



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

APR -8 2003

Contact Persons

Name : Ruth Ryder
Telephone : (202) 205-5547
Name : Lawrence Wexler
Telephone : (202) 205-5390
Name : Sarah Willis
Telephone : (202) 205-8658

OSEP - 03-5

MEMORANDUM

TO: Chief State School Officers
Lead Agency Directors

FROM: Stephanie S. Lee, Director
Office of Special Education Programs *Stephanie S. Lee*

RE: Implementation of the Office of Special Education Programs' Focused
Monitoring during Calendar Year 2003

The purpose of this memorandum is to inform States about important changes to the Office of Special Education Program's (OSEP's) monitoring of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Since the passage of the 1997 Amendments to IDEA, OSEP has worked to shape its accountability work in a way that drives and supports improved results for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities, while continuing to require that States protect the individual rights of children with disabilities and their families. During this time, OSEP instituted major changes in the monitoring process through implementation of a Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP).

After soliciting input from a diverse group of stakeholders, OSEP has developed focused monitoring procedures that target resources on those performance issues most closely related to improved results for children with disabilities and to those States most in need of improvement on those performance issues. OSEP will implement the Continuous Improvement and Focused Monitoring System (CIFMS), which incorporates the most effective elements of CIMP and focused monitoring and enables OSEP to work with States in a way that will improve both performance and compliance.

Accountability Strategy to Support Improvement

OSEP will implement an integrated, four-part accountability strategy: (1) verifying the effectiveness and accuracy of States' monitoring, assessment, and data collection systems; (2) attending to States at high risk for compliance, financial, and/or management failure; (3) supporting States in assessing their performance and compliance, and in planning, implementing, and evaluating improvement strategies; and (4) focusing OSEP's intervention on States with low ranking performance on critical performance indicators. This four-part accountability strategy is aligned with the recommendations of the President's Commission on Excellence in Special Education. It will enable OSEP to: (1) focus on a small set of critical indicators that are based on improving results for children with disabilities and their families; (2) support improvement in the validity and reliability of data that OSEP and States use to focus on performance; (3) through improvement planning, and the Annual and Biennial Performance Report process, help ensure that accountability for improvement rests primarily with States; (4) provide States with needed technical assistance; and (5) focus the attention of OSEP's Monitoring and State Improvement Planning (MSIP) Division on the States that need the most support to improve their performance.

1. Verifying the effectiveness and accuracy of States' monitoring, assessment and data collection systems

Because OSEP's focused monitoring relies so heavily on State-reported data regarding performance and compliance, it is critical to ensure that States are reporting accurate data based upon State designed systems for data collection/reporting and monitoring. Therefore, OSEP's primary focus during the 2003 calendar year will be on verification of the effectiveness of States' systems for data collection, assessment, and monitoring. For each State, OSEP staff will analyze the accuracy of critical information regarding States' systems for monitoring, assessment, and data collection as this information is essential to analyzing and improving State performance, student performance, and the protection of child and family rights. Based on these analyses, OSEP will select some States for on-site data verification, which will involve some data collection activities at the State educational agency and lead agency level.

2. Attending to States at high risk for compliance, financial and/or management failure

In addition to its focus on States that are low ranking on critical performance indicators (see number 4, below), OSEP will also focus its intervention on States that it determines are at high risk for compliance, financial, and/or management failure. These will include primarily States with significant uncorrected audit findings.

3. Supporting States in assessing their performance and compliance, and in planning, implementing, and evaluating improvement strategies

All States have completed a self-assessment of their performance and compliance for both Part C and Part B. By July 2003, all States will have submitted an improvement plan to OSEP. In the future, we anticipate that States will be using their Part C Annual Performance Report and their Part B Biennial Performance Report to update their self-assessments and their improvement plans, including reporting on the impact of their improvement strategies on performance and compliance.

OSEP will continue to make technical assistance available to all States regarding self-assessment, improvement planning, and evaluation, including reviewing and commenting on improvement plans. As part of this process, OSEP will require that States demonstrate that they correct any noncompliance that OSEP has identified through monitoring or that States identify through their own self-assessment process. OSEP will target technical assistance to support States in these efforts.

4. Focusing OSEP's intervention on States with low ranking performance on critical performance indicators

With input from a diverse national group of stakeholders, OSEP has developed preliminary indicators for ranking States' performance annually. The newly-funded National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring will gather stakeholder input regarding indicators and benchmarks through its advisory board, and OSEP will use this input to finalize the indicators, and to set benchmarks for each. OSEP will widely disseminate these indicators and benchmarks to States and other stakeholders.

As noted above, ensuring the accuracy and completeness of State-reported data is essential, because OSEP will be relying so heavily on these data in ranking States and targeting its interventions regarding performance (i.e., child outcomes such as graduation, dropout for Part B and identification for Part C services). For this first year of implementation, while OSEP is focusing on determining the accuracy and completeness of State-reported data, OSEP is reporting States' performance on four initial indicators in rank order (see the attached rank-ordered data tables). In the future, OSEP will be using additional indicators such as participation and performance on assessment for Part B and exiting for Part C. OSEP encourages States to closely examine the rank orders and the data reported for these indicators, keeping in mind that while a low ranking is a "red flag" that may indicate a need for improvement, a high ranking does not necessarily mean good performance where it is a result of poor quality data or low standards. Based on this analysis, States should consider how to revise their improvement plans to improve their performance. All States, including the States with low-ranking performance, must take effective and timely steps to ensure the correction of all noncompliance, and such correction of noncompliance must be an urgent priority for each State.

Technical Assistance to Support Improvement

It is important that all States work aggressively to improve results for children with disabilities and their families. It is especially important that States whose data show the greatest need for improvement take prompt, evidence-based, action to achieve significant and sustainable improvement in their performance. OSEP will make a broad range of support available to all States to support them in:

1. Collecting and analyzing data to enable them to identify the factors that will support or impede their improvement strategies;
2. Making evidence-based decisions about the strategies that are most likely to result in systemic change and improved results; and

3. Identifying the evidence of change, benchmarks, and timelines that will assist the State in evaluating the impact of the improvement strategies.

OSEP is working to make a number of resources available to States to support their intensive improvement work. Resources under consideration include:

1. A web-site that focuses on research-based effective practices for data-based analysis of underlying causes of poor performance and the development and implementation of improvement strategies.
2. Periodic conference calls and regional meetings of States focused on effective improvement of outcomes for children with disabilities and their families.
3. Strong collaboration between OSEP, the Regional Resource Centers, the Monitoring Center, and other partners in the Technical Assistance and Dissemination Network, to ensure effective brokering and provision of technical assistance to States.

We know that States are working hard to improve results for all children, including children with disabilities. We look forward to continuing to focus our monitoring and technical assistance activities to support improvement efforts at the State level.

Attachments (rank-ordered data tables)

cc: State Directors of Special Education
State Part C Coordinators
Technical Assistance and Dissemination Network
Technical Assistance Alliance for Parent Centers

Table 1.1
 Number, Percentage, and Difference from National Baseline of Students Ages 14-21+
 Exiting Special Education with a Diploma
 Based on Number of Students Leaving School by Disability
 During the 2000-2001 School Year

	ALL DISABILITIES		DIF
	#	%	

TEXAS	21,166	86	29
KANSAS	2,370	77	20
NEW JERSEY	9,250	75	18
PENNSYLVANIA	5,533	75	18
NORTH DAKOTA	516	74	17
NEW MEXICO	2,262	73	16
NEBRASKA	1,006	71	14
SOUTH DAKOTA	439	71	14
OHIO	10,225	71	14
MONTANA	739	70	13
MASSACHUSETTS	5,673	70	13
CONNECTICUT	2,995	70	13
MINNESOTA	4,306	70	13
OKLAHOMA	3,123	69	12
WISCONSIN	4,878	69	12
ARKANSAS	1,786	68	11
IDAHO	924	68	11
IOWA	2,645	67	10
MISSOURI	5,024	66	9
COLORADO	2,423	66	9
ILLINOIS	9,383	66	9
MAINE	1,179	65	8
RHODE ISLAND	1,097	65	8
CALIFORNIA	13,870	64	7
MARYLAND	3,353	63	6
WASHINGTON	3,150	63	6
DELAWARE	364	62	5
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1,150	61	4
ARIZONA	2,623	60	3
WEST VIRGINIA	1,621	59	2
VERMONT	485	57	0
WYOMING	409	57	0
VIRGINIA	4,233	55	-2
UTAH	1,077	54	-3
INDIANA	4,071	53	-4
KENTUCKY	2,034	50	-7
ALASKA	437	50	-7
OREGON	1,279	43	-14
NEW YORK	10,301	41	-16
MICHIGAN	5,256	40	-17
NORTH CAROLINA	2,896	38	-19
FLORIDA	5,558	35	-22
TENNESSEE	2,224	33	-24
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	152	31	-26
SOUTH CAROLINA	1,120	29	-28
PUERTO RICO	547	28	-29
GEORGIA	2,180	26	-31
LOUISIANA	1,204	26	-31
NEVADA	492	26	-31
MISSISSIPPI	731	24	-33
HAWAII	167	24	-33
ALABAMA	1,260	23	-34
VIRGIN ISLANDS	55	70	13
GUAM	68	64	7
AMERICAN SAMOA	17	52	-5
BUR. OF INDIAN AFFAIRS	194	47	-10
NORTHERN MARIANAS	3	18	-39
PALAU	0	0	-57
NATIONAL BASELINE	173,523	57	

 is - # in disability category graduating with diploma + # in disability category leaving school.

Students leaving school includes students who graduated with a diploma, received a certificate, dropped out, died, and reached maximum age.

DIF = Difference from National Baseline.

Differences in state graduation rates should be interpreted with caution. Standards for graduation vary widely across states.

Please see Data Notes for an explanation of individual state differences on how data are reported (<http://IDEAdata.org/docs/bdatanotes2001.pdf>).
 Data as of August 30, 2002.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, Data Analysis System (DANS).

Table 1.3
 Number, Percentage, and Difference from National Baseline of Students Ages 14-21+ Dropping Out
 Based on Number of Students 14-21+ Leaving School by Disability
 During the 2000-2001 School Year

	ALL DISABILITIES		
	#	%	DIP
TEXAS	3,345	14	-15
CALIFORNIA	3,912	18	-11
SOUTH DAKOTA	119	19	-10
OHIO	2,903	20	-9
KANSAS	649	21	-8
NORTH DAKOTA	154	22	-7
TENNESSEE	1,509	23	-6
NEW MEXICO	699	23	-6
NEW JERSEY	2,794	23	-6
NEBRASKA	324	23	-6
PENNSYLVANIA	1,766	24	-5
VIRGINIA	1,841	24	-5
IDAHO	351	26	-3
ARKANSAS	678	26	-3
WASHINGTON	1,331	27	-2
COLORADO	987	27	-2
MARYLAND	1,421	27	-2
CONNECTICUT	1,174	27	-2
MASSACHUSETTS	2,225	27	-2
WISCONSIN	1,980	28	-1
ILLINOIS	3,989	28	-1
RHODE ISLAND	472	28	-1
MISSISSIPPI	859	28	-1
MONTANA	297	28	-1
MISSOURI	2,145	28	-1
DELAWARE	173	29	0
MINNESOTA	1,822	29	0
IOWA	1,171	29	0
OKLAHOMA	1,341	30	1
MAINE	539	30	1
FLORIDA	5,052	32	3
INDIANA	2,586	33	4
WEST VIRGINIA	966	35	6
NEW HAMPSHIRE	669	35	6
ALABAMA	1,977	36	7
SOUTH CAROLINA	1,433	37	8
ARIZONA	1,654	38	9
NEW YORK	9,633	38	9
NEVADA	733	38	9
WYOMING	275	38	9
PUERTO RICO	763	39	10
VERMONT	331	39	10
KENTUCKY	1,601	40	11
LOUISIANA	1,877	41	12
NORTH CAROLINA	3,104	41	12
OREGON	1,230	41	12
UTAH	830	42	13
GEORGIA	3,487	42	13
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	209	43	14
ALASKA	404	46	17
MICHIGAN	7,151	54	25
HAWAII	494	70	41
PALAU	0	0	-29
VIRGIN ISLANDS	16	20	-9
GUAM	33	31	2
NORTHERN MARIANAS	6	35	6
AMERICAN SAMOA	14	42	13
BUR. OF INDIAN AFFAIRS	174	42	13
NATIONAL BASELINE	89,672	29	

 % _ # in disability category dropped out + # in disability category leaving school.

"Dropped out" is defined as the total who were enrolled at some point in the reporting year, were not enrolled at the end of the reporting year, and did not exit through any of the other bases described. This category includes dropouts, runaways, GED recipients, expulsions, status unknown, and other exiters.

Students leaving school includes students who graduated with a diploma, received a certificate, dropped out, died, and reached maximum age.

DIF - Difference from National Baseline.

Differences in state dropout rates should be interpreted with caution. Standards for graduation vary widely across states.

Please see Data Notes for an explanation of individual state differences on how data are reported (<http://IDEAdata.org/docs/bdatanotes2001.pdf>).
 Data as of August 30, 2002.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, Data Analysis System (DAMS).

Table 1.5
 IDEA 2000-2001 Graduation Rate for Students Ages 14-21+,
 Compared with the Regular Education Graduation Rate

	IDEA k	IDEA % Grad	Reg ED % Grad	DIF
TEXAS	21,166	86	68	18
NEW MEXICO	2,262	73	63	10
KANSAS	2,370	77	76	1
ARIZONA	2,623	60	60	0
ARKANSAS	1,786	68	71	-3
COLORADO	2,423	66	70	-4
NEW JERSEY	9,250	75	80	-5
OKLAHOMA	3,123	69	75	-6
IDAHO	924	68	75	-7
OHIO	10,225	71	78	-7
SOUTH DAKOTA	439	71	78	-7
CALIFORNIA	13,870	64	73	-9
WASHINGTON	3,150	63	72	-9
MASSACHUSETTS	5,673	70	80	-10
MONTANA	739	70	80	-10
PENNSYLVANIA	5,533	75	85	-10
CONNECTICUT	2,995	70	81	-11
MISSOURI	5,024	66	77	-11
MAINE	1,179	65	77	-12
RHODE ISLAND	1,097	65	77	-12
DELAWARE	364	62	75	-13
NORTH DAKOTA	516	74	87	-13
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1,150	61	74	-13
MINNESOTA	4,306	70	84	-14
NEBRASKA	1,006	71	85	-14
ILLINOIS	9,383	66	82	-16
MARYLAND	3,353	63	79	-16
WISCONSIN	4,878	69	87	-18
WEST VIRGINIA	1,621	59	78	-19
WYOMING	409	57	76	-19
ALASKA	437	50	70	-20
INDIANA	4,071	53	74	-21
KENTUCKY	2,034	50	71	-21
VIRGINIA	4,233	55	76	-21
UTAH	1,077	54	77	-23
OREGON	1,279	43	67	-24
IOWA	2,645	67	93	-26
TENNESSEE	2,224	33	59	-26
FLORIDA	5,558	35	63	-28
NORTH CAROLINA	2,896	38	66	-28
VERMONT	485	57	85	-28
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	152	31	60	-29
GEORGIA	2,180	26	57	-31
NEW YORK	10,301	41	74	-33
MISSISSIPPI	731	24	60	-36
MICHIGAN	5,256	40	77	-37
NEVADA	492	26	63	-37
ALABAMA	1,260	23	62	-39
LOUISIANA	1,204	26	66	-40
SOUTH CAROLINA	1,120	29	72	-43
HAWAII	167	24	72	-48
PUERTO RICO	547	28		
AMERICAN SAMOA	17	52		
BUR. OF INDIAN AFFAIRS	194	47		
GUAM	68	64		
NORTHERN MARIANAS	3	18		
PALAU	0	0		
VIRGIN ISLANDS	55	70		

----- --
 -IDEA % Grad' is equal to the number of students, ages 14-21+, graduating with a regular high school diploma divided by the sum of the number who graduated, received a certificate, dropped out, died, and reached maximum age.

'Reg Ed % Grad' are for the class of 1998. The percent is calculated by dividing the number of regular diploma recipients in 1998 by the number of 8th graders counted in 1993, adjusted for population change. Percentages are from Greene, J. (2001) High School Graduation

Rates in the United States. Downloaded from the web, http://www.manhattan-institute.org/cr_baeo.pdf, on 1/28/2002.

DIF - Difference between graduation rates for special education and regular education.

Differences in state graduation rates should be interpreted with caution. Standards for graduation vary widely across states.

Please see Data Notes for an explanation of individual state differences on how data are reported (<http://IDEAdata.org/docs/bdatanotes2001.pdf>).
 Data as of August 30, 2002.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, Data Analysis System (DANS).

Exiting Data Notes (Part B)

Alabama-The state attributed the increases in the number of students exiting special education in the moved, known to be continuing category and the decrease in the reached maximum age category to improvements in its data collection methodology.

Arizona-The state attributed the increase in the number of students reported in the moved, not known to be continuing category to incorrect data. The state noted that it is difficult to collect and report clean data in this category but believes this will change in 1 to 2 years when the new student accountability information system is in place.

California-The state attributed the decrease in the number of children reported in the moved, not known to be continuing category to a change in the data collection methodology. The state is now forcing school districts to do a better job of tracking students in the two moved categories.

Colorado-Data reported for school year 2000-01 are actually data for students exiting between December 1999 and December 2000.

Connecticut-In the past few years, many students were counted in the no longer receives special education category because of a change in the state eligibility guidelines. This change meant that many students were no longer eligible for special education. These new eligibility guidelines particularly affected students with specific learning disabilities. This year, there was a decrease in the total number of students who left special education services, as well as a decrease in the number of students with specific learning disabilities who left special education services. The state believes this is because the data have begun to stabilize.

District of Columbia-The District of Columbia reported that it did not report any students in the no longer receives special education services exit category because it does not collect these data.

Georgia-The state attributed the increase in the number of students in the moved, known to be continuing category to better tracking of transient students in its database.

Hawaii-The state attributed the increase in the number of students with speech or language impairments who are no longer receiving special education services to better training of teachers **regarding eligibility** for this category under IDEA. As a result of this training, students were identified differently, and many were taken out of all special education services and are now served under Section 504. The state reported that the change in how students are identified also resulted in an overall increase in the number of students exiting special education and an increase in the number of Asian/Pacific Islanders exiting. Many of the students now served under 504 rather than IDEA are of Asian/Pacific Islander descent.

The state attributed the decrease in the number of students with specific learning disabilities who received a certificate to the large number of students from this category who exited special education due to state efforts to place students in the least restrictive environments or to mainstream them.

Hawaii reported that its data were captured from the Integrated Special Education Database (ISPED), a fairly new system. As improvements are made in ISPED, the state expects the data to become increasingly accurate. The Special Education Section also plans to resume the practice of verifying data with districts. This practice was curtailed this past year due to difficulties with matching information from different databases.

Idaho-Data reported for school year 2000-01 are actually data for students exiting between December 1999 and December 2000.

The state reported that it awards the same diploma to all students, regardless of whether the diploma is earned by meeting regular graduation requirements or IEP requirements.

Exiting Data Notes (Part B)

Ohio-The state noted that the number of children reported as reached maximum age is incorrect. Most of the students reported have clearly not reached maximum age pursuant to state law because they are under 21 years old.

Texas-Each fall, the state collects exiting data for the previous year. Data reported for school year 2000-01 are actually for students exiting in 1999-2000. Due to a different timeframe for the collection of disability data and exiting data, 5,912 records did not have disability data for exiting. Disability was imputed for these students using the disability distribution for known cases. Disability information for the entire school year will be available for the exiting report of 2000-01.

Vermont-Data reported for school year 2000-01 are actually data for students exiting between December 1999 and December 2000.

Wisconsin-Data reported for school year 2000-01 are actually data for students exiting between December 1999 and December 2000.

The state reported that the number of Asian/Pacific islanders collected by one school district is incorrect.

Table 5.2
Number, Percentage, and Difference from National Baseline of Children Ages 6-21 Served in
Different Educational Environments
Under IDEA, Part B
During the 2000-2001 School Year

	ALL DISABILITIES		DIP
	OUTSIDE REGULAR CLASS		
	c 21%		
	#	%	
NORTH DAKOTA	9,781	79	33
VERMONT	9,734	79	33
NEW HAMPSHIRE	20,472	74	28
OREGON	49,740	72	26
COLORADO	50,423	72	26
IDAHO	16,518	65	19
SOUTH DAKOTA	9,313	65	19
MINNESOTA	62,741	64	18
CALIFORNIA	356,720	61	15
NEBRASKA	23,119	59	13
KANSAS	31,473	59	13
NORTH CAROLINA	94,609	58	12
INDIANA	82,168	58	12
ALASKA	9,289	58	12
MONTANA	9,723	55	9
CONNECTICUT	36,738	55	9
MISSOURI	67,028	53	7
MAINE	16,456	52	6
WYOMING	5,981	52	6
KENTUCKY	39,702	51	5
NEVADA	17,476	51	5
NEW YORK	192,839	50	4
WEST VIRGINIA	22,217	49	3
WASHINGTON	52,172	49	3
FLORIDA	163,789	49	3
ARIZONA	42,086	48	2
ALABAMA	44,104	48	2
MISSISSIPPI	25,993	47	1
OKLAHOMA	37,091	47	1
MARYLAND	47,246	46	0
RHODE ISLAND	12,954	46	0
IOWA	30,197	45	-1
TENNESSEE	51,901	45	-1
HAWAII	9,878	45	-1
LOUISIANA	39,098	44	-2
MICHIGAN	89,374	44	-2
PUERTO RICO	25,544	44	-2
NEW JERSEY	90,688	44	-2
WISCONSIN	47,951	43	-3
UTAH	20,405	42	-4
OHIO	89,679	41	-5
PENNSYLVANIA	89,672	41	-5
ARKANSAS	20,263	38	-8
VIRGINIA	54,441	37	-9
ILLINOIS	97,734	36	-10
GEORGIA	56,011	36	-10
NEW MEXICO	15,724	33	-13
DELAWARE	4,902	32	-14
SOUTH CAROLINA	30,153	32	-14
TEXAS	129,886	29	-17
MASSACHUSETTS	27,487	18	-28
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	441	4	-42
BUR. OF INDIAN AFFAIRS	5,296	62	16
AMERICAN SAMOA	371	57	11
PALAU	48	39	-7
GUAM	638	31	-15
VIRGIN ISLANDS	355	25	-21
NORTHERN MARIANAS	137	25	-21
NATIONAL BASELINE	2,687,969	46	

% - # in environment category + # in all environment categories.

DIP . Difference from National Baseline.

Please see Data Notes for an explanation of individual state differences on how data are reported
(<http://IDEAdata.org/doce/bdatanotes2001.pdf>).

Data based on the December 1, 2000 count, updated as of August 30, 2002.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, Data Analysis System (DAMS).

Table 5.2
Number, Percentage, and Difference from National Baseline of Children Ages 6-21 Served in
Different Educational Environments
Under IDEA, Part B
During the 2000-2001 School Year

	OUTSIDE REGULAR CLASS		
	#	%	DIF
NORTH DAKOTA	463	4	-16
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1,071	4	-16
VERMONT	740	6	-14
SOUTH DAKOTA	896	6	-14
IDAHO	1,822	7	-13
COLORADO	5,607	8	-12
OREGON	5,568	8	-12
MINNESOTA	8,568	9	-11
ALABAMA	8,764	10	-10
WYOMING	1,107	10	-10
MONTANA	1,877	11	-9
OKLAHOMA	9,725	12	-8
ALASKA	1,984	12	-8
KANSAS	6,624	12	-8
MISSOURI	15,864	13	-7
NEBRASKA	5,013	13	-7
WEST VIRGINIA	5,785	13	-7
MAINE	4,190	13	-7
ARKANSAS	7,421	14	-6
WISCONSIN	16,016	14	-6
KENTUCKY	11,530	15	-5
IOWA	9,911	15	-5
WASHINGTON	16,567	15	-5
MASSACHUSETTS	23,447	15	-5
NEVADA	5,429	16	-4
CONNECTICUT	10,768	16	-4
NORTH CAROLINA	28,318	17	-3
TEXAS	79,814	18	-2
ARIZONA	15,402	18	-2
DELAWARE	2,670	18	-2
CALIFORNIA	104,492	18	-2
TENNESSEE	20,595	18	-2
NEW JERSEY	37,252	18	-2
PUERTO RICO	10,627	18	-2
OHIO	41,539	19	-1
HAWAII	4,659	21	1
INDIANA	30,065	21	1
UTAH	10,314	21	1
MISSISSIPPI	12,277	22	2
PENNSYLVANIA	49,193	22	2
FLORIDA	75,674	22	2
MARYLAND	23,574	23	3
MICHIGAN	46,760	23	3
SOUTH CAROLINA	23,136	24	4
VIRGINIA	37,229	25	5
GEORGIA	41,356	27	7
RHODE ISLAND	7,837	28	8
ILLINOIS	76,674	29	9
NEW YORK	116,112	30	10
LOUISIANA	26,747	30	10
NEW MEXICO	15,344	32	12
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	4,229	42	22
BUR. OF INDIAN AFFAIRS	576	7	-13
AMERICAN SAMOA	58	9	-11
PALAU	25	20	0
VIRGIN ISLANDS	396	28	8
GUAM	596	29	9
NORTHERN MARIANAS	329	60	40
NATIONAL BASELINE	1,130,626	20	

% - # in environment category + # in all environment categories.

DIF - Difference from National Baseline.

Please see Data Notes for an explanation of individual state differences on how data are reported
(<http://IDEAdata.org/docs/bdatanotes2001.pdf>).

Data based on the December 1, 2000 count, updated as of August 30, 2002.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, Data Analysis System (DAMS).

Number, Table 5.2
 Percentage, and Difference from National Baseline of Children Ages 6-21 Served in
 Different Educational Environments
 Under IDEA, Part B
 During the 2000-2001 School Year

ALL DISABILITIES

	PUBLIC/PRIVATE SEPARATE SCHOOL FACILITY		
	#	%	DIF
HAWAII	0	0.0	-3.0
WEST VIRGINIA	61	0.1	-2.9
NORTH DAKOTA	59	0.5	-2.5
NEW MEXICO	242	0.5	-2.5
LOUISIANA	490	0.6	-2.4
INDIANA	804	0.6	-2.4
TEXAS	2,688	0.6	-2.4
OKLAHOMA	478	0.6	-2.4
WASHINGTON	729	0.7	-2.3
MONTANA	140	0.8	-2.2
IDAHO	212	0.8	-2.2
WYOMING	97	0.8	-2.2
KENTUCKY	665	0.9	-2.1
MISSISSIPPI	480	0.9	-2.1
ARKANSAS	487	0.9	-2.1
GEORGIA	1,510	1.0	-2.0
SOUTH CAROLINA	974	1.0	-2.0
TENNESSEE	1,312	1.1	-1.9
ALABAMA	1,071	1.2	-1.8
WISCONSIN	1,404	1.3	-1.7
MAINE	406	1.3	-1.7
NORTH CAROLINA	2,240	1.4	-1.6
COLORADO	1,116	1.6	-1.4
NEBRASKA	635	1.6	-1.4
SOUTH DAKOTA	237	1.7	-1.3
ALASKA	279	1.7	-1.3
FLORIDA	6,074	1.8	-1.2
NEVADA	651	1.9	-1.1
ARIZONA	1,754	2.0	-1.0
VIRGINIA	3,171	2.1	-0.9
KANSAS	1,160	2.2	-0.8
OREGON	1,682	2.4	-0.6
NEW HAMPSHIRE	678	2.4	-0.6
IOWA	1,647	2.5	-0.5
CALIFORNIA	15,839	2.7	-0.3
PENNSYLVANIA	6,335	2.9	-0.1
MISSOURI	3,622	2.9	-0.1
UTAH	1,593	3.3	0.3
MICHIGAN	6,993	3.5	0.5
RHODE ISLAND	1,033	3.7	0.7
VERMONT	483	3.9	0.9
MINNESOTA	4,015	4.1	1.1
DELAWARE	683	4.5	1.5
CONNECTICUT	3,178	4.8	1.8
PUERTO RICO	2,809	4.9	1.9
ILLINOIS	14,921	5.6	2.6
NEW YORK	22,650	5.8	2.8
MARYLAND	6,775	6.7	3.7
OHIO	14,688	6.7	3.7
MASSACHUSETTS	10,940	7.2	4.2
NEW JERSEY	18,654	9.1	6.1
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	2,957	29.2	26.2
AMERICAN SAMOA	0	0.0	-3.0
VIRGIN ISLANDS	0	0.0	-3.0
GUAM	3	0.1	-2.9
BUR. OF INDIAN AFFAIRS	13	0.2	-2.8
NORTHERN MARIANAS	4	0.7	-2.3
PALAU	3	2.4	-0.6
NATIONAL BASELINE	173,824	3.0	

4 - # in environment category + # in all environment

categories. DIF = Difference from National

Baseline.

Please see Data Notes for an explanation of individual state differences on how data are reported
 (<http://IDEAdata.org/docs/bdatanotee2001.pdf>).

Data based on the December 1, 2000 count, updated as of August 30, 2002.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, Data Analysis System (DANS).

Educational Environments Data Notes

Alabama-The state attributed the increase in the number of children ages 3 through 5 served in the part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education category to district-level improvements in the transition of children from Part C to Part B.

The state attributed the decrease in the number of students ages 6 through 21 served in public residential facilities to a concerted effort to place students with disabilities in regular classrooms.

California-The state attributed the increase in the number of children ages 6 through 21 who received special education outside the regular class less than 21% of the day to an increase in the number of special education students being placed in less restrictive environments.

Illinois-The state noted that some of its definitions do not match Federal definitions for time outside the regular classroom. Illinois tracks time outside the classroom in two categories: from 1 to 49% of the school day and more than 50% of the school day.

Kentucky-The state attributed the decreases in both the early childhood setting and the early childhood special education setting and the increase in the part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education setting to district training on educational environments. Districts have been trained to report students who have any amount of time in both programs in the part-time early childhood/ part-time early childhood special education category. Previously, many districts reported students as either full-time early childhood or full-time early childhood special education setting based on percentages similar to those used in the placement categories for students ages 6 through 21.

The state attributed the increase in the separate school environment to three specific districts, two of which had new special education directors.

Missouri-The state reported that the increase in part-time early childhood special education is due to a change in the crosswalk from the school-age educational environment categories to the early childhood categories used for kindergarten students.

Montana-The state has a statute that allows school districts to identify children ages 3 through 5 under the category "child with disabilities," without specifying a disability category. This year about 72% of the students in this age group were reported by disability. The state used the reported disability for the 72% to impute disability for the remaining 28%. In previous years, the state imputed disability for 3- to 5-year-olds using the disability distribution for 6-year-olds.

Montana provided unduplicated, rather than duplicated, counts of children with disabilities served in correctional facilities and enrolled in private schools not placed or referred by public agencies. The state will correct this error for the 2001-02 educational environments data.

Nebraska-The state reported that 67 students served in private residential facilities were counted in other educational environments.

New York-The state reported that school-age (kindergarten) students with disabilities who are 4 to 5 years old are not reported on the educational environments table.

North Carolina-The state does not collect race/ethnicity data for children enrolled in private schools, not placed or referred by public agencies.

Ohio-The state increased the number of placement options from the 10 used during the 1999-2000 school year to 23 for the 2000-01 school year. The state attributed the changes in the number of children served in some of the educational environments for 6- through 21-year-olds to this change in reporting categories.

Educational Environments Data Notes (Continued)

Oregon-The state considers children who are 5 years old on September 1 to be school age and includes them in the count of 6- through 21-year-olds. The state counts children who turn 5 after September 1 in the 3-through-5 age group.

The state attributed the decrease in the number of children ages 3 through 5 in part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings to one program in the state that changed how it coded children. This program had 171 students in this category during the previous year, and none in the category for 2000-01. The program increased the number of children reported in early childhood special education. The state is providing additional training to all contractors to improve data quality in the upcoming year.

The state attributed the increase in the number of children ages 6 through 21 in public residential facilities to the expanded Youth Correction Education Program in Oregon. Within the past 3 years, five youth correctional facilities and one "boot camp" opened, bringing the state total to 13 facilities. The overall student population served in these facilities, previously capped at 513 students, was raised to around 1,100 statewide. The cap is increased gradually as facilities fill. Many students in Oregon Youth Authority have been previously determined IDEA eligible and were served while in public school (estimates range from 40% to 64%). In addition, the state reported that 73 students in this category were most likely miscoded by LEAs. The state is working with LEAs to correctly code students in the future.

Puerto Rico-The state attributed the changes in the number of students served in various educational environments to population growth and to the state's special education policies. Educational environments are based on children's individual needs and are reevaluated every year. Therefore, the same child may move in and out of different educational environments each year based on need.

Texas-The state noted that some of its definitions do not match Federal definitions for the amount of time spent outside the regular classroom. When Texas cross-walked state categories into Federal categories, many students were counted as spending more time outside the regular classroom than they actually did. The following categories were affected: (1) special education outside regular class less than 21% of day, (2) special education outside regular class at least 21% of day and no more than 60% of day, and (3) special education outside regular class more than 60% of day. The definition of the mainstream instructional arrangement in Texas includes only those students who receive their full instructional day in a general education setting with special education support. Specific data about students receiving "pull-out" services for less than 21% of the day are unavailable; therefore, many students who could be reported in category 1 were reported in category 2. The Texas definition of self-contained classroom includes students who spend 50% or more of their school day outside the regular classroom, whereas the Federal definitions use 60% as the cutoff. Students in Texas who are outside the regular classroom for 50% to 60% of their instructional day were included in category 3. Texas revised its data collection system and will more accurately capture data related to Federal categories for the 2001-02 school year.

Texas state law mandated a change in the collection of data in several environments. Three state categories-self-contained, separate campus, multidistrict class, and community class-were collapsed into one "off home campus" environment. Students served in these environments were previously reported in the public separate facility and separate class environments. In the 200001 count, these students were all reported to OSEP in the public separate facility category. As a result, the number of children reported in public separate facilities is higher than the number of students actually served in this environment.

The state does not collect race/ethnicity data for children enrolled in private placed or schools, not referred by public agencies.

Educational Environments Data Notes (Continued)

West Virginia-The state attributed the decrease in the number of children ages 3 through 5 served in part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education environments to a change in data collection methodology. The 1999-2000 data collection was the first year that districts used the new definitions and codes for reporting children ages 3 through 5; however, some districts did not update the definitions and codes until 2000-01. The state believes that data collected this year are more accurate.

Table 8.2
 Number (Excluding Children at Risk), Percentage (Based on 2000 Census Population), and Difference from
 National Baseline of Infants and Toddlers Receiving Early Intervention Services
 December 1, 2001

STATE	0-1	1-2	2-3	BIRTH THROUGH 2 TOTAL	POPULATION 0-2	PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION	DIF
MASSACHUSETTS	2,088	3,836	6,563	12,487	235,958	5.29	3.19
NEW YORK	2,313	7,854	20,250	30,417	732,065	4.15	2.05
HAWAII	378	519	793	1,690	46,412	3.64	1.54
INDIANA	1,501	2,808	4,336	8,645	253,136	3.42	1.32
CONNECTICUT	442	1,094	2,343	3,879	130,813	2.97	0.87
DELAWARE	176	305	422	903	30,867	2.93	0.83
RHODE ISLAND	177	309	602	1,088	37,775	2.88	0.78
WYOMING	81	172	278	531	18,561	2.86	0.76
NEW HAMPSHIRE	154	358	643	1,155	43,897	2.63	0.53
FLORIDA	2,874	4,455	7,113	14,442	561,839	2.57	0.47
WISCONSIN	680	1,492	3,040	5,212	203,339	2.56	0.46
ARKANSAS	413	962	1,399	2,774	108,555	2.56	0.46
KANSAS	439	852	1,447	2,738	113,456	2.41	0.31
KENTUCKY	458	1,314	2,038	3,810	159,519	2.39	0.29
PENNSYLVANIA	1,644	3,383	5,164	10,191	428,274	2.38	0.28
VERMONT	60	140	271	471	19,807	2.38	0.28
MARYLAND	563	1,479	2,858	4,900	209,218	2.34	0.24
MAINE	69	266	612	947	41,453	2.28	0.18
WEST VIRGINIA	236	469	662	1,367	60,404	2.26	0.16
COLORADO	696	1,307	2,041	4,044	179,130	2.26	0.16
ALASKA	90	195	339	624	28,231	2.21	0.11
IDAHO	216	393	648	1,257	58,550	2.15	0.05
SOUTH DAKOTA	82	201	372	655	30,516	2.15	0.05
TENNESSEE	820	1,590	2,291	4,701	224,825	2.09	-0.01
VIRGINIA	550	1,688	3,476	5,714	276,614	2.07	-0.03
UTAH	433	820	1,241	2,494	129,200	1.93	-0.17
ILLINOIS	998	3,365	5,658	10,021	520,550	1.93	-0.17
NEW JERSEY	679	1,952	3,781	6,412	333,135	1.92	-0.18
TEXAS	2,767	5,918	9,486	18,171	977,438	1.86	-0.24
MONTANA	164	220	216	600	32,532	1.84	-0.26
OKLAHOMA	577	899	1,151	2,627	143,177	1.83	-0.27
MICHIGAN	1,226	2,346	3,522	7,094	398,600	1.78	-0.32
PUERTO RICO	222	855	1,906	2,983	174,849	1.71	-0.39
OHIO	1,103	2,708	3,801	7,612	448,690	1.70	-0.40
CALIFORNIA	4,967	8,407	11,051	24,425	1,459,066	1.67	-0.43
MISSISSIPPI	336	660	1,034	2,030	123,078	1.65	-0.45
NORTH DAKOTA	63	142	166	371	23,357	1.59	-0.51
MINNESOTA	388	871	1,793	3,052	195,989	1.56	-0.54
NORTH CAROLINA	533	1,753	2,646	4,932	326,535	1.51	-0.59
IOWA	241	508	888	1,637	112,488	1.46	-0.64
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	19	101	159	279	19,276	1.45	-0.65
OREGON	217	602	1,068	1,887	132,734	1.42	-0.68
NEW MEXICO	114	342	650	1,106	78,338	1.41	-0.69
NEBRASKA	117	296	540	953	70,106	1.36	-0.74
WASHINGTON	340	1,038	1,741	3,119	235,475	1.32	-0.78
SOUTH CAROLINA	289	695	1,109	2,093	159,387	1.31	-0.79
MISSOURI	309	873	1,643	2,825	221,068	1.28	-0.82
ARIZONA	417	1,035	1,472	2,924	229,836	1.27	-0.83
LOUISIANA	319	750	1,242	2,311	191,286	1.21	-0.89
ALABAMA	239	740	1,107	2,086	177,099	1.18	-0.92
NEVADA	116	306	473	895	86,767	1.03	-1.07
GEORGIA	485	1,151	1,876	3,512	358,255	0.98	-1.12
AMERICAN SAMOA							
GUAM	2	12	36	50			
NORTHERN MARIANAS	7	15	26	48			
PALAU	.						
VIRGIN ISLANDS	65	69	73	207			
BUR. OF INDIAN AFFAIRS							
NATIONAL BASELINE	34,952	76,890	131,556	243,398	11,591,525	2.10	

PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION = BIRTH THROUGH 2 TOTAL + POPULATION 0-2. DIF

= Difference from National Baseline.

971 children were added to Virginia's count of two year olds to adjust for children under the age of 3 who were served under IDEA, Part B.

Population data are provided from summary file of the 2000 Census, U.S. Bureau of the Census. These population data are from the year prior to disability counts.

Because criteria for Part C eligibility varies widely across states, differences in identification rates on this table should be interpreted with caution.

Please see Data Notes for an explanation of individual state differences on how data are reported (<http://IDEAdata.org/docs/cdatanotes2001.pdf>).

Data based on the December 1, 2001 count, updated as of August 30, 2002.

r_.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, Data Analysis System (DANS).

Table 8.3
 Number (Excluding Children at Risk), Percentage (Based on 2000 Census Population), and Difference from
 National Baseline of Infants and Toddlers Receiving Early Intervention Services
 December 1, 2001
 Grouped by Eligibility Criteria

STATE	0-1	1-2	2-3	BIRTH THROUGH 2 TOTAL	POPULATION 0-2	PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION	DIF
Broad Eligibility Criteria							
MASSACHUSETTS	2,088	3,836	6,563	12,487	235,958	5.29	3.19
HAWAII	378	519	793	1,690	46,412	3.64	1.54
INDIANA	1,501	2,808	4,336	8,645	253,136	3.42	1.32
DELAWARE	176	305	422	903	30,867	2.93	0.83
WYOMING	81	172	278	531	18,561	2.86	0.76
NEW HAMPSHIRE	154	358	643	1,155	43,897	2.63	0.53
FLORIDA	2,874	4,455	7,113	14,442	561,839	2.57	0.47
WISCONSIN	680	1,492	3,040	5,212	203,339	2.56	0.46
ARKANSAS	413	962	1,399	2,774	108,555	2.56	0.46
KANSAS	439	852	1,447	2,738	113,456	2.41	0.31
PENNSYLVANIA	1,644	3,383	5,164	10,191	428,274	2.38	0.28
VERMONT	60	140	271	471	19,807	2.38	0.28
MARYLAND	563	1,479	2,858	4,900	209,218	2.34	0.24
MAINE	69	266	612	947	41,453	2.28	0.18
WEST VIRGINIA	236	469	662	1,367	60,404	2.26	0.16
COLORADO	696	1,307	2,041	4,044	179,130	2.26	0.16
SOUTH DAKOTA	82	201	372	655	30,516	2.15	0.05
VIRGINIA	550	1,688	3,476	5,714	276,614	2.07	-0.03
MICHIGAN	1,226	2,346	3,522	7,094	398,600	1.78	-0.32
OHIO	1,103	2,708	3,801	7,612	448,690	1.70	-0.40
MISSISSIPPI	336	660	1,034	2,030	123,078	1.65	-0.45
MINNESOTA	388	871	1,793	3,052	195,989	1.56	-0.54
NORTH CAROLINA	533	1,753	2,646	4,932	326,535	1.51	-0.59
IOWA	241	508	888	1,637	112,488	1.46	-0.64
NEW MEXICO	114	342	650	1,106	78,338	1.41	-0.69
WASHINGTON	340	1,038	1,741	3,119	235,475	1.32	-0.78
LOUISIANA	319	750	1,242	2,311	191,286	1.21	-0.89
ALABAMA	239	740	1,107	2,086	177,099	1.18	-0.92
Moderate Eligibility Criteria							
NEW YORK	2,313	7,854	20,250	30,417	732,065	4.15	2.05
CONNECTICUT	442	1,094	2,343	3,879	130,813	2.97	0.87
RHODE ISLAND	177	309	602	1,088	37,775	2.88	0.78
KENTUCKY	458	1,314	2,038	3,810	159,519	2.39	0.29
IDAHO	216	393	648	1,257	58,550	2.15	0.05
TENNESSEE	820	1,590	2,291	4,701	224,825	2.09	-0.01
UTAH	433	820	1,241	2,494	129,200	1.93	-0.17
ILLINOIS	998	3,365	5,658	10,021	520,550	1.93	-0.17
NEW JERSEY	679	1,952	3,781	6,412	333,135	1.92	-0.18
TEXAS	2,767	5,918	9,486	18,171	977,438	1.86	-0.24
PUERTO RICO	222	855	1,906	2,983	174,849	1.71	-0.39
CALIFORNIA	4,967	8,407	11,051	24,425	1,459,066	1.67	-0.43
OREGON	217	602	1,068	1,887	132,734	1.42	-0.68
NEBRASKA	117	296	540	953	70,106	1.36	-0.74
SOUTH CAROLINA	289	695	1,109	2,093	159,387	1.31	-0.79
GEORGIA	485	1,151	1,876	3,512	358,255	0.98	-1.12
Narrow Eligibility Criteria							
ALASKA	90	195	339	624	28,231	2.21	0.11
MONTANA	164	220	216	600	32,532	1.84	-0.26
OKLAHOMA	577	899	1,151	2,627	143,177	1.83	-0.27
NORTH DAKOTA	63	142	166	371	23,357	1.59	-0.51
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	19	101	159	279	19,276	1.45	-0.65
MISSOURI	309	873	1,643	2,825	221,068	1.28	-0.82
ARIZONA	417	1,035	1,472	2,924	229,836	1.27	-0.83
NEVADA	116	306	473	895	86,767	1.03	-1.07
Outlying Areas							
AMERICAN SAMOA						-	
GUAM	2	12	36	50			
NORTHERN MARIANAS	7	15	26	48			
PALAU							
VIRGIN ISLANDS	65	69	73	207			
BUR. OF INDIAN AFFAIRS							
NATIONAL BASELINE	34,952	76,890	131,556	243,398	11,591,525	2.10	

 PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION - BIRTH THROUGH 2 TOTAL + POPULATION 0-2.

DIF - Difference from National Baseline.

971 children were added to Virginia's count of two year olds to adjust for children under the age of 3 who were served under IDEA, Part B.

Population data are provided from summary file of the 2000 Census, U.S. Bureau of the Census. These population data are from the year prior to disability counts.

Because criteria for Part C eligibility varies widely across states, differences in identification rates on this table should be interpreted with caution.

Please see Data Notes for an explanation of individual state differences on how data are reported (<http://IDEAdata.org/docs/cdatanotes2001.pdf>).

Data based on the December 1, 2001 count, updated as of August 30, 2002.

Table 8.4
 Number (Excluding Children at Risk), Percentage (Based on 2000 Census Population), and Difference from National
 Baseline of Children Age 0-1 Receiving Early Intervention Services

STATE	AGE 0-1 SERVED UNDER PART C	POPULATION Age 0	PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION	DIP
December 1, 2001				
MASSACHUSETTS	2,088	77,998	2.68	1.78
HAWAII	378	15,464	2.44	1.54
INDIANA	1,501	84,517	1.78	0.88
DELAWARE	176	10,286	1.71	0.81
FLORIDA	2,874	186,977	1.54	0.64
MONTANA	164	10,732	1.53	0.63
RHODE ISLAND	177	12,206	1.45	0.55
WYOMING	81	6,130	1.32	0.42
OKLAHOMA	577	47,533	1.21	0.31
WEST VIRGINIA	236	20,176	1.17	0.27
PENNSYLVANIA	1,644	141,431	1.16	0.26
KANSAS	439	37,977	1.16	0.26
ARKANSAS	413	36,065	1.15	0.25
COLORADO	696	60,823	1.14	0.24
NEW HAMPSHIRE	154	14,006	1.10	0.20
IDAHO	216	19,700	1.10	0.20
TENNESSEE	820	75,127	1.09	0.19
CONNECTICUT	442	42,719	1.03	0.13
CALIFORNIA	4,967	483,143	1.03	0.13
WISCONSIN	680	67,474	1.01	0.11
UTAH	433	44,605	0.97	0.07
ALASKA	90	9,361	0.96	0.06
NEW YORK	2,313	243,891	0.95	0.05
VERMONT	60	6,381	0.94	0.04
MICHIGAN	1,226	131,188	0.93	0.03
KENTUCKY	458	53,156	0.86	-0.04
TEXAS	2,767	330,770	0.84	-0.06
NORTH DAKOTA	63	7,660	0.82	-0.08
MISSISSIPPI	336	41,217	0.82	-0.08
MARYLAND	563	69,647	0.81	-0.09
SOUTH DAKOTA	82	10,239	0.80	-0.10
OHIO	1,103	148,468	0.74	-0.16
IOWA	241	37,338	0.65	-0.25
NEW JERSEY	679	110,298	0.62	-0.28
MINNESOTA	388	65,072	0.60	-0.30
VIRGINIA	550	92,708	0.59	-0.31
ILLINOIS	998	173,373	0.58	-0.32
ARIZONA	417	77,421	0.54	-0.36
SOUTH CAROLINA	289	53,947	0.54	-0.36
MAINE	69	13,456	0.51	-0.39
NEBRASKA	117	23,459	0.50	-0.40
LOUISIANA	319	64,092	0.50	-0.40
OREGON	217	44,189	0.49	-0.41
NORTH CAROLINA	533	110,654	0.48	-0.42
WASHINGTON	340	77,740	0.44	-0.46
NEW MEXICO	114	26,335	0.43	-0.47
MISSOURI	309	72,842	0.42	-0.48
ALABAMA	239	59,101	0.40	-0.50
GEORGIA	485	120,992	0.40	-0.50
NEVADA	116	29,046	0.40	-0.50
PUERTO RICO	222	58,043	0.38	-0.52
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	19	6,518	0.29	-0.61
AMERICAN SAMOA				
GUAM	2			
NORTHERN MARIANAS	7			
PALAU	.			
VIRGIN ISLANDS	65			
BUR. OF INDIAN AFFAIRS				
NATIONAL BASELINE	34,952	3,863,691	0.90	

PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION - AGE 0-1 SERVED UNDER PART C + POPULATION AGE 0.

DIP - Difference from National Baseline.

Population data are provided from summary file of the 2000 Census, U.S. Bureau of the Census. These population data are from the year prior to disability counts.

Because criteria for Part C eligibility varies widely across states, differences in identification rates on this table should be interpreted with caution.

Please see Data Notes for an explanation of individual state differences on how data are reported (<http://IDEAdata.org/docs/cdatanotes2001.pdf>).

Data based on the December 1, 2001 count, updated as of August 30, 2002.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, Data Analysis System (DAMS).

Child Count Data Notes (Part C)

Alaska-Race/ethnicity was imputed for 99 children. The child count for 2- to 3-year-olds includes 49 children over the age of 3.

California-Although the state serves at-risk children, it did not submit data on the number of at-risk children served in the 2001 child count. Due to the time lag between when a delay is identified and when this information is updated in the state's data system, the state is no longer able to distinguish the at-risk population from other Early Start consumers.

Indiana-The reported child count is not complete. The state expects to revise the count in the future.

Iowa-The state reported a 15% increase in the child count as a result of improved Child Find and improved data reporting as a result of modifications to the computerized information system.

Nevada-The state attributes the decrease in the number of children served to unfilled direct service positions and/or frozen positions for direct service personnel. These staff shortages have resulted in a waiting list. Nevada is unable to serve all of the children with disabilities that it has identified. In addition, as a result of a change in state policy, Nevada no longer serves children who are at-risk.

New Hampshire-The slight decline in the child count reflects a change in reporting methodology. Last year, the count was based on survey information that was not completely accurate. The state believes this year's data are correct.

Rhode Island-The state imputed race/ethnicity for 122 infants and toddlers using the known distribution. They also counted some children (2.6% of total count) who had turned age 3 in the 2-to-3 age category.

Washington-The state did not report race/ethnicity for 214 children whose race/ethnicity was unknown.

Table 9.1
 Number, Percentage (Based on the Total for All Settings), and Difference from National Baseline
 of Infants and Toddlers Birth *Through* Age 2 Served in
 Different Early Intervention Settings Under Part C
 December 1, 2000

STATE	HOME #	%	DIF
MASSACHUSETTS	12,145	100	28
CONNECTICUT	3,660	96	24
WEST VIRGINIA	1,463	96	24
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1,137	94	22
OKLAHOMA	2,296	93	21
KENTUCKY	2,766	92	20
NORTH DAKOTA	334	92	20
NEW JERSEY	5,011	92	20
ALASKA	596	92	20
PENNSYLVANIA	8,558	91	19
MONTANA	520	91	19
TEXAS	14,316	89	17
LOUISIANA	1,909	88	16
IOWA	1,016	85	13
INDIANA	6,934	84	12
NORTH CAROLINA	3,607	84	12
KANSAS	2,042	82	10
WYOMING	409	80	8
MISSOURI	2,396	79	7
WISCONSIN	4,016	78	6
MINNESOTA	2,284	77	5
SOUTH DAKOTA	496	77	5
MICHIGAN	5,564	77	5
UTAH	1,727	76	4
HAWAII	2,721	76	4
NEW YORK	20,362	76	4
IDAHO	951	75	3
VERMONT	322	74	2
VIRGINIA	2,263	73	1
ARIZONA	2,086	71	-1
MARYLAND	3,331	69	-3
ALABAMA	1,366	68	-4
NEBRASKA	803	68	-4
RHODE ISLAND	644	68	-4
SOUTH CAROLINA	1,519	66	-6
ILLINOIS	7,084	65	-7
NEW MEXICO	1,137	65	-7
GEORGIA	3,030	65	-7
COLORADO	1,299	63	-9
TENNESSEE	2,561	60	-12
CALIFORNIA	5,709	58	-14
OHIO	3,964	55	-17
OREGON	994	54	-18
MISSISSIPPI	1,128	51	-21
NEVADA	426	44	-28
WASHINGTON	1,063	37	-35
PUERTO RICO	1,116	35	-37
DELAWARE	322	32	-40
MAINE	253	30	-42
ARKANSAS	604	26	-46
FLORIDA	3,484	24	-48
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	34	17	-55
GUAM	206	88	16
NORTHERN MARIANAS	32	76	4
VIRGIN ISLANDS	41	47	-25
AMERICAN SAMOA	0	0	-72
PALAU	0		
NATIONAL BASELINE	156,057	72	

 % . # in setting category + total # in all setting categories.

DIF . Difference from National Baseline.

Please see Data Notes for an explanation of individual state differences on how data are reported
 (<http://IDEAdata.org/docs/cdatanotes2001.pdf>).

Data based on the December 1, 2000 count, updated as of August 30, 2002.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, Data Analysis System (DAMS).

Table 9.1
 Number, Percentage (Based on the Total for All Settings), and Difference from National Baseline
 of Infants and Toddlers Birth Through Age 2 Served in
 Different Early Intervention Settings Under Part C
 December 1, 2000

STATE	TYPICALLY DEVELOPING PROGRAMS		DIF
	k	%	
ARKANSAS	743	31.79	27.48
SOUTH DAKOTA	127	19.69	15.38
VERMONT	83	18.95	14.64
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	36	17.48	13.17
GEORGIA	784	16.76	12.45
MAINE	137	16.27	11.96
NEBRASKA	128	10.80	6.49
WYOMING	55	10.76	6.45
ALABAMA	212	10.62	6.31
TEXAS	1,642	10.18	5.87
NORTH CAROLINA	416	9.67	5.36
TENNESSEE	406	9.55	5.24
WASHINGTON	248	8.55	4.24
MISSOURI	241	7.93	3.62
NORTH DAKOTA	25	6.89	2.58
MISSISSIPPI	141	6.33	2.02
KANSAS	150	6.04	1.73
PENNSYLVANIA	518	5.51	1.20
COLORADO	112	5.39	1.08
NEVADA	52	5.32	1.01
NEW HAMPSHIRE	64	5.27	0.96
IOWA	63	5.26	0.95
MONTANA	30	5.23	0.92
WISCONSIN	269	5.22	0.91
NEW JERSEY	264	4.83	0.52
MINNESOTA	134	4.55	0.24
IDAHO	55	4.32	0.01
MARYLAND	174	3.61	-0.70
FLORIDA	491	3.45	-0.86
OREGON	62	3.38	-0.93
DELAWARE	31	3.10	-1.21
CONNECTICUT	117	3.08	-1.23
ALASKA	20	3.07	-1.24
VIRGINIA	95	3.06	-1.25
INDIANA	217	2.63	-1.68
HAWAII	85	2.38	-1.93
PUERTO RICO	71	2.20	-2.11
RHODE ISLAND	20	2.10	-2.21
OHIO	147	2.03	-2.28
SOUTH CAROLINA	38	1.66	-2.65
ILLINOIS	158	1.45	-2.86
NEW YORK	380	1.41	-2.90
UTAH	30	1.33	-2.98
NEW MEXICO	17	0.97	-3.34
WEST VIRGINIA	13	0.85	-3.46
LOUISIANA	18	0.83	-3.48
MICHIGAN	34	0.47	-3.84
OKLAHOMA	1	0.04	-4.27
ARIZONA	0	0.00	-4.31
CALIFORNIA	0	0.00	-4.31
KENTUCKY	0	0.00	-4.31
MASSACHUSETTS	0	0.00	-4.31
VIRGIN ISLANDS	9	10.34	6.03
NORTHERN MARIANAS	2	4.76	0.45
GUAM	6	2.56	-1.75
AMERICAN SAMOA	0	0.00	-4.31
PALAU	0		
NATIONAL BASELINE	9,371	4.31	

 % . # in setting category + total M in all setting categories.

DIF = Difference from National Baseline.

Please see Data Notes for an explanation of individual state differences on how data are reported
 (<http://IDEAdata.org/docs/cdatanotes2001.pdf>).

Data based on the December 1, 2000 count, updated as of August 30, 2002. U.S. Department of
 Education, Office of Special Education Programs, Data Analysis System (DANS).

Table 9.1
 Number, Percentage (Based on the Total for All Settings), and Difference from National Baseline
 of Infants and Toddlers Birth Through Age 2 Served in
 Different Early Intervention Settings Under Part C
 December 1, 2000

STATE	NATURAL ENVIRONMENTS		DIF
	#	%	
MASSACHUSETTS	12,145	100	24
CONNECTICUT	3,777	100	24
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1,201	99	23
TEXAS	15,958	99	23
NORTH DAKOTA	359	99	23
SOUTH DAKOTA	623	97	21
PENNSYLVANIA	9,076	97	21
WEST VIRGINIA	1,476	97	21
NEW JERSEY	5,275	96	20
MONTANA	550	96	20
ALASKA	616	95	19
NORTH CAROLINA	4,023	93	17
OKLAHOMA	2,297	93	17
VERMONT	405	92	16
KENTUCKY	2,766	92	16
WYOMING	464	91	15
IOWA	1,079	90	14
LOUISIANA	1,927	89	13
KANSAS	2,192	88	12
MISSOURI	2,637	87	11
INDIANA	7,151	87	11
WISCONSIN	4,285	83	7
MINNESOTA	2,418	82	6
GEORGIA	3,814	82	6
ALABAMA	1,578	79	3
IDAHO	1,006	79	3
NEBRASKA	931	79	3
HAWAII	2,806	79	3
UTAH	1,757	78	2
MICHIGAN	5,598	77	1
NEW YORK	20,742	77	1
VIRGINIA	2,358	76	0
MARYLAND	3,505	73	-3
ARIZONA	2,086	71	-5
RHODE ISLAND	664	70	-6
TENNESSEE	2,967	70	-6
SOUTH CAROLINA	1,557	68	-8
COLORADO	1,411	68	-8
ILLINOIS	7,242	66	-10
NEW MEXICO	1,154	66	-10
CALIFORNIA	5,709	58	-18
ARKANSAS	1,347	58	-18
OREGON	1,056	58	-18
MISSISSIPPI	1,269	57	-19
OHIO	4,111	57	-19
NEVADA	478	49	-27
MAINE	390	46	-30
WASHINGTON	1,311	45	-31
PUERTO RICO	1,187	37	-39
DELAWARE	353	35	-41
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	70	34	-42
FLORIDA	3,975	28	-48
GUAM	212	91	15
NORTHERN MARIANAS	34	81	5
VIRGIN ISLANDS	50	57	-19
AMERICAN SAMOA	0	0	-76
PALAU	0		
NATIONAL BASELINE	165,428	76	

 % . # in setting category + total # in all setting categories.

DIF . Difference from National Baseline.

Natural Environments is a constructed category that combines the early intervention settings, Home and Typically Developing Programs.

Please see Data Notes for an explanation of individual state differences on how data are reported (<http://IDEAdata.org/docs/cdatanotes2001.pdf>).

Data based on the December 1, 2000 count, updated as of August 30, 2002.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, Data Analysis System (DAMS).

Settings Data Notes

Alabama-The decline in the number of infants and toddlers in programs designed for children with developmental delays or disabilities and in the service provider location and the increase in the number reported in the home setting category is the result of Alabama's move to serve children in more natural *environments*.

Florida-The change in the number of children reported in the settings categories for 2000 is a result of a change in how the state classifies a child who receives services in a variety of settings. Prior to 2000, Florida assigned the child's setting/location based on the initial service location data in the Florida Early Intervention Program data system. For the December 2000 data, each child's service setting was determined based on a hierarchy of settings.

Illinois-The increase in the number of children served in almost all the settings is the result of caseload growth during the 2000-01 reporting period. This was reflected in the 2000 child count. The state continued implementation of a new front-end data system, so the data are also clean.

Kentucky-Kentucky only determines whether the program setting is home or community based versus office or center based. Because all children may receive services in multiple settings, when the state reports data to OSEP it assigns the service provider location to all children not also served in the home or community setting.

Missouri-The decrease in the other settings category is a result of better identification of children's primary settings by the state. These improvements allow the state to assign the applicable OSEP settings category.

New York-The increase in children served primarily in the home environment is the result of the state's emphasis on the delivery of services in natural environments. This is also the explanation for the decrease in the number of children served in programs designed for children with developmental delays or disabilities.

The increase in the number of children served primarily at a service provider location or other setting is a result of guidance the state gave to counties regarding how to code specific settings into the OSEP data collection categories.

Oklahoma-The state attributes the increase in the other settings category to a mistake in the assignment of settings categories. Through technical assistance, the state encouraged data collectors to use the other settings category when serving children in natural environment settings other than the child's home or child care environments. The state is providing further assistance to data collectors so that they better understand each program settings category.

Oregon-The state reported that the bulk of the number of infants and toddlers served in the service provider location setting occurred in two regions of the state. These two regions account for most of the decrease in the number of children (N = -54) in the programs for developmental delay category. According to Oregon, because of the similarity in the definitions of these two settings (either can serve a group of children with disabilities), they believe there was a clarification/interpretation made for these two sites. This accounted for the increase in the service provider location setting. They will train service providers in the accurate interpretation of these definitions this coming year.

Settings Data Notes (Continued)

Rhode Island-The state reported that the increase in the other settings category is related to how service settings are classified into this setting. In Rhode Island, the individualized family service plan (IFSP) form does not provide a space to define other location. Providers define other on a service-rendered form (SRF) at the time the services are provided. However, the SRF has a different set of location codes that do not correspond with those on the IFSP. In the future, these codes will match, and providers will be asked to define other location on the IFSP. Until then, the other settings category is inflated (e.g., daycare was entered into an SRF under other location. It should be counted as a program designed for typically developing children). The location codes will be revisited and more clearly defined within the next 5 months. The state expects that the data for 2002 will be clearer.