Data Notes for IDEA, Part B

These data notes contain information on the ways in which states collected and reported data differently from the OSEP data formats and instructions. In addition, the notes provide explanations of significant changes in the data from the previous year. The chart below summarizes differences in collecting and reporting data for 12 states. These variations affected the way data were reported for the IDEA, Part B child count and the educational environment, exiting, and discipline collections. Additional notes on how states reported data for specific data collections follow this table.

Table A-1
State Reporting Patterns for IDEA, Part B
Child Count Data 2000-01,
Other Data 1999-2000

States	Differences from OSEP reporting categories Where H = Reported in the hearing impairments category O = Reported in the orthopedic impairments category P = Reported in the primary disability category R = Reported in other disability categories			
	Multiple disabilities	Other health impairments	Deaf-blindness	Traumatic brain injury
Colorado		O		
Delaware	P	O		
Florida	P			
Georgia	P			
Illinois	P			
Michigan		O	H	R
Minnesota	P			
Mississippi		O		
North Dakota	P			
Oregon	P			
West Virginia	P			
Wisconsin	P			

Arkansas—The state attributed the decrease in the number of American Indian/Alaska Native children ages 3 through 5 to a large cohort of children reaching age 6 during the past year. A significant increase in the number of American Indian/Alaska Native students ages 6 through 21 during the same reporting period supports the explanation.

Arizona—The state attributed the increases from 1999-2000 to 2000-01 in the number of students with autism and traumatic brain injury (TBI) to a change in the state's reporting system. The state changed the crosswalk it uses to translate the multiple disability categories it collects for each student to the IDEA disability categories. This was done to make the data more closely align with the IDEA disability categories.

Colorado—The state attributed the increase from 1999-2000 to 2000-01 in the number of students with autism to the increased training the state has provided to local education agencies (LEAs) in identifying students with autism.

Florida—The state attributed the increase from 1999-2000 to 2000-01 in the number of students with other health impairments to the growth in the number of children identified with attention deficit disorder/attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADD/ADHD) and children identified with Asperger's syndrome.

Kentucky—The state attributed the increase in other health impairments to an increase in the number of students served with ADD/ADHD.

Minnesota—The state attributed the increase in the number of children served with autism to the success of early intervention programs within the state.

Montana—The state attributed the increase from 1999-2000 to 2000-01 in the number of children with autism served to the implementation of the state early intervention program. Montana attributes the increase in the developmental delay category to the fact that the category has been used for only 2 years.

New Jersey—The state indicated that in 1998, a change in state regulations redefined the state category "neurologically impaired" exclusively as the Federal category TBI. This change has resulted in a huge increase in New Jersey's and the Nation's TBI figures. In the past, the previous combination of "neurologically impaired" and "perceptually impaired" was reported under the Federal "specific learning disability" category. New Jersey indicated that most of the neurologically impaired pupils will eventually be reevaluated and classified under specific learning disability, communication impairments, some other category, or declassified as not eligible for special education. To provide consistency in these data over time, the numbers reported here have been projected based on previous New Jersey reporting patterns.

The state attributed the increase in students with autism to a change in the definition to include in the autism category students with onset after age 3 and also children with Asperger's syndrome.

New York—The state noted that race/ethnicity data for students with disabilities will not be submitted this school year. In addition, New York noted that it does not classify preschool students with disabilities by disability category. The state uses estimates to report the disability categories of 3- to 5-year-olds.

North Carolina—The state noted that seven charter schools failed to submit data and therefore are not included in the child count.

Oklahoma—The state indicated that the increases in other health impairments and autism are consistent with the increases reported in these categories over the last 3 to 4 years. The state continued to provide training and technical assistance in identifying and reporting other health impairments and autism, and as a result there is much more awareness and better recognition of students with these disabilities.

Oregon—The state noted that its age ranges are different from the OSEP definitions. Children who are 5 years old on September 1 are considered to be school age and, therefore, are included in the counts for the 6-through-21 age group rather than the 3-through-5 age group.

Utah—The state indicated that the increase in the number of students served with autism was due to a more accurate collection system. In addition, the state noted that two districts collected and submitted erroneous information in last year's data submission. The state also indicated that improved training in the area of autism identification has resulted in an increase in the number of autistic children served and reported.

Wisconsin—The state attributed the increase in the number of autistic children served and reported to its autism training program.

Tables AB1-AB11: Educational Environments

Alabama—The state attributed some of the increase in the number of children ages 3 through 5 served in an early childhood special education setting and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education setting, and the decreases in the number served in an early childhood setting and separate school setting, to coding errors in last year's report. The state also suggests that the changes in the educational environments categories are the result of more students ages 3 through 21 being served in less restrictive environments within the state.

Arkansas—The state attributed the decrease in the number of students served in private residential facilities to the new policy of reclassifying students receiving services at the following facilities: (a) the Arkansas School of the Deaf, (b) the Arkansas School of the Blind, and (c) the Arkansas Department of Human Services. These students are now placed in the public residential facilities category.

Arizona—The state reported that the home and part-time early childhood categories were transposed in the 1998-99 submission. The state also noted that its current definition for part-time early childhood includes the reverse mainstream setting. Next school year, the state will provide data for the reverse mainstream setting separately.

Bureau of Indian Affairs—The Bureau reported that the data for children ages 3 through 5 only include those children whose tribe has contracted with a BIA-funded school to provide services.

Colorado—The state was unable to report race/ethnicity data for children ages 3 through 5.

Connecticut—The state noted that for the second year, data for students ages 6 through 21 are a duplicate count of students with disabilities served in correctional facilities and children enrolled in private schools, not placed by the local district. In the past, these numbers were reported as unduplicated counts. Students classified as "other" race/ethnicity were distributed proportionately by disability.

District of Columbia—The state was unable to provide data about the educational environments of children ages 3 through 5.

Illinois—The state noted that some of its definitions regarding least restrictive environment do not match the Federal definitions. For example, those students who are reported as being in resource classrooms may be receiving services in the resource room from 1 percent to 49 percent of the school day. Additionally, the count for students in separate classes includes students receiving special education and related services for 50 percent or more of the school day.

New Jersey—The state attributes the differences in the number of children served in itinerant services outside the home from 1998-99 to 1999-2000 to a change in collection methodology. In 1998-99, students receiving speech for fewer than 3 hours a week were reported in part-time early childhood general education/part-time early childhood special education. This year, the students were reported in the itinerant services category.

New Mexico—The state attributed the changes from 1998-99 to 1999-2000 to the use of a new data collection system and a change in collection methodology. The state went from a special-education-only data collection to a unified data collection for special education and regular education.

New York—The state noted that race/ethnicity data reported for children ages 3 through 5 are for all students receiving "preschool special education services," not for all children ages 3 through 5. Race/ethnicity data provided for students ages 6 through 21 are for all students with disabilities receiving "school-age special education services," not for all students ages 6 through 21. There was no duplication between the two tables, and all students ages 3 through 21 with disabilities are reported by race/ethnicity.

North Carolina—The state noted that seven charter schools failed to submit data and therefore are not included in the environment counts.

Ohio—The state noted that the settings data for ages 3 through 5 were not correct for 1998-99 and that this year's numbers are correct.

Oregon—The state noted its age ranges are different from the OSEP definitions. Children who are 5 years old on September 1 are considered to be school age and, therefore, are included in the counts for the 6-through-21 age group rather than the 3-through-5 age group.

Pennsylvania—The state attributed the changes in the educational environments data from 1998-99 to 1999-2000 to its new data collection system.

Texas—The state noted that educational environment data will not be available for children ages 3 through 5 until school year 2000-01. The state also noted that its definitions do not match those used by the Federal data collection. Therefore, the figures reported to OSEP and reflected in the charts for several categories are estimates. The impact was especially significant for the following categories: (a) special education outside regular class less than 21 percent of day, (b) special education outside regular class at least 21 percent of day and no more than 60 percent of day, and (c) special education outside regular class more than 60 percent of day. Likewise, the Texas definition of self-contained includes those students receiving 50 percent or more of their school day in special education settings outside of the regular classroom. The Federal definition for category c uses 60 percent as the cutoff. Therefore, those students in Texas receiving more than 50 percent through 60 percent of their instructional day in special education are included in category c for Federal reporting purposes even though, if data were available, they could be reported in category b. The state is revising the data collection to capture specific elements as required by OSEP definitions for future collections.

Tables AC1-AC3: Personnel

Arizona—The state attributed the increase in state education agency (SEA) supervisors/administrators to a misinterpretation of the category in previous years.

Arkansas—The state attributed the variation between the 1998-99 and the 1999-2000 data to errors in the reporting of noncertified diagnostic and evaluation staff.

Illinois—The state did not collect personnel data by ages served and therefore was able to report only the number of teaching personnel serving early childhood or preschool students. All other personnel, including those who may be serving children ages 3 through 5, are reported as serving students ages 6 through 21. The state also does not collect full-time equivalency (FTE) data for home-hospital personnel. As a result, these personnel are not included in the data.

Nebraska—The state attributed the variations in the number of supervisors/ administrators from 1998-99 to 1999-2000 to a change in the data collection methodology. Prior to this year, FTEs were not used to report supervisors and administrators.

New Mexico—The state attributed the large variations in the personnel table from 1998-99 to 1999-2000 to a change in the data collection methodology. Prior to 1999-2000, the state's data collection used a paper and pencil format and allowed "estimates" of FTE for certain staff. The state now collects its data electronically and does not allow estimates.

North Carolina—The state noted that seven charter schools failed to submit data and therefore are not included in the personnel counts.

Ohio—The state attributed the changes in the number of diagnostic and evaluation staff, interpreters, speech pathologists, as well as in total demand to hiring increases within the categories and more accurate reporting. In the past, Ohio reported speech pathologists in two separate categories. This year, all speech-language pathologists are reported within the speech pathologists category. The state also attributed the increase in total personnel to increased hiring within the personnel categories teachers, teacher assistants, other professional staff, and nonprofessional staff. The latter two categories, which represent 1,000 positions, were not reported before this year.

Pennsylvania—The state attributed the variations in the personnel data from 1998-99 to 1999-2000 to a change in data collection procedures. In 1999-2000, the personnel data were collected for the first time in an aggregate manner.

Texas—The state attributed the variations in personnel from 1998-99 to 1999-2000 to a decision for the 1999-2000 data collection to report school social workers, diagnostic and evaluation staff, and counselors as fully certified when certification cannot be determined through the state Board Education Certification (SBEC). In 1998-99, certification for the above three roles was determined by matching with the SBEC database.

Utah—The state attributed the increase from 1998-99 to 1999-2000 in the number of interpreters to an increase in hiring for that category. In addition, the state noted that it does not have a certification program for aides.

Wisconsin—The state attributed the increase in the number of fully certified diagnostic and evaluation staff to districts incorrectly reporting program support teachers as teachers last year. This year, they are correctly included as diagnostic and evaluation staff, resulting in an increase in this category. The decrease in the not fully certified diagnostic and evaluation staff category was the result of continuing license checks.

Tables AD1 - AD4: Exiting

Bureau of Indian Affairs—The Bureau believes that some of the students ages 14 and 15 years old who were reported as graduated with a diploma may not have graduated from high school, but rather they graduated from middle school or junior high school. BIA has noted this mistake and will inform the local district to correct this problem in future submissions.

Connecticut—The state attributed the increases in the number of students no longer receiving special education and the decreases in dropouts to a change in the data collection methodology.

Illinois—The state reported that it is still having problems collecting and reporting exiting data. The state attributed the differences in the data from 1998-99 to 1999-2000 to problems with the data collection system.

Georgia—The state indicated that the increases in total exits from 1998-99 to 1999-2000 were the result of its new web-based data system. Georgia believes that the data are now more reliable. The state also noted that the special education population was increasing at a significant rate, and the changes in the data reflect this growth.

Missouri—The state noted that all of the increases in the moved, known to be continuing and dropped out categories are attributed to the Missouri Department of Corrections (MDC) exiting report. The state indicated that the MDC's exiting data fluctuate from year to year.

New York—The state reported that the increase in the number of students exiting with a diploma suggests that more and more students with disabilities are participating in the state assessments, which they are required to pass to graduate.

Ohio—The state suspects that the number of students reported in the reached maximum age category is inflated for 1999-2000. Ohio will address the discrepancies in the 2000-01 data.

Pennsylvania—The state attributed the changes in the exiting data from 1998-99 to 1999-2000 to its new data collection system.

Texas—Each fall, the state collects exiting data for the previous year. Data reported for school year 1999-2000 are actually for students exiting in 1998-99.

Washington—The state's exiting data are for school year 1998-99.

Tables AE1-AE4: Discipline

Arizona—The state attributed the increase in the number of students reported in the category removed by a hearing officer to a change in collection methodology. The decrease in removal by school personnel and in weapons offenses is being attributed to the state's "zero tolerance" policy.

Arkansas—The state noted that the increase in the number of short-term suspensions and in the unduplicated count of children subject to unilateral removal are attributed to this being a new data collection. This was only the second year that the districts were required to report discipline data, and the data manager believes some of the information may be incorrect.

Bureau of Indian Affairs—The Bureau noted that the race/ethnicity data do not match the computed totals. The Bureau further noted that it is unable to correct the error and attributed the year-to-year differences to the newness of the collection and to problems collecting the data at the district level.

California—The state noted that the variation from the previous year in the unduplicated count of children subject to unilateral removal was due to an error in reporting last year's data.

Delaware—The state noted that variations in all the discipline data from 1998-99 to 1999-2000 are the result of incomplete data reported for 1998-99.

Kentucky—The state attributed the changes in the discipline data from 1998-99 to 1999-2000 to the new data collection system. The state further noted that reporting discipline data remains problematic for Kentucky because reporting covers the entire year, and the same student may have multiple incidents to be reported. Kentucky does not have an individual student record system.

Louisiana—The state was unable to report an unduplicated count of children subject to unilateral removal for drug or weapon offenses.

Massachusetts—The state attributed year-to-year changes in the discipline data to a new data system and more accurate reporting in 1999-2000.

Missouri—The state indicated that variations in the discipline data from 1998-99 to 1999-2000 are the result of reporting some categories for the first time. In 1998-99, disability by condition and race/ethnicity were optional categories in the discipline collection, and Missouri did not report them.

New Mexico—The state noted that the discipline data are still collected on a paper and pencil form because the state has not had enough time to incorporate them into the unified data collection system. This was the second year that the state provided discipline data, and this year, there was wider participation than in 1998-99. The collection has not had enough time to establish itself; therefore, significant changes are expected.

Ohio—The state indicated that increases from the previous year in the number of children subject to unilateral removal for drug and weapon offenses might be a result of a major emphasis by the state on safe and drug-free schools. Student codes of conduct and state law leave little discretion regarding the consequences for certain types of behavior.

Oklahoma—The state reported that the changes in the discipline data from the previous year are the result of more accurate reporting in 1999-2000.

Pennsylvania—The state noted that collecting the discipline data has been problematic. The data are hard to collect at the district level because of the state's collection methodology. In addition, there are conflicting definitions used at the state and district levels. The state will address the problem with more data collection training at the state and local levels.

Tennessee—The state attributed the variations in the discipline data from 1998-99 to 1999-2000 to a change in its data collection methodology. The 1998-99 data were collected by way of a separate survey. This year's data are collected as part of the special education reporting system.

Wisconsin—The state was unable to report an unduplicated count of children subject to unilateral removal for drug and weapon offenses.

Table AH1: Counts of Infants and Toddlers Served

Illinois—The state reported that the increase in the child count from 1999-2000 to 2000-01 is a continued result of massive Child Find efforts mandated by the state courts. Further, the state also began allowing children to remain eligible until age 3 regardless of their progress.

Tables AH7: Early Intervention Service Settings

Colorado—The state of Colorado attributes the increase in the number of children served in the home setting category to a change in focus to concentrate on getting children out of center-based programs and providing more services in natural environments. One of the larger counties in the state transformed its entire project from center based (programs for developmental delay) to focus on providing services in natural environments.

Connecticut—The state reports that the decrease in the number of children served in the programs for typically developing children setting is a result of training staff on the definition of the category.

Illinois—The state reports that its increased child count resulted in more children served in all settings categories from 1998-99 to 1999-2000. This is more apparent for the home settings category as a result of an emphasis on providing services in natural environments.

Indiana—The state reports that the change in the number of children served in different settings, in particular the 71% increase in the home setting, reflects the shift toward providing services in natural environments.

New York—The increase in the number of children served in the service provider location setting is primarily the result of guidance given to counties regarding how to code specific settings in the state's data collection program.

Puerto Rico—The decrease in the service provider location category (59.3%) is the result of the late receipt of settings data for children served by the Department of Education. The data were not received from the Puerto Rico Department of Education until after the February 1, 2001, date of submission, for a total of 205 children. The state did not submit revised data for this count.

Texas—The state reports that the increase in the number of children served in the other settings category is due to the incorrect classification of some children in 1998-99. In the first year after the family child care category was dropped from the Federal reporting requirements, programs may have reported children receiving care in the family child care setting as receiving services in home-based rather than the other settings category. The state is now correctly reporting these children.

Table AH12: Early Intervention Program Exiting

Alabama—The state reports that the 75% decrease in the attempts to contact unsuccessful category is a result of the state's changing the way the exit data for this category are collected. In 1998-99, two of the state's exiting reasons were combined to construct the Federal attempts to contact unsuccessful exit category. For 1999-

2000, these categories are no longer combined, and the state is now correctly reporting in this category.

Connecticut—The state reports that the increase in the number of children exiting under the categories Part B eligibility not determined, withdrawal by parent, and attempts to contact unsuccessful, as well as the decreases in the number who exit to other programs and exit with no referral are a result of improving the state's data system. The state also began running reports showing each program where data were missing. This also helped to improve data accuracy.

Georgia—The state explains that the increase in the number of infants and toddlers exiting is the result of improvements to the data collection procedures. Georgia is now able to accurately report exit data. In the previous year (1998-99), the state of Georgia was unable to accurately report exit data and as a result underreported the number exiting.

Illinois—The large increase in the Part B eligibility exiting category was a result of the state's implementing a policy allowing children to remain eligible until age 3 regardless of progress. The increase in the total number of children exiting is related to increases in Child Find efforts and the corresponding increased child count.

Indiana—The state reported that the increase in the total number of children exiting is due to increased enrollment. The state noted that some other changes (completion of IFSP, withdrawn by parent, attempts to contact unsuccessful) should be expected if the state is beginning to reach children whose need for services is less severe.

Oklahoma—The state attributes the increase in the number of children exiting under the Part B eligible category, and the decreases in the number of children exiting with no referral and with Part B eligibility not determined, to its creation of a new database and training emphasis on the accurate reporting of data.

Texas—The state reports that the increases in the categories exit with no referral and deceased are correct. Though the increase in the number deceased seems large (125 in 1998-99 and 166 in 1999-2000), in 1997-98 there were 143 deceased, suggesting some variation across years. In addition to the year-to-year variation, the state also believes that some of the reported increase in deaths is due to an increased number of medically fragile infants entering into services as a result of efforts on the part of programs to link with neonatal intensive care units.

The state explains the decline in the number of children withdrawn by parent as the result of changes in how the state classifies children who moved within the state. In 1998-99, children who exited for this reason were included in the withdrawal by parent category. In 1999-2000, these children were removed from the exit number, since they were not really exiting Part C services.

Wisconsin—The state reports that the increase in the number of children exiting under the Part B eligible category reflects better reporting as well as significant increases in the number of children served in the 1999-2000 child count. Wisconsin's data require local programs to update the information on the children when they exit. With prodding from state staff, the local programs are more consistently reporting the changes.

In addition, the state also indicated that in 1999-2000 its reporting system did not include all the exit reasons used in the Federal report. The system has since been updated to include all of the Federal exit reasons.

Table AH10: Early Intervention Services

Alabama—The state reports that the 1998-99 count of other services incorrectly included service coordination. To correct this, a statement was placed on the bottom of the form explaining which services were included in "other." As a result, in 1999-2000, service coordination was no longer included in the "other" count. This resulted in the extreme difference in the numbers across the years.

Illinois—The state reports that the increase in the number of services provided is the direct result of the increased child count.

Indiana—The state reports that the increases in speech language pathology and audiology services are due to continuing outreach efforts and implementation of universal newborn hearing screening. The majority of the increase in assistive technology was for speech and hearing-related equipment. The decrease in transportation services is the result of a change in the location of services to the child's home.

New Mexico—The state reports that the increase in the other early intervention service category is consistent with the increase in the number of children served and with providers becoming more proficient with data entry into the FIT database.

Puerto Rico—The state reported increases in several service categories and offers the following as explanations:

1. The increase in special instruction is a result of the state's changing how it classifies instructions to families. Instructions to families were being provided; however, they were counted under family training. The state has changed the classification and now counts instructions to families under the special instruction service category.

2. The state explains that the increase in the number of audiology services is a result of the state's failing to include audiology-related services, such as fitting/adjustments of earphones, in previous counts.

Wisconsin—The state suggests that the decrease in the transportation service category is the result of more children receiving services in the home.

Table AH4: Early Intervention Personnel Employed

Illinois—The state reports that in 1998-99, special educators were incorrectly reported under the orientation/mobility personnel category. In the same year, the service coordinators were counted as other professional staff. These errors were corrected for the 1999-2000 reporting year.