part C transition data to Part B data clerks and SPED Directors
- Sends detailed instructions on how to import Part C information, complete reporting form and export data to KSDE

KDHE and KSDE Collaborative Verification Process

- Account for every child who has been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination
 - Follow-up on any data inconsistencies with networks and districts
 - Establish verified number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination

Data Sharing Impact

- Identification of transition training needs
- Increased communication at state and local level
- Tracking children's progress throughout public school experience
- Identification of agency policy changes needed to improve transition
- Improvement in the accuracy of the data systems

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Colleen Riley
Special Education
Services
Kansas State
Department of Education
120 SE 10th Avenue
Topeka, KS 66612-1182
(785) 291-3097
criley@ksde.org

Carolyn Nelson
Children's Developmental
Services
State Department of
Health and Environment
1000 SW Jackson, Suite
220
Topeka, KS 66612-1274
(785) 296-6135
cnelson@kdhe.state.ks.us

Illinois Data Sharing Process

Nyle Robinson

Illinois Department of Human Services

Scott Beever

Illinois State Board of Education

A New Approach

- Part C approached ISBE & began to negotiate data sharing based on “The Letter”
- Took about a year to get it through both legal departments, probably hardest part

See data sharing agreement hand-out

What Makes Illinois Different?

Everything depends on assignment to school district, a chronic problem for states

- Entire state is divided into elementary school districts, geocoding software assigns almost any valid address to a school district

Map Marker v12.3

Other Options: Arcview, Centrus

How It Works

- The basic software produces a 95% match rate
- Unmatched addresses entered by hand into Yahoo Maps, which gives us an exact geographic location

When Addresses Go Bad

- Most of the problem addresses are too new to be in the geocoding software, fixable with Yahoo Maps
- Problems arise with “alias addresses”, addresses used locally but not a real legal name, sometimes fixable with human intervention
- Remaining problems are addresses so bad we cannot code them, *ex: Aurora, up the back stair, 3rd door on the right*

Healing Address Data

- Side benefit, we are sending the bad addresses to SC agencies to fix
- Better address information will improve our mailing and other services
- Minor map problems, *ex: District line down the middle of a street, software thinks it is 50 yards north, fixed in the software by hand*

What Is Sent?

We send three reports to ISBE:

1. Individual names with elements noted in “The Letter” of each child who turns 27-months or who starts service after that age
2. A grid of all eligible kids by age & by school district, for use in planning
3. Termination reasons for each child closed after being on a 27-month list

But Wait! There's More!

- Also have been using & refining a paper transition tracking form

Blank form is in your hand-outs

- EI SC agencies forwards it to the LEA who returns it when work is complete
- Detail is entered into Cornerstone client data system

How Does That Work?

- Anticipate receipt of tracking forms reinforces the main effort
- Reinforces that we are in it together, now consequences on both sides for not cooperating with your counterparts
- ISBE matches up the lists we send them with the transition tracking forms

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

rrfcnetwork.org/content/view/493/47/

Nyle Robinson
Statewide Data Manager
Illinois Department of
Human Services
Division of Community
Health and Prevention
535 W. Jefferson
Springfield, IL 62702
(217) 524-6615
Nyle.robinson@illinois.gov

Scott Beever
Principal Consultant
Illinois State Board of
Education
100 N. 1st Street
Springfield, IL 62702
(217) 782-5589
sbeever@isbe.net