



Building Capacity for High-Quality *IDEA* Data

A Review of State Approaches to IDEA Reporting Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS)

Friday, August 1, 2014

Jody Fields

*Director, IDEA Data and Research
University of Arkansas at Little Rock*

Dave Phillips

IDEA Data Center

Chris Thacker

IDEA Data Center

Agenda

- Welcome
- About IDC
- Overview of CEIS
- Review of approaches to IDEA reporting CEIS
- A state example: Arkansas
- Q & A

About IDEA Data Center (IDC)

- IDC funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) in 2013 for five years
- Westat is the lead organization with seven partners and a pool of expert consultants

Mission

- To build capacity within states for collecting, reporting, and analyzing high-quality data
 - Sections 616 and 618 of IDEA
 - Programs for infants, toddlers, and their families (Part C) and programs serving children ages 3 through 21 (Part B)

Targeted & Intensive TA

- Targeted TA – Provide through a state liaison model, using email and telephone, short-term consultation, and regional workshops
- Intensive TA – Address more complex data challenges using a systemic approach

Tools & Products Year 1 - Examples

- Assessment
- Discipline
- Educational Environments-Online Learning
- Maintenance of Effort (MOE) and Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS)
- Part C Exiting
- Preschool Environments
- Public Reporting of 618 Data

For more information...

www.ideadata.org

ideadata@westat.com

What is CEIS?

20 U.S. Code 1413(f) of the IDEA allows LEAs to use not more than 15 percent of their IDEA awards in any combination with other amounts to develop and implement coordinated, early intervening services (CEIS), which may include interagency financing structures, for students in kindergarten through grade 12 (with a particular emphasis on students in kindergarten through grade 3) who have not been identified as needing special education or related services but who need additional academic and behavioral support to succeed in a general education environment.

Does an LEA have to use its IDEA funds to implement CEIS?

When an LEA is found to have Significant Disproportionality in one or more of several areas, the LEA is required to use 15 percent of its IDEA funds to provide CEIS to students in grades K through 12 with an emphasis on children in grades K through 3 who have not been identified for special education. Ideally, though not required, these academic and behavioral supports are provided to those groups of children who were significantly over identified that resulted in the LEA's significant disproportionality (**34 CFR 300.646(b)(2)**).

What is Significant Disproportionality?

- Occurs when an LEA identifies students of a particular race and ethnicity category at a greater rate than the LEA identifies students for the same purpose who are not of that race
- OSEP allows each state agency to define the process it uses to calculate significant disproportionality; OSEP must approve the state defined process

What is Significant Disproportionality? (continued)

- LEA has significant disproportionality when it over identifies at a rate established by SEA, children of a particular race and ethnicity as
 - Children with disabilities
 - Children with specific disability
 - Placement in specific Educational settings
 - Disciplinary resolutions (in-school, out-of-school, and length)

Must an LEA have Significant Disproportionality to Implement CEIS?

CEIS includes a variety of services that an LEA may already be providing

- CEIS only if the LEA uses IDEA funds (up to 15% of its allocation for a given fiscal year) to pay in whole or in part for these services
- LEAs with significant disproportionality must implement CEIS and set aside 15% of its IDEA award

Must an LEA have Significant Disproportionality to Implement CEIS? (continued)

- LEA may voluntarily choose to use up to 15% of its IDEA award for any fiscal year but must meet most of the same requirements for CEIS as an LEA that is required to implement CEIS

Why was the IDEA amended to allow CEIS?

The rationale for using IDEA funds for CEIS is based on research showing that the earlier a child's learning problems or difficulties are identified, the more quickly and effectively the problems and difficulties can be addressed and the greater the chances that the child's problems will be ameliorated or decreased in severity. Conversely, the longer a child goes without assistance, the longer the remediation time and the more intense and costly services might be.

(OSEP Guidance Memorandum, July 28, 2008)

Why was the IDEA amended to allow CEIS? (continued)

Allowing schools to use some Part B funds for CEIS has the potential to benefit both special education and general education.

***(Analysis of Comments and Changes;
Final IDEA Regulations, August 14, 2006)***

What are allowable activities for CEIS?

- Professional development may be provided by entities other than the LEAs for teachers and other school staff to enable such personnel to deliver scientifically based academic and behavioral interventions, including scientifically based literacy instruction and where appropriate instruction on the use of adaptive and instructional software; and

What are allowable activities for CEIS? (continued)

- Providing educational and behavioral evaluations, services, and supports, including scientifically based literacy instruction. (***OSEP Memo, July 2008 and NASDSE Policy Forum, September 2008 – Paula Burdette, Ph.D.***)

What data around CEIS are required to be collected and reported?

34 CFR 300.226(d) requires 2 counts of child specific data relative to the implementation of CEIS. These data are submitted annually on the IDEA Part B Maintenance of Effort (MOE) Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS) report. These data are reported by LEA.

- Count of children receiving CEIS for the reporting school year
- Count of children who received CEIS at any time during either the reporting year or the past 2 school years who received special education and related services during the reporting school year

Are there other non-child specific reporting requirements for CEIS?

In addition to the count of children, the SEA must also include on the report for each LEA the following information specific to CEIS:

- If the LEA was required to set aside 15% of its IDEA allocation for CEIS due to significant disproportionality;
- Amount the LEA reserved for CEIS;
- If the LEA voluntarily set aside IDEA funds for CEIS; and
- Amount the LEA voluntarily reserved for CEIS.

This report has other requirements that are specific to MOE and other IDEA requirements.

IDC MOE and CEIS Workgroup

Purpose

- Help states improve Maintenance of Effort (MOE) and Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS) data quality

IDC MOE and CEIS Workgroup Year 1

- Document different data collection and reporting approaches adapted by states to implement CEIS
- Identify challenges with CEIS data collection and reporting
- Develop tools/products for state use to help LEAs improve CEIS data quality

IDC MOE and CEIS Workgroup Year 1 (continued)

- Identify states with highest number of LEAs that are either required or voluntarily reserved CEIS funds (using prior two years of data)

IDC MOE and CEIS Workgroup Year 1 (continued)

- Solicit input from identified states on
 - Processes for implementing CEIS
 - Challenges with implementing CEIS
 - Tracking & reporting students receiving CEIS and special education services
 - Challenges with CEIS data collection and reporting

IDC MOE and CEIS Workgroup

Challenges identified

- Providing professional development/training for LEAs by SEAs
- Communication between fiscal and program teams
- Validating CEIS data

IDC MOE and CEIS Workgroup

Challenges identified (continued)

- Comprehending CEIS requirements by LEAs
- Identifying students receiving CEIS when transferred from one district to another

IDC MOE and CEIS Workgroup

State approaches on implementation of CEIS

- Collection of CEIS data from LEAs
 - Aggregate
 - Student level
- Tracking funds
 - LEAs submit application and narratives on CEIS expenditure
 - Allowable expenditures

IDC MOE and CEIS Workgroup

State approaches on implementation of CEIS (continued)

- Tracking students receiving CEIS
 - LEAs submit a tracking sheet
 - Integrated into the state database

IDC MOE and CEIS Workgroup

State approaches on implementation of CEIS (continued)

- Tracking students who received CEIS services and identified for special education over subsequent two years
 - Flags are integrated into the state database
 - Students are given unique IDs

IDC MOE and CEIS Workgroup

State approaches on implementation of CEIS (continued)

- Data verification
 - Integrated into the monitoring process
 - Integrated into the budget process
 - LEAs required to submit data quarterly for review

IDC MOE and CEIS Workgroup

State approaches on implementation of CEIS (continued)

- Guidance/training
 - Trainings provided as part of the RTI process
 - Individuals available to provide one-on-one TA
 - Guidance documents available in the fiscal database and/or the state website

Arkansas Data Collection

- Student Level
- Built into the Student Management System
 - Does not allow a student to be active in special education and CEIS at the same time

Arkansas Data Collection

Data Collected - Demographics

Name (first, middle, last)	SSN
State Unique Identifier	Date of Birth
Race	Gender
Resident LEA	Grade
English Language Learner	

Arkansas Data Collection

Data Collected – entry date, exit date, reason

SN: Services no longer needed	MD: Moved
SP: Placed into Special Education	DO: Dropped out of school
DP: Services discontinued at parent's request	GD: Graduated
RP: Reached Program Eligibility (i.e. child moved to another grade level or building where no CEIS program is available)	DI: Deceased

Arkansas Data Collection

- Data Collected
 - Type of services provided

AS: Adaptive Software	AT: Adaptive Technology	BE: Behavior Evaluation
LI: Literacy Instruction	LS: Language Skills	OS: Other Services
MI: Math Instruction	SI: Science Instruction	S2: Other Services
RH: Section 504 of Rehab Act	SB: School Based Mental Health	S3: Other Services
CB: Counseling/Behavioral Intervention		

- Begin date and end date for each service provided

How Arkansas Addresses the Four Challenges of CEIS

1. Capturing students that move from one district to another
2. Lack of professional development/training for the districts
3. Lack of communication between the fiscal team and the program team
4. Districts lack of understanding CEIS

1. Capturing students that move from one district to another

Use of identifiers for tracking students

- SSN
- State Unique Identifiers
- Other demographic information

We have not been looking at whether a student who moved to another district that is not provided CEIS has been placed in special education.

2. Lack of professional development/training for the districts

- Training around data is continual
- CEIS program development
 - Most guidance has come from non-program staff
 - Informal conversations
- Changes are coming for SFY15...
 - Mandated Districts had to submit a CEIS plan
 - New focus for Monitoring Staff

3. Lack of communication between the fiscal team and the program team

- State

- No real program team
- Most information came from Data & Research and Finance

3. Lack of communication between the fiscal team and the program team (continued)

- District
 - Special Education Supervisors of **mandated** districts have more communication
 - Special Education Supervisors of **voluntary** districts don't always know that funds were budgeted

4. Districts lack of understanding CEIS

- Identification methodologies
- Spending of special education funds on non-disabled students
- Not every student who is struggling is at risk for special education and should be part of the program
- How funds can be used to support not supplant

Questions?

Contact: IDC MOE-CEIS Work Group

Danielle Crain

DanielleCrain@westat.com

Swati Nadkarni

SwatiNadkarni@westat.com

- Visit the IDC website at:
<http://ideadata.org/>
- Follow us on Twitter:
[@IDEAdataCenter](https://twitter.com/IDEAdataCenter)

The contents of this presentation were developed under a grant from the U.S. Department of Education, #H373Y130002. However, those contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government. Project Officers: Richelle Davis and Meredith Miceli