

PART B MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT (MOE) REDUCTION AND COORDINATED EARLY INTERVENING SERVICES (CEIS) DATA NOTES

FFY 2016/SY 2016-17 Reporting Year

This document provides information or data notes on the ways in which states collected and reported data differently from the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) data formats and instructions. In addition, the data notes provide explanations of substantial changes from previous year's submissions as well as other information that data users may find notable or of interest when reviewing and using these data.

Alabama

In response to the items generated from the MOE Reduction/CEIS (May 2016) Warning Report, the following is the response from Alabama:

- **Trussville City (No value for A3B):** The base year allocation for the Trussville City School System was zero. The Trussville City School System was formed in 2006. Prior to 2006, the schools within Trussville City were part of the Jefferson County School System. The base amount for the Trussville City School System was based on the preschool child count in 1997 and included transferred schools that were in Jefferson County prior to 2006. As a result, Trussville City had a \$0.00 allocation.
- **Butler County (C2A = Yes and A5 <> C2B):** The LEA (Butler County) had CEIS expenditures that did not equal the required 15% amount. The LEA, therefore, had carry-over funds that will be used to continue CEIS activities and will be used for expenditures in FFY 2015, totaling the required amount.
- **Hale County (C2A = Yes and A5 <> C2B):** The LEA (Hale County) had CEIS expenditures that did not equal the required 15% amount. The LEA, therefore, had carry-over funds that will be used to continue CEIS activities and will be used for expenditures in FFY 2015, totaling the required amount.
- **Pelham City (No value for A2A; No value for A3A):** The LEA, Pelham City, was not an established system in FFY 2014 (SY 2014-15) and, therefore, had no allocations for sections 611 and 619 during FFY 2014 (SY 2014-15). (OMB Max)

Arkansas

AR DEPT. OF CORRECTION SCHOOL DISTRICT 0500025 This is adult corrections and does not receive 619 funding

AR SCHOOL FOR THE BLIND 0500035 State Agency with all funding coming from 611; does not receive 619 funding

AR SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF 0500036 State Agency with all funding coming from 611; does not receive 619 funding

ARKANSAS VIRTUAL CHARTER SCHOOL 0500394 Had zero 5-year-old students; thus did not receive 619 funding

DDS 0500389 State Agency with all funding coming from 611; does not receive 619 funding

DIVISION OF YOUTH SERVICES (DYS) 0500390 State Agency Youth Corrections with all funding coming from 611; does not receive 619 funding.

Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIE)

BIE recognizes the data warnings identified. The warnings are for Part B appropriation of 0 dollars. The appropriation of 0 dollars are correct; school did not need/request Part B supplemental funds to maintain/support their Special Education program that academic year. Through utilizing the 15% of Indian School Equalization Program funds identified for Special Education Programs the schools provided special education services.

BIE accurately reported NA in column B2 for all LEAs. The BIE is not required to report MOE data. The BIE is not subject to Maintenance of Effort requirements. However, due to over-identification, the BIE has schools that have Voluntary CEIS programs. Refer to OSEP Data Documentation, Dec. 2017, IDEA Part B MOE/CEIS FFY2015, page 21. (OMB Max)

The value reported for Voluntary CEIS Percent taken for voluntary CEIS during SY 2016-17 (%) (column C3C) was greater than 15.00 when the response for Voluntary CEIS Did the LEA/ESA voluntarily use up to 15% of IDEA 611 and 619 fund for CEIS in SY 2016-17? (Y/N) (column C3A) was "Yes" for one or more LEAs. The state responded the three LEAs with this error. They have made corrections in their internal systems and have provided evidence (business ledgers and/or budget amendments) of the corrections to the BIE using Native Star.

California

C2A = No, NA or M and C3A = No or M and D2 > 0: In these instances, the LEA was significantly disproportionate in the prior year which required them to use prior year IDEA funds for CEIS. As the federal funds are available for 27 months these districts provided CEIS related activities to students in school year 2016 and in the prior school year.

Delaware

Delaware reported 0 or NA "Total LEA/ESA allocation for Section 619 of IDEA FFY 2016 (\$)" (column A3B) for one or more LEAs because Children with Disabilities ages 3-5 were not served in the LEAs where 0 or NA were reported. NA was entered into column A3B because those districts do not have any 619 students.

District of Columbia

The following LEAs were new to DC in SY2016-17, therefore values for B2 and A2A are “NA” and “0” respectively for these LEAs:

- Breakthrough Academy Public Charter School (NCES 1100104)
- Goodwill Excel Public Charter School (NCES 1100105)
- Ideal Academy Public Charter School (NCES 1100012)
- Next Step Public Charter School (NCES 1100017)
- Richard Wright Public Charter School (NCES 1100082)
- Rocketship Academy Public Charter (NCES 1100106)
- Thurgood Marshall Academy Public Charter School (NCES 1100034)
- Washington Leadership Academy Public Charter School (NCES 1100103)

Excel Academy PCS (NCES 1100076) returns values of zero for D2 and D3 because this LEA did not use any of the allocated funding for the school year. In addition, this LEA had findings of significant disproportionality for FFY2015 but have the value of “0” for D2 because they did not use any of their funds. The set aside will be used within their tidings amendment portion of the grant.

Community College Preparatory Public Charter School (NCES 1100092) was removed from reporting this year because it is an adult education LEA and they waived their funds.

Several LEAs have a data warning that no value is reported for A3B. Many of our LEAs do not serve students aged 3-5 and therefore receive no funding under 619.

Two LEA’s Bridges PCS (NCES 1100055) and Washington Latin PCS (NCES 1100019) had findings of significant disproportionality for FFY2015; they elected not to use funds in FFY2016 and instead to use funds from FFY2017. Therefore the value for C2A is ‘YES’ but the values for D2 in “NA.”

Florida

C2A - CALHOUN, GADSDEN, and WASHINGTON were required to use 15% of their funds for CEIS, however, in the state reporting system they indicated 0 students served (D2). C3A - JACKSON chose to voluntarily use up to 15% of their funds for CEIS, however, in the state reporting system they indicated 0 students served (D2).

Column A3B = SOUTHTECH, DOC, Lake Wales Charter, FAU LAB SCH, FSU LAB SCH, FAMU LAB SCH, UF LAB SCH, and FLORIDA VIRTUAL were reported as NA for Total LEA/ESA allocation for Section 619 of IDEA FFY 2016. Children with disabilities ages 3 through 5 are NOT served in these LEAs/ESAs.

Guam

Year to year note: The amounts reported this year for FFY2016 LEA/ESA 611 allocations under A2A for FFY 2015 - \$14,096,945; and A2B for FFY 2016- \$14,120,991 are accurate for 611 funds, with a difference of \$24,046.

Idaho

A2A Total LEA/ESA allocation for Section 611 of IDEA FFY 2015 (\$) = 0, NA or M: Two LEAs are noted with this warning - one was not in operation during 2015-2016, and the other LEA elected not to apply for federal funds.

For further clarification, the LEA that was in operation during FFY 2015 was notified by the Idaho State Department of Education (SDE) of the availability of 611 funds and elected not to apply for these funds. Idaho generates initial allocation amounts that illustrate funding amounts for which LEAs may apply. The allocations documented in the MOE CEIS report reflect funds after LEAs complete their funding applications. LEAs regardless of applying/accepting 619 or 611 grant funds must participate in general supervision monitoring processes to ensure students with disabilities receiving special education and related services are being served appropriately and the LEA is abiding by IDEA regulatory requirements.

A3B Total LEA/ESA allocation for Section 619 of IDEA FFY 2016 (\$) = 0, NA or M: All LEAs marked with this warning are charters and do not have early childhood.

Idaho's previous accountability system allowed charters to serve grades K-12. Of those charter LEAs, 19 had kindergarten students with disabilities between ages 3-5. The SDE notified LEAs serving students age 3-5 making them aware of the availability of 619 funds. After being made aware, the LEAs elected not to apply for these funds. Idaho's Special Education Funding and Fiscal Accountability team generates initial allocation amounts that illustrate funding amounts for which LEAs may apply. The allocations documented in the MOE CEIS report reflect funds after LEAs complete their funding applications. Idaho has developed general supervision monitoring processes to ensure that LEAs that elect to not apply for 619 funds are providing appropriate services and abiding by IDEA regulatory requirements for students ages 3-5 for whom they provide special education and related services. General supervision monitoring processes were developed based on recommendations from the Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR)

B2 Determination under 34 CFR 300.600(a)(2) that controls whether the LEA may be able to reduce MOE during SY 2016-17 = NA or M: Three LEAs were listed with this warning. One LEA was not in operation during the year data was collected for determinations and two LEAs did not have sufficient data to make determinations for 2014-2015.

For further clarification: Up until the FFY 2016, Idaho made determinations on only compliance indicators and IDEA Fiscal Audit. Indicators 4b, 9, and 10: LEAs did not meet n-size requirements to calculate and had no disciplinary actions associated with students with disabilities. Idaho's calculations for indicators 4b, 9, and 10 were reviewed with assistance from the IDEA Data Center (IDC).

Indicators 11 and 12: LEAs did not have any students to report. Indicator 13 (data collected through state monitoring): Swan Valley 092, did not have students age 16-21 and Coeur d'Alene Charter Academy 491, did not have a secondary file specified for general supervision monitoring that year. IDEA Fiscal Audit: No audit findings/not on that year's cycle. Both LEAs that were in operation during the period participated in general supervision monitoring processes to ensure students with disabilities receiving special education and related services were served appropriately and the LEA abided by IDEA regulatory requirements. For FFY 2016 all three LEAs received a determination (FORRESTER ACADEMY, INC. 495) FFY 2016 Needs Assistance, COEUR D'ALENE CHARTER ACADEMY 491 FFY 2016 Meets Requirements, SWAN VALLEY ELEMENTARY DIST 092 FFY 2016 Needs Assistance.

Illinois

Total LEA/ESA allocations for Section 611 FFY 2015 (A2A) contain a zero, 'NA,' or 'M: The LEAs did not receive an IDEA Section 611 or 619 allocation because the LEAs did not serve students during the FFY 2016 and 2015 school year. The allocations for those students in LEAs, 1700333 and 1701397, are provided to the serving districts. LEAs, 1701424, 1701426, and 1701431, were not in existence in FFY2015. They began serving students in FFY2016.

Total LEA/ESA allocations for Section 611 FFY 2016 (A2B) contain a zero, 'NA,' or 'M: The LEAs, 1700333 and 1701397, did not receive an IDEA Section 611 or 619 allocation because it did not serve students during the FFY 2016 and 2015 school year. The allocation for those students is provided to the serving districts.

Total LEA/ESA allocations for Section 619 FFY 2016 (A3B) contain a zero, 'NA,' or 'M: The LEAs, 1700333 and 1701397, did not receive an IDEA Section 611 or 619 allocation because the LEAs did not serve students during the FFY 2016 and 2015 school year. The LEA, 1701426, only serves grades 6-12. The following LEAs did not receive an IDEA Section 619 allocation because they only serve children with disabilities ages 6-21. The LEAs do not serve children with disabilities ages 3-5, therefore they do not receive an IDEA Section 619 allocation: 1700006, 1701400, 1706960, 1714490, 1719320, 1720610, 1723350, 1724090, 1726880, 1728530, 1729280, and 1729790.

The LEAs were required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality, however, 15% of the 611 and 619 allocations was more than the amounts reserved for CEIS: LEAs , 1704170 and 1706540, did not expend the full 15% of the 2016-2017 allocations on required CEIS and carried over a small portion of the required amount to be expended in the 2017-2018 school year. In SY 2016-17, LEA 1705640 reserved \$143,015. This was 15% of the LEA's combined FFY 15 IDEA Part B Section 611 and Section 619 allocation. The 15% should have been calculated using the FFY 16 allocations, and the SEA has verified that the LEA was using FFY 16 funds to provide required CEIS and that the LEA has actually expended \$150,217 (15% of the FFY 16 funds) during SY 2016-17 and SY 2017-18. Since SY 2016-17, the SEA has implemented updated procedures for calculating the required 15% amount for CEIS using the current year allocation (award available beginning July 1 of the reporting school year) and ensuring that

LEAs choosing to use funds from a different FFY are correctly calculating, reserving, and expending the required 15% for CEIS.

The LEA budgeted 15% of funds for voluntary CEIS, however, 15% of the 611 and 619 allocations was less than the amounts reserved for CEIS: The LEA, 1736840, carried over unexpended CEIS funds from the 2015-2016 school year that were used in the 2016-2017 school year in addition to the 15% of the 2016-2017 allocation also set aside for voluntary CEIS.

The LEA/ESA voluntarily use up to 15% of IDEA 611 and 619 funds for CEIS in SY 2016-2017 and D2 =0, NA or M: These LEAs, 1707830 and 1719830, budgeted to utilize funds for voluntary CEIS but did not expend those funds in school year 2016-2017.

Indiana

B2=NA: Schools were not open during the years used to make the determination.

Maine

Mountain View Youth Dev Ctr no longer serves as an LEA, as they are no longer responsible for youth who have been committed. All children now served by Mountain View Youth Dev Ctr are the responsibility of the sending LEAs, therefore, Mountain View no longer receives IDEA allocations.

NA for districts that were not responsible for any students or the district was not in existence during the determination year. A search of Maine NCESIDs on the NCES website does not reveal that a permanent NCESID has been assigned for Child Development Services at this time.

Maryland

Section 619 of IDEA allocations do not apply for THE SEED SCHOOL because it does not serve any children 3-5 years of age - only serves students in grades 6-12.

Massachusetts

A response of 0 was used in column A3B for several districts that did not allocate section 619 of IDEA funds in FFY 2016. These districts do not serve students ages 3 to 5. The data submitted for these districts are accurate.

Michigan

The Michigan Department of Education will be reporting at the LEA level through 2019. At that point, the Michigan Department of Education will be solely reporting at the sub-recipient level. Michigan will need to report at the LEA to track the LEAs for the subsequent years. For the warning: Total LEA/ESA

allocations for Section 611 FFY 15 (A2A) and/or FFY 16 (A2B) contain an NA, the ESA in Michigan receives the Part B allocations as the subrecipient and determines whether or not to distribute Section 611 funds to their member districts. All LEAs that contain an NA in columns A2A and/or A2B did not receive a Section 611 distribution from their ESA. For the warning: Total LEA/ESA allocations for Section 619 FFY 16 (A3B) contain an NA, the ESA in Michigan receives the Part B allocations as the subrecipient and determines whether or not to distribute Section 619 funds to their member districts. All LEAs that contain an NA in column A3B did not receive a Section 619 distribution from their ESA. (OMB Max)

A response of 0 or NA reported as a value for Total LEA/ESA allocation for Section 611 of IDEA FFY 2015 (\$) (column A2A) is correct. ESAs are the subrecipient and those ESAs retain the Section 611 of IDEA for the provision of special education programs or services for their member districts.

The ESA in Michigan receives the Part B allocations as the subrecipient and determines whether or not to distribute Section 611 funds to their member districts. All LEAs that contain an NA in columns A2A and/or A2B did not receive a Section 611 distribution from their ESA.

A response of 0 or NA reported as a value for Total LEA/ESA allocation for Section 611 of IDEA FFY 2016 (\$) (column A2B) is correct. ESAs are the subrecipient and those member districts ESAs retain the Section 611 of IDEA for the provision of special education programs or services. The SEA does not ask the ESAs why they do not distribute Section 611 allocations to their member districts. An ESA will distribute only millage funding or a combination of millage and Section 611. Each ESA determines their funding model.

A response of 0 or NA reported as a value for Total LEA/ESA allocation for Section 619 of IDEA FFY 2016 (\$) (column A3B) is correct. ESAs are the subrecipient and those member districts ESAs retain the Section 619 of IDEA for the provision of special education programs or services. The SEA does not ask the ESAs why they do not distribute Section 619 allocations to their member districts. An ESA will distribute only millage funding or a combination of millage and Section 619. Each ESA determines their funding model.

The ESA in Michigan receives the Part B allocations as the subrecipient and determines whether or not to distribute Section 619 funds to their member districts. All LEAs that contain an NA in column A3B did not receive a Section 619 distribution from their ESA.

A response of NA was reported as a value for Determination under 34 CFR 300.600(a)(2) that controls whether the LEA may be able to reduce MOE during SY 2016-17 (column B2) for one or more LEAs. Michigan has newly created charter schools that do not have available data to make a determination for the SY 2016-2017. Detroit City School District was closed and taken over by Detroit Community School District that has the relevant information.

A response of 0, M or NA was reported as a value for Total number of children receiving CEIS under the IDEA in the LEA/ESA during SY 2016-17 (column D2) when the response reported for Required CEIS Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality in SY 2016-17?

(Y/N) (column C2A) was Yes for one or more LEAs. At the time of the submission of this table, the LEA had not submitted documentation as to how many students were served. In Table 8 submitted in 2019, that data will be submitted.

A response greater than zero was reported as a value for Total number of children receiving CEIS under the IDEA in the LEA/ESA during SY 2016-17 (column D2) when the response for Required CEIS Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality in SY 2016-17? (Y/N) (column C2A) was No, M or NA and the response for Voluntary CEIS Did the LEA/ESA voluntarily use up to 15% of IDEA 611 and 619 fund for CEIS in SY 2016-17? (Y/N) (column C3A) was No or M for one or more LEAs.

The LEA in question used FFY 15 Part B funds for CEIS in FFY 16 that are not reported on FFY 16 Table 8. Students receiving CEIS in FFY 16, regardless of fund source, are correctly reported in FFY 16 Table 8 in column D2.

Minnesota

A2A = 0 - These are all new LEAs for FFY 2015 that have been reported correctly with an update flag of "3".

A3A = 0 -These are all new LEAs for FFY 2015 that have been reported correctly with an update flag of "3" or are LEAs that do not have a school program that spans the age range of children ages 3-5 and do not receive section 619 funds.

A3B = 0 -LEAs that do not have a school program that spans the age range of children ages 3-5 and do not receive section 619 funds.

C2A = Yes, D2 = 0, C3A = Yes, D2 = 0 - CEIS funds were used for professional development. Districts can be involved in initiatives that involve the planning phase of tiered models of intervention such as Response to Intervention (RtI) and Positive Behavioral Intervention.

Mississippi

COAHOMA CO AHS, FORREST COUNTY AG HIGH SCHOOL, MIDTOWN CHARTER SCHOOL, and REIMAGINE CHARTER SCHOOL serve only middle and high school populations and do not enroll or serve any children ages 3-5, therefore do not have 619 allocations.

Missouri

The LEAs with \$0 for 619 are charter schools or programs that do not provide early childhood special education services. Beginning in 2018-19, Missouri will allocate IDEA Part B Section 619 funds to all LEAs, including charter schools with a Kindergarten grade level. The LEAs with \$0 for 611 are part of a special school district where all allocations flow to the special district rather than the component districts.

These districts do, however, operate Early Childhood Special Education programs and therefore receive 619 funds. In a change from prior years, the state provided IDEA Part B funds to state agencies (Department of Corrections, Division of Youth Services, Missouri School for the Blind, Missouri School for the Deaf, and Missouri Schools for the Severely Disabled) in 2016-17 through targeted funds, not the allocation formula process for funding to LEAs. Therefore, the 2016-17 611 allocations for those LEAs is \$0, when they had allocations reported in 2015-16.

Montana

The LEAs that did not receive a 619 allocation are LEAs that only serve students in grades 9-12 and our Dept of Corrections facility for students aged 6-18. They do not have a requirement to serve children under Section 619.

Nebraska

Column B6, LEA's designated with "0." The Nebraska Department of Education has determined the LEA has not met MOE compliance and has not provided enough documented instances (34 CFR 300.204) to reduce the level of expenditures for the education of children with disabilities below the level of expenditures of the comparison year.

Column B7, LEA's designated with "0." The Nebraska Department of Education is obtaining from the LEA that failed to meet the MOE compliance standard non-federal funds for the MOE compliance shortage amount. The Nebraska Department of Education will pay those non-federal funds to the Department at a later date.

Column B8, LEA's designated with "0" in column B7. After obtaining non-federal funds from the LEA that failed to meet the MOE compliance standard, the Department will be paid non-federal funds for the MOE compliance shortage amount.

New Hampshire

A response of 0 or NA was reported as a value for Total LEA/ESA allocation for Section 619 of IDEA FFY 2016 (\$) (column A3B) for one or more LEAs. Based on the child count data the districts did not have preschool children with disabilities.

New Mexico

B6 = Yes, M or NA and B7 and B8 not = NA or M and C2A = Yes and C2B = 0, NA or M and B6 = M and B6 = Yes, M or NA and B7 and B8 not = NA or M because MOE has not been finalized and is currently under review by PED

North Carolina

LEA SUCCESS INSTITUTE CHARTER (NCES 3700106) did not meet MOE and funds and North Carolina is in the process of reverting the 37.44 reduced and returning it to the department.

All LEAs and Charter schools are given the opportunity to submit a 619 Grant in North Carolina. Some Charter schools do not serve students age 3-5 which is why they did not submit a grant and others chose not to submit the grant even if they did have students aged 5 in Kindergarten.

For NCESIDs 3700530, 3702010, 3702370, 3704620 the LEAs chose to use previous year carry over funding to continue to provide CEIS in 16-17.

For NCESID 3700324, funding was on hold because they were out of compliance with SAM requirements. This requirement was not meet until FY 18-19 and the 94,521 was allotted in FY 17-18.

Ohio

A2A=0, NA or M:

- There are 11 LEAs that are new charter schools with the first year of operation FFY2016.

A3B=0, NA or M:

- IDEA Section 619 will fund three LEAs through restoration funds.
- There are seven LEAs that are new, open, and no students were reported.
- One LEA is new, open and did not receive an IDEA Section 619 allocation because it is a high school district and does not serve children with disabilities ages 3-5.
- There are 114 LEAs that did not receive an IDEA Section 619 allocation because they are high school districts and do not serve children with disabilities ages 3-5.
- There are 13 LEAs that did not receive an IDEA Section 619 allocation because they are middle school districts and do not serve children with disabilities ages 3-5.
- There are 189 LEAs that did not receive an IDEA Section 619 allocation because they did not report any preschool students (ages 3-5) with disabilities through child find.

B2=NA or M:

- Three LEAs did not have determinations as they did not access funds until 2018.
- Fifteen LEAs had organizational structures established in 2014 but had no students with disabilities enrolled. They were reported as new entities in a subsequent year.
- Eight LEAs were new as of 2017 and did not receive allocation in FY 14, thus no determination was made.
- Two LEAs had no allocations made in 2014. Thus, determination was not made.
- One LEA did not exist in 2014, so no determination was made was made. It closed during the 2016-2017 school year and thus no data was available reflecting activities of 2016-2017 school year.
- One LEA straddles the states of Ohio and Indiana. Per agreement between the two states, Indiana administers the LEA; Ohio provides funding for enrolled students whose state of residence is Ohio. Thus, all data based on Ohio students are included in Indiana's reporting and Indiana issues the LEA's determination.

Oregon

Oregon has long term care and treatment centers and approved private schools that provide specialized services to students. It is believed that improved awareness of the need to address mental health issues resulted in an increase in separate school placements.

It is believed that training and technical assistance are leading to better decisions regarding eligibility and accounts for the decrease in emotional disturbance counts. Also, the increase in services provided in the home (and decrease in services provided in the service provider location) are thought to be the result of an overall increase in ECSE population with services initially provided in the home. The intent is to transition to other settings upon determining the needs of the child.

Pennsylvania

The following LEAs, identified by NCESID, are charter schools that closed and were not in business in FFY 2016: 4200142, 4200759, 4200823, 4200865. The remaining school districts/charter schools reported as NA did not have any eligible pre-school children.

Rhode Island

The following LEAs have no IDEA 619 allocations as they have no preschool children: Davies, Achievement First, SS Nowell, Segue Institute, RIMA-Blackstone Valley, UCAP, Paul Cuffee, Kingston Hill, International Charter, Blackstone Academy, Compass, Beacon, Learning Community, Metropolitan Center, Trinity Academy, The Greene School, RI Nurses Institute, Village Green, DCYF and Foster Gloucester. The Dept of Corrections and the Dept of Children, Youth and Families both are limited

purpose LEAs for youthful offenders and are therefore reported as 'NA' under 'The Determination under 34 CFR 300.600(a)(2) that controls whether the LEA may be able to reduce MOE during SY 2016-17.

South Carolina

SCGSAH does receive funds from SCDE OSES for 611 but it is an IDT for salary and fringe. We have yet to award them an official 611 award.

Felton, SCFSAH, JDLH, DDSN and WLG cannot capitalize on MOE reduction up to 50% of 611 award, they did not receive a 611 award. Palmetto, SCSDDB and DJJ 611 award went down from FFY 2015 to FFY 2016. To be eligible for the up to the 50% MOE reduction there must be an increase in the 611 award and that is not the case.

A response greater than zero was reported as a value for Total number of children receiving CEIS under the IDEA in the LEA/ESA during SY 2016-17 (column D2) when the response for Required CEIS Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality in SY 2016-17? (Y/N) (column C2A) was No, M or NA and the response for Voluntary CEIS Did the LEA/ESA voluntarily use up to 15% of IDEA 611 and 619 fund for CEIS in SY 2016-17? (Y/N) (column C3A) was No or M for one or more LEAs.

All LEAs should have 0's for a "No" on the EMAPS submission. We do not have any district having significant disproportionality. Therefore, no single district is required to use 15% of their funds for CEIS.

South Dakota

South Dakota have failed to provide an IDEA Section 619 allocation to LEAs listed below: NCESID 4600029 4621300 4640860 4652770 These LEAs had never received a 619 base payment allocation and because the level of federal funding in FFY 14, FFY 15 and FFY 16 is below FFY 1997, South Dakota has not provided funding for the population and poverty portions of the 619 grant to any of its districts. This is the reason why the LEAs, mentioned above, have not received any allocations. These four districts have served a very small number of children with disability within age range 3-5.

Tennessee

In the FFY 2016 (FY 2017) MOE Reduction and CEIS report Tennessee has had to update the allocations denoted in the MOE Reduction and CEIS report submitted in May of 2017 for FFY 2015 (FY 2016). It was discovered when completing the FFY 2016 (FY 2017) report that the allocations provided previously were for the incorrect fiscal year. The FFY 2015 (FY 2016) allocations have been updated with the correct amounts for the 2016 MOE Reduction and CEIS report loaded in the EMAPS portal. Due to the change in allocation amounts for the previous year's report, there will be discrepancies in allocation amounts for all school districts in this year's report. This is not due to an error in the report, but as a correction to amounts incorrectly reported previously.

Texas

LEAs reported zero, NA, or M 611 funds in Column A2A: LEAs with zero previous year 611 funds are because they either did not receive an allocation or were not in operation.

LEAs reported zero, NA, or M 619 funds in A3B: LEAs with zero 619 funds in the current year are due to ineligibility determined by the state. Issue #3: No Value for B2 (LEA had no Determination under 34 CFR 300.600(a)(2)): These LEAs did not receive a 2016 determination because they were not in operation during the year the information was collected, determinations do not apply, or the LEA had only an adjudicated population.

LEAs with zero previous year 611 funds are because they either did not receive an allocation or were not in operation.

All LEAs reported with a 0 or NA value for Section 619 of IDEA FFY 2016 (A3B) were reported as such because they do not service children with disabilities, ages 3-5. LEAs with zero 619 funds in the current year are due to ineligibility determined by the state.

Utah

The following charter schools are secondary schools and have 0.00 for 619 allocations:

- Academy For Math Engineering and Science
- American Academy of Innovations
- Beehive Science and Technology Academy
- City Academy
- East Hollywood High
- Fast Forward High
- Intech Collegiate High School
- Itineris Early College
- High Kairos Academy
- Karl G Maeser Preparatory Academy
- Merit College Preparatory Academy
- Mountain Heights Academy
- Northern Utah Academy For Math Engineering and Science
- Paradigm High School
- Rockwell Charter High School
- Roots Charter High School
- Salt Lake Arts Academy
- Salt Lake Center For Science Education
- Salt Lake School For The Performing Arts
- Success Academy
- Summit Academy High School
- Tuacahn High SchoolFor The Performing Arts
- Uintah River High
- Utah Career Path High School
- Utah County Academy Of Science
- Utah International Charter School
- Utah Military Academy
- Vanguard Academy
- Winter Sports School

The following schools were reviewed and had no students with disabilities ages 3-5 for the FFY2016 calculation:

- Athlos Academy of Utah
- Franklin Discovery Academy
- Mountain West Montessori Academy
- Pacific Heritage Academy
- Wallace Stegner Academy
- Wasatch Waldorf Charter School
- Weber State University
- Charter Academy

Dixie Montessori Academy Renaissance Academy waived 619 funds for the FFY2016 only and are eligible on for future allocations.

Pioneer High School for the Performing Arts waived 611 Funds for the FFY2016 and are secondary only and not eligible for 619 funds.

The year to year changes are due to faulty data being submitted for the FFY2015 year. The individual who submitted the data for the FFY2015 year is no longer at the USBE and the USBE has set up a review policy to ensure future submissions are correct. Numbers listed in the current submission have been verified and are correct.

The USBE has issued a finding of non-compliance for Syracuse Arts Academy and are in the process of recovering funds, which will be submitted to OSEP.

Vermont

SU (Essex North) budgeted \$8,166.75 (15% of FY17 619 & 611 funds), none were used and no students were served under CEIS. The CEIS funds were not transferred from the State to the LEA and there no future plans for the LEA to administer CEIS funds or efforts.

Although CEIS funds were budgeted, none were spent and no students were served under CEIS (for Essex North, Orleans Southwest and Windsor Central).

WINDSOR NORTHWEST SUPERVISORY UNION (NCES 5099950) was dissolved for FFY2016.

Virgin Islands

The Virgin Islands does not receive 619 funds as the outlying territories were not included in the authorizing statute.

Washington

Stehekin School District (NCES 5308430) had no 611 or 619 allocation in FFY 2015

LaCenter School District (NCES 5304170) was flagged due to a permitted value of NA – Not Applicable submitted in Column B2. LaCenter did not have an individual district determination for the 2014-15 school year as they were still participating under the ESA 112 during that time. Since 2014-15 they are no longer participating within the ESA.

Shaw Island (NCES 5307860), Star (NCES 5308370) and Stehekin (NCES 5308430) were flagged due to a permitted value of NA – Not Applicable submitted in Column B2. Those districts had no students enrolled in their districts for that Determinations year.

Wapato (NCES 5309480) school district set aside funds in the 2015-16 school year but not all of their activities were completed until the following school year. This is the reason the district was not required to continue setting additional funds aside but continue to report as they complete the rest of the activities of the plan.

West Virginia

The allocation provided in column A3B for Institutional Educational Programs (NCES 5400511), was correct. The allocation for FFY2016 is 0 because this LEA does not serve any preschool students, ages 3-5.

Wisconsin

The following LEAs are state agencies for which no determination is made.

- Wisconsin Department of Corrections (NCES 5500035)
- Wisconsin Department of Health Services (NCES 5500036)
- Wisconsin School for the Deaf (NCES 55F0001)
- WI Center for the Blind & Visually Impaired (NCES 55F0002)

The following LEAs are newly established local education agencies that were not in operation in FFY 2014; data was not available to make a determination.

- Herman-Neosho-Rubicon (NCES 5500075)
- Stellar Collegiate (NCES 5500076)
- UCC Acosta Middle School (NCES 5500077)
- Penfield Montessori Academy NCES (5500078)

The following LEAs did not receive an IDEA Section 611 FFY 2015 allocation because they are newly established local education agencies that were not in operation in FFY 2015.

- Herman-Neosho-Rubicon (NCES 5500075)
- Stellar Collegiate (NCES 5500076)
- UCC Acosta Middle School (NCES 5500077)
- Penfield Montessori Academy (NCES 5500078)

The following LEAs did not receive an IDEA Section 619 FFY 2016 allocation because they only serve children in secondary grades. The LEAs do not serve children ages 3 through 5 and so do not receive an IDEA Section 619 allocation.

- Milwaukee Collegiate Academy (NCES 5500066)
- Escuela Verde (NCES 5500069)
- Nicolet UHS (NCES 5505490)
- Hartford UHS (NCES 5506120)
- Arrowhead UHS (NCES 5506180)
- Lake Geneva-Genoa City UHS (NCES 5507650)
- Lakeland UHS (NCES 5509630)
- Norris (NCES 5510710)
- Central/Westosha UHS (NCES 5513290)
- Union Grove UHS (NCES 5515150)
- Big Foot UHS (NCES 5515480)
- Waterford UHS (NCES 5515600)
- Wilmot UHS (NCES 5516770)
- UCC Acosta Middle School (NCES 5500077)
- Wisconsin Department of Corrections (NCES 5500035)

The following LEAs did not receive an IDEA Section 619 allocation because the LEAs did not have a base award. Prior to 2013-14, these LEAs did receive a Section 619 allocation based solely on total student enrollment and poverty. The state's Section 619 allocation, however, is now less than the base award. As such, an allocation is no longer distributed to these LEAs based on total student enrollment and poverty.

- Dover #1 (NCES 5503750)
- Barneveld (NCES 5500840)

The following LEAs did not have a base award.

- WI Center for the Blind & Visually Impaired (NCES 55F0002)
- Wisconsin School for the Deaf (NCES 55F0001)