



Data Notes
Part B Maintenance of Effort Reduction and
Coordinated Early Intervening Services
2009-10 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 other explanations from states about their data.

Arkansas

Greenbrier School District did not budget Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS) funds in school year (SY) 2009-10; however, it provided services to two students using carryover funds from SY 2008-09 when it was mandated to provide CEIS.

Arizona

Some local education agencies (LEAs) voluntarily spent CEIS funds in 2009-10 (C3B). Some of these LEAs used the funds for staff professional development, and they did not report any students served yet because of the timing of their training. The districts will report served students in 2010-11.

The reason Arizona reported a “not applicable” for the Graham County Special Services (GCSS) determination is that GCSS is considered a public consortium, which is defined as the district of attendance where services are provided to students enrolled in several districts of residence that make up the consortium. This public education agency (PEA) acts as the fiscal agent but does not meet the criteria for a PEA determination given that many data points in the determination do not apply, and the resulting calculation would not be valid.

The Academy of Arizona is a charter that reserved American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) funds for CEIS. No funds were released to this charter. No final financial report was submitted requesting reimbursement of costs. The amount reported was the budgeted (reserved) amount. This charter is now closed.

Academy with Community Partners, Inc., charter reserved ARRA IDEA funds for CEIS but did not spend any of its funds for this purpose. The amount reported was the budgeted (reserved) amount.

Acorn Montessori Charter School reserved ARRA IDEA funds for CEIS but did not spend any of its funds for this purpose. The amount reported was the budgeted (reserved) amount.

Blue Ridge Unified District reserved IDEA Basic Entitlement funds for CEIS but did not spend any of its funds for this purpose. The amount reported was the budgeted (reserved) amount.

Creighton Elementary district reserved and spent ARRA IDEA funds for CEIS. The costs were for staff professional development. No students were served during this grant period. This district will track and report any students affected by its use of CEIS funds during the next two years.

Happy Valley School, Inc., charter reserved ARRA IDEA funds for CEIS but did not spend any of its funds for this purpose. The amount reported was the budgeted (reserved) amount.

Isaac Elementary District reserved and spent ARRA IDEA funds for CEIS. The costs were for staff professional development. No students were served during this grant period. This district will track and report any students affected by its use of CEIS funds during the next two years.

Kayenta Unified District reserved and spent ARRA IDEA funds for CEIS. The costs were for staff professional development. No students were served during this grant period. Note that the amount spent was actually \$292.00. This district will track and report any students affected by its use of CEIS funds during the next two years.

Bureau of Indian Education

Four Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) schools reported they reserved funds for voluntary CEIS (column C3A) but did not report 611 or 619 allocations for these schools. Of all the reporting, this was the most difficult because of the tracking requirements and general confusion about reporting. Choctaw Central High School reported reserved funds for CEIS, but it did not need to use any funds for this purpose. The high school reported no students receiving these funds. Hopi Day School does not know how much it spent, but thought the amount was considerable because of the number of students to whom it applies the money. That data point is missing in the report. Hunters Point reported that it spent \$2,250 on 24 students, none of whom eventually needed special education services. San Felipe was confused in reporting as it indicated it did not reserve up to 15% of its funds for CEIS, but did spend \$1,100 on no students. The 611 and 619 funds for these four schools are:

Choctaw Central HS: \$720,033

Hopi Day School: \$245,910

Hunters Point: \$121,551

San Felipe: \$473,025

School	Part B Allocation	Verified Expenditure	Data Note
Lummi Tribal School System	\$855,300	\$354,200	High school & elementary combined
Rocky Ridge Boarding School	\$235,100	\$0	CEIS Plan provided but was not implemented
T'siya Elementary and Middle School	\$242,660	\$11,355	
Santa Fe Indian School	\$528,800	\$120,309	
Red Rock Day School	\$325,800	\$48,870	

Tate Topa Tribal School	\$824,500	\$123,675	
Lukachukai Community School	\$295,800	\$1,721	
Loneman Day School	\$445,000	\$79,393	
Little Wound School	\$551,311	\$90,527	Reserved funds and reported 42 students served and 5 or less were placed with an individualized education program (IEP)
Standing Rock Community School	\$1,358,975	\$199,277	
Red Water Elementary School	\$261,810	\$45,311	
Two Eagle River School	\$160,600	\$29,738	
Marty Indian School	\$505,900	\$74,604	
San Ildefonso Day School	\$82,500	\$14,892	
Bug-O-Nay-Ge-Shig School	\$623,948	\$96,117	
Takini School	\$409,000	\$63,483	
Noli School	\$213,520	\$31,260	
Tiospa Zina Tribal School	\$1,087,006	\$136,597	
Alamo Navajo School	\$541,333	\$69,584	
America Horse School	\$330,000	\$30,424	
Black Mesa Community School			Did not report students
Bogue Chitto Elementary School	\$260,100	\$27,345	
Cherokee Elementary School			Did not reserve funds
Cheyenne-Eagle Butte School	\$1,251,800	\$175,203	
Chinle Boarding School Inc.			Did not report students
Chitimacha Day School	\$211,100	\$26,998	
Choctaw Central Middle School	\$273,000	\$22,710	
Ch'ooshgai Community School	\$388,900	\$0	
Coeur d' Alene Tribal School	\$240,000	\$0	

Conehatta Elementary School	\$470,500	\$33,465	
Cottonwood Day School	\$288,668	\$0	Did not reserve funds and did not report students
Dennehotso Boarding School	\$233,300	\$0	Reserved funds and reported 20 students served and 63 eventually placed with an IEP
Enemy Swim Day School	\$476,100	\$64,800	Did not reserve funds
Hopi Day School	\$308,400	\$28,638	Did not reserve funds and reported serving 12 students, with five or less students placed with an IEP
Hunters Point Boarding School	\$106,000	\$0	
Isleta Elementary School	\$272,700	\$0	
Jemez Day School	\$173,845	\$0	
Lac Courte Oreilles Ojibwa School		\$0	
Leupp School Inc.	\$369,800	\$53,132	
Little Singer Community School		\$0	
Nay-Ah-Shing School		\$0	
Northern Cheyenne Tribal School	\$75,501	\$0	
Oneida Nation School	\$882,600	\$115,279	
Paschal Sherman Indian School	\$381,600	\$57,090	
Pearl River Elementary School	\$813,500	\$75,270	
Pine Hill Schools	\$450,300	\$0	
Pyramid Lake High School	\$273,300	\$0	
Quileute Tribal School	\$332,000	\$0	Did not reserve funds and reported serving 15 students with five or less students placed
Rock Point Community School	\$466,900	\$52,687	
San Felipe Pueblo Elementary School	\$532,000	\$11,000	\$507,825 allocated for 2009-10 and \$532,000 allocated for 2010-11
Sanostee Day School		\$0	Did not reserve funds
Sequoyah High School	\$383,600	\$57,540	
Standing Pine	\$276,100	\$39,905	

Elementary School			
Theodore Roosevelt School	\$144,400	\$2,000	85 students served and five or less students placed with an IEP
Tiospaye Topa School	\$452,600	\$64,325	
Tohaali' Community School	\$424,500	\$29,846	
Tonalea Day School		\$0	
Tucker Elementary School	\$230,800	\$29,875	
Wounded Knee District School	\$171,100	\$8,243	
Ahfachkee Day School			Did not report students

California

Julian Union High had a significant decrease in the amount of 611 funds it received in 2009. Each Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) has a unique allocation model that a governance board approves. The governance board comprises each member district, and each member district approves the allocation plan. Thus, California Department of Education (CDE) does not know why a district agrees to receive a particular allocation of *IDEA* funds from its SELPA for a particular school year.

The 2009-10 cohort of LEAs identified as having significant disproportionality was notified Nov. 25, 2009. LEAs were required to provide CDE with assurances related to setting aside 15% of their regular FY 2009-10 funds and ARRA IDEA funds in order to continue to receive their 2009-10 grant funds. CDE provided guidance and training regarding use of funds and appropriate implementation plans to the districts in March 2010. The guidance required the districts to complete a review of policies, procedures, and practices; to prepare a plan that would integrate early intervening services (EIS) into existing school improvement and reform plans; and to publicly report any policy changes made as a result of their reviews. LEA EIS plans were due by June 30, 2009. As a result, there were eight LEAs/educational services agencies (ESAs) that reserved funds, developed plans, and provided professional development for staff, but no students were served using these funds in SY 2009-10. However, districts will fully expend the 15% of regular IDEA grant and IDEA ARRA funds by Sept. 30, 2011. As the state understood the version of Table 8 for 2010-11, there is no provision for reporting students served using 2009-10 funds in SY 2010-11.

Also, three LEAs did not report reserving CEIS funds, but reported students served. These districts reported CEIS students in error for the following reasons: (1) the LEA had an infant program and thought the CEIS fields referred to Early Intervention Services, and (2) the LEA provided intervention services to non-special education students using a fund source other than

IDEA, thus the LEA did not understand that CEIS is only the provision of intervention services for non-special education students using IDEA reserved funds.

Colorado

General fund operating dollars (state and local) were used as part of the comprehensive plan to serve the needs of all students in the district. The students reported for Table 8 were served in this manner (general funds). No IDEA Part B ARRA funds were used for this activity, as the system to track and serve students was already in place using general funds.

Initially, the Administrative Unit (AU, Douglas RE-1) requested ARRA funds to support CEIS activities. As it was unable to secure authorization for the expenditure, it spent money on other allowable expenditures. The AU was unaware that it was not required to submit data regarding the students affected by the activities supported with general funds, thus the 1,299 students reported for Table 8. The AU did not use IDEA funds, so it did not need to report these students.

Connecticut

The state reported that one or more LEA/ESA was required to use, due to significant disproportionality or voluntarily set aside, up to 15% of funds for CEIS purposes. One CT LEA set aside 15% of its IDEA funds, and two other LEAs voluntarily set aside funds, for CEIS. The data points for these three LEAs were reported on Table 8 for federal fiscal year (FFY) 2010.

Delaware

One LEA reported that it was required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality in section C2A, but no students were reported in section D2 for one or more LEAs. The one LEA is a very unique district in that it serves only middle and high school students. Its elementary schools are actually located in and served by the State of Maryland.

The data entered in C2B appear to be 15% of what A5 totals were before FFY 2008 data were adjusted to include the *ARRA* money. There was a typo in the amount for one of the districts.

Sixty students during FFY 2009 received CEIS training or support at Delmar school district.

District of Columbia

The state reported one or more LEA/ESA was required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality in section C2A, but no students were reported under section D2. The district did not release its CEIS determinations, using FFY 2009 data, until after the FFY 2010 grant allocations were released. As such, each LEA had the option to take its 15% reservation from one of the following grant cycles: FFY 2008, FFY 2009, FFY 2010, or FFY 2011. Four out of five of the LEAs identified as having to make a mandatory set-aside chose to take it from the upcoming FFY 2011 grant cycle. One LEA, Capital City PCS, elected to take the mandatory set aside from the FFY2010 grant cycle.

Georgia

Dublin City received a grant, and it appears that the \$89,068 was reported in error. The actual allotment should be \$574,563. The FFY 2009 amount allocated for ARRA IDEA and regular IDEA was \$1,150,209. There was an increase in the FFY 2009 allocation of \$575,646; thus, 50% of that figure is \$287,823 that could be used for the reduction of local maintenance of effort (MOE).

Hawaii

Hawaii Department of Education functions as a unitary system, with one Board of Education. As the state education agency (SEA), Hawaii demonstrates compliance with the maintenance of financial support (MFS) CFR 300.163, rather than MOE, as authorized by OSEP during the 2010 Verification visit. Under the MFS, both the 611 and 619 funds were used to determine the 50% requirement, CFR 300.230.

For Table 8, the instructions are for states to calculate the MOE requirement, not MFS. Since Hawaii is not required to calculate the MOE, Table 8 does not give an accurate picture for the operation of unitary systems. With that said, in Table 8 in column B3, Hawaii reported a reduction of \$20,832,413 of the 611 funds per the instructions for the MOE requirement. However, since Hawaii reports on MFS, which includes both 611 and 619 funds, the reduction was increased by \$530,534, totaling \$21,362,947 to include 619 funds, as required under MFS.

Idaho

Idaho reported several districts as reducing MOE more than 100% of the allowed amount. In the case of Salmon River District #243, the district was notified in December of 2010, and the funds were repaid, from non-federal funds, to the state department of education. The funds were returned to the U.S. Department of Education by April of 2011. In the case of Cambridge District #432, the district was notified in December of 2010, and the excess was repaid. The funds were returned to the U.S. Department of Education by January of 2011.

For the other two districts with excess reductions, Idaho Falls 091 and Bear Lake 033, MOE was recalculated under 34 CFR 300.203(b)(1)(i). Expenditures from local funds only in 2008-09 were zero; expenditures from local funds only in 2009-10 were zero.

In the Blackfoot District 055, Meridian Joint District 002, Nampa School District 131, and Pocatello District 025, CEIS funds were reserved from 2008-09, and students were served in 2009-10.

Illinois

IL reported one LEA was required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality in section C2A, but the LEA reported no students under section D2 in SY 2009-10 and did not use funds for this purpose during that year. The SEA is currently implementing enforcement actions with this LEA to ensure the LEA implements this requirement in a future fiscal year, despite the fact that the LEA did not continue to show significant disproportionality beyond SY 2009-10.

IL reported that some LEAs voluntarily used up to 15% of IDEA 611 and 619 funds for CEIS in section C3A, but no students were reported under section D2 for one LEA that used the funds in SY 2009-10. In this instance, the amount voluntarily reserved for CEIS was from the LEA's ARRA allocation. The combined regular and ARRA allocations were reported in column A2B and A3B per Table 8 instructions. In accordance with federal guidance that allows LEAs to obligate ARRA funds over the course of 27 months up to the Sept. 30, 2011, deadline and in order to allow for proper planning and fiscal prudence, the timeframe in which the funds were spent did not allow for implementation of CEIS services to serve students without disabilities until SY 2010-11.

IL reported different figures for column C2B than the auto-calculated figure in column A5 for one or more LEAs. In one instance (as described above), the LEA was required by the SEA to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality in SY 2009-10, but the LEA did not use the funds for this purpose during SY 2009-10. The SEA is currently implementing enforcement actions with this LEA to ensure the LEA implements this requirement in a future fiscal year, despite the fact that the LEA did not continue to show significant disproportionality beyond SY 2009-10. In another instance, the LEA was required by the SEA to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality in SY 2009-10, but the LEA did not use the entire 15% of funds for this purpose during that year. The SEA subsequently ensured that the LEA implemented CEIS in SY 2010-11, despite the fact that the LEA did not continue to show significant disproportionality beyond SY 2009-10. In the remaining instances, the SY 2008-09 final total allocations were used to determine the 15% CEIS set-aside amount. This is because the SY 2009-10 allocations were projected, not final, at the time the set-aside was determined.

Indiana

Six LEAs appeared to have exceeded the 50% MOE reduction limit: Huntington County Community School Corporation, Lebanon Community School Corporation, Perry Central School Corporation, Southeast Dubois School Corporation, Tell City-Troy Township School Corporation, and Western Wayne School Corporation. Each of these LEAs maintained MOE with eligible exceptions under 34 CFR 300.204 as well as through the per-capita calculation. Lebanon Community School Corporation and Western Wayne School Corporation also maintained MOE through the aggregate calculation once the eligible exceptions were applied.

South Knox School Corporation exceeded the 50% MOE reduction limit in both the per-capita and aggregate calculations and with no applicable exceptions. The SEA will be responsible for repayment of any funds to the U.S. Department of Education.

In FFY 2009, the total 611 allocation for Eastern Green Schools was \$593,827. This was mistakenly excluded from the submission of the FFY 2009 Table 8 data.

Five LEAs reduced MOE but did not receive a local determination of "Meets Requirements." Twin Lakes School Corp maintained MOE with eligible exceptions under 34 CFR 300.204. Linton-Stockton School Corp, Southwest School Corp, and Bloomfield School District maintained MOE with eligible exceptions under 34 CFR 300.204 as well as through the per-capita calculation. MSD Shakamak Schools reported an eligible exception under 34 CFR 300.204 but with the exception still did not maintain MOE; the SEA will be responsible for repayment of any funds to the U.S. Department of Education.

Iowa

The two LEAs that reported they voluntarily used up to 15% of IDEA 611 and 619 funds for CEIS in C3A did not report students are in their area education agencies, and they used their funds to serve students in other LEAs in their region. These other LEAs then reported those students.

The state reported different figures for column C2B (amount reserved for required CEIS in the LEA/ESA in 2009-10) and column A5 (15% of the total LEA/ESA allocation for 611 and 619 of IDEA for FFY 2009) in one or more LEAs. The “General Instructions” state in item #2 to report whole-dollar amounts. That is what the state entered in both C2A and in C3B. Those LEAs reported in C2A must reserve (and expend) the 15% maximum; those in C3A (Voluntary user) may use up to the 15% but may use less than the 15% maximum. The federal calculation does not round to the nearest whole dollar; Iowa’s figures do round to the nearest whole dollar.

Data reported as the required CEIS amount reserved represent the CEIS amount spent. All CEIS funds that were reserved were equivalent to 15% of the LEA total allocation.

In the state’s student-level data system for this reporting year students could only be assigned to a school district. Intermediate education agencies (AEAs) that reported required or voluntary CEIS amounts also served students, but the state was not able to attribute students to these locations. Presently, students can be assigned to districts and AEAs based on who provides services to the student.

LEAs did not reserve funds for CEIS in SY 2009-10 but reported students receiving CEIS. In the state’s student-level data system for this reporting year, there was not a data check between students marked as being served through CEIS and locations reserving CEIS funding. Presently, this data check exists in the data system, and students cannot be marked in locations that did not reserve CEIS funds.

Louisiana

A portion of the data for Table 8 was obtained from the state’s Egrants system. Districts were required to submit how many students were actually served. The following charter organizations did not provide that information for Table 8:

- 343 – Community School for Apprenticeship Learning
- 371-RSD – Shreveport Charter School, Inc. (School closed at the end of 2009-10; no information available)
- 372-RSD – Crestworth Learning Academy, Inc.
- 373-RSD – Arise Academy
- 374-RSD – Success Preparatory Academy, Inc.
- 375-RSD – Benjamin E. Mays Preparatory School
- 376-RSD – Pride College Preparatory Academy
- 378 – 100 Black Men Charter Initiative (School closed; no information available)
- 380-RSD – Intercultural School Board, Inc.
- 381-RSD – Akili Academy of New Orleans
- 382-RSD – Advocacy for Science and Math

- 386– Esperanza Charter School (School closed and reopened by a new charter organization; no information available)
389-RSD Pelican Education Foundation
390-RSD – Dryades YMCA

Though Avoyelles Public Charter School reported serving students through early intervening (i.e., a tiered intervention approach), these services were not funded with IDEA CEIS funds. The MAX Charter School did allocate funds during the 2009-10 school year in the amount of \$4,271 for CEIS.

Maine

Two LEAs (Boothbay-Boothbay Harbor CSD and Lewiston School Department) had significant decreases in the amount of 611 funds they received in 2009. The state has received revised numbers that would correct the MOE concerns in both districts and changes in 2009 values for additional districts. The original source data for 2009 data apparently did not include the latest ARRA numbers. The revised number also includes small adjustments to nine districts' 2008 values.

Maryland

Baltimore City used Part B 611 and Part B 619 ARRA funds (July 1, 2009-Sept. 20, 2011) for voluntary CEIS. The Baltimore City ECEIS plan was approved late in April 2010. In the time remaining in the 2009-10 school year, Baltimore City was unable to complete evaluations to determine the academic and behavioral supports to benefit students in the general education environment. Funds were carried over into the 2010-11 school year. Zero was reported in the category "total number of children receiving CEIS under the IDEA" in the LEA/ESA during 2009-10, consistent with the OSEP Memorandum 08-09 question #8. The students assessed were reported in the year immediately following the evaluation (2010-11) and will be tracked for two years.

Michigan

The state reported different figures for column C2B and column A5 in one or more LEAs. Based on guidance provided by OSEP, the answer to question 16 states that an LEA required to reserve 15% of its allocations for CEIS may either use funds from the award following the date on which significant disproportionality was determined, or from funds awarded from the appropriation for a prior federal fiscal year. In fact, of the LEAs shown on Table 8, four LEAs chose to use 2009-10 allocations, and seven LEAs chose to use 2008-09 allocations to carry out their required CEIS activities. Therefore, Table 8 incorrectly assumes that all LEAs identified must use 2009-10 funds to meet the CEIS requirement. Data reported in section C2B were reported correctly.

Per OSEP Memorandum 08-09, all LEAs identified with reducing MOE and required to reserve funds for CEIS used 15% of their fiscal year 2008-09 Part B funds in 2009-10, the carryover year, to implement the required CEIS. This enabled the LEAs to reduce their MOE related to the fiscal year 2009-10 Part B funds.

Per OSEP Memorandum 08-09, all LEAs identified with reserving less than 15% of funds for required CEIS used 15 % of their fiscal year 2008-09 Part B funds in 2009-10, the carryover year, to implement the required CEIS.

Ann Arbor Public Schools (NCESID 2602820) used 15% of their fiscal year 2008-09 Part B funds in 2009-10, the carryover year, to implement the required CEIS. In addition, Ann Arbor Public Schools voluntarily used a portion of their fiscal year 2009-10 Part B allocation for CEIS activities. Therefore, the amount shown in the required column C2B was incorrectly reported and should have been reported under the voluntary CEIS column C3B.

Dexter Community School District (NCESID 2612030) was initially reported with an amount of \$277,895 in column C3B, in excess of 15% of its SY Part B allocation. A subsequent approved grant budget amendment reduced the amount voluntarily reserved by the Dexter Community School District from \$277,895 to 205,736, an amount less than 15% of its Part B allocation. Therefore, column C3B should have been reported as \$205,736.

Per OSEP Memorandum 08-09, all LEAs identified with not reserving funds for CEIS for FFY 2009 but reported students receiving CEIS used fiscal year 2008-09 Part B funds in 2009-10, the carryover year, to implement CEIS. The LEAs did not reserve fiscal year 2009-10 funds to implement CEIS. Therefore, no fiscal year 2009-10 Part B funds were reported as reserved for implementing CEIS activities, and the children/students receiving CEIS during school year 2009-10 were correctly reported.

Minnesota

Since CEIS funds may be spent on many different projects, expenditures do not directly affect students in the year the funds are expended. In other words, CEIS is a funding stream and not a specific program. Some examples of why Minnesota districts used 611 and 619 funds for CEIS in 2009-10 but did not report students as receiving CEIS in the same school year include the following: the funded program was a summer school activity, and students are not reported until the following school year, and October 1 enrollment, a teacher mentoring program designed to improve instruction to students or a professional development program.

Districts reserving CEIS funds but reporting no students:

Fourteen districts reserved funds for CEIS on a voluntary basis and did not use their funds in 2009-10 for various reasons. Four returned funds to 611; seven balanced funds forward to 2010-11, and three did not expend their budgeted funds and lost them. All districts in this list are charter schools.

Two districts were expending funds for a planning phase of a CEIS program. One was in the initial year of Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) planning and had no direct service; the other reported no direct services in 2009-10.

One district used reserved CEIS funds for a kindergarten program. General education students are not reported on Minnesota Automated Reporting Student System (MARSS) until the following fall. Reporting the number of students in a CEIS program in May is not possible as they do not have MARSS associated with them.

Eight charter schools had a budget for CEIS, expended those funds, and did not report as required. Minnesota Department of Education has procedures and processes in place to prevent these issues for the May 2013 submission.

Cedar Riverside Community School had a budget for CEIS and no direct service but purchased supplies.

Districts reporting students but reserved no CEIS funds:

The 12 districts in this group reported students incorrectly on MARSS. Two districts (St. Cloud and Hiawatha Valley) had somewhat larger numbers of students and recorded Alternative Delivery of Specialized Instructional Services (ADSIS) or similar local program students incorrectly as CEIS. The other nine districts incorrectly recorded very small numbers of students under the CEIS code.

Inver Grove Heights Schools	Had CEIS budget in 2009-10 for \$64,372.16 but redirected back to 419 later
Minnetonka Public School District	Had CEIS budget for 2009-10 for \$15,016.20 that was carried forward from 2008-09
Rum River Special Education Coop	Had CEIS budget in 2009-10 and balanced forward to 2010-11; did not do CEIS as planned in 2009-10
Midwest Special Education Coop	Had CEIS budget in 2009-10 for \$28,487.48 with direct services; budget not recorded until after Table 8 submission
Hutchinson Public School District	Had CEIS budget in 2008-09 and carried forward to 2009-10 with no new funds; budget not recorded until after Table 8 submission

Mississippi

The state reported LEAs were required to use and voluntarily used 15% of funds in section C2A and C3A, but no students were reported in section D2. The state will be moving from an aggregate count of students who are included in the LEA’s annual application to a data collection within the student state database, Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS), which will require a CEIS indicator to be set for all students. This collection will allow the tracking of all students through the state database and will provide clearer results.

The state reported different figures for column C2B and column A5. One district that was required to set aside 15% had only set aside 8%, thus causing a discrepancy in the total state numbers. Mississippi will be moving to an online application for SY 2011-12 that will include edits and mathematical calculations, thereby removing human mistakes.

Three school districts (Houston, Lafayette County, and Marshall County) did use CEIS funds to serve students. The student counts for these districts were inadvertently left off during the data entry for Table 8; we have listed the student counts by district below.

- Houston: 109
- Lafayette County: 212
- Marshall County: 24

The 61 districts that provided CEIS services but did not reserve funds in the current grant year used carry-over funds for the CEIS services that they provided.

Montana

There was a discrepancy in the FFY 2009 Table 8 submission. There were three districts reported as having students who were served using CEIS funds, but did not allocate for CEIS funds. This is incorrect. For FFY2009, none of the districts were required to, or voluntarily took, 15% of Part B funds to provide CEIS services, nor did any districts serve students using CEIS funds that fiscal year. The error will not occur again, as the state has made more copious notes and will be rewriting our Business Process Manual to reflect that is an edit check we need to perform prior to submitting the data in the future.

Nebraska

Nebraska misunderstood the directions for reporting MOE reduction on Table 8 and as a result reported inaccurate data. Nebraska erroneously reported only those districts that were ineligible to reduce local, or state and local, expenditures under 613(a)(2)(C). As specified in the directions for Table 8, the data have now been corrected to report the actual dollar amount that each LEA or ESA reduced local, or state and local, expenditures under the IDEA MOE provision contained in 613(a) (2) (C) of IDEA. Table 8 now accurately reflects that only those districts that received a determination of "Meets Requirements" were allowed to use the provisions of 613(a)(2)(C) and that the seven districts that did not receive a determination of "Meets Requirements" were not allowed to reduce local, or state and local, expenditures under 613(a)(2)(C).

LEA	NCESID	MOE Reduction
Kenesaw Public Schools	3172420	\$944.00
Hastings Public Schools	3171580	not applicable
Adams Central Public Schools	3102770	\$29,888.46
Silver Lake Public Schools	3100066	\$2,460.55
Neligh-Oakdale Schools	3174220	\$46,319.92
Elgin Public Schools	3170050	not applicable
Nebraska Unified District 1	3100119	\$64,598.50
Arthur County Schools	3103210	not applicable
Banner County Public Schools	3100067	\$13,193.50
Sandhills Public Schools	3176380	not applicable
Boone Central Schools	3102820	not applicable
Cedar Rapids Public Schools	3100068	not applicable
St Edward Public Schools	3176980	not applicable
Alliance Public Schools	3102910	not applicable
Hemingford Public Schools	3171730	\$42,301.50
Lynch Public Schools	3173170	not applicable
West Boyd School District	3100180	not applicable
Ainsworth Community Schools	3102790	not applicable
Gibbon Public Schools	3170980	not applicable
Kearney Public Schools	3172390	not applicable

Elm Creek Public Schools	3170140	\$2,045.50
Shelton Public Schools	3176620	\$22,324.50
Ravenna Public Schools	3175960	not applicable
Pleasanton Public Schools	3175690	not applicable
Amherst Public Schools	3100070	\$2,725.00
Tekamah-Herman Community Schools	3100071	\$13,696.56
Oakland Craig Public Schools	3174640	\$7,140.08
Lyons-Decatur Northeast Schools	3173210	not applicable
Rising City Public Schools	3176080	not applicable
David City Public Schools	3100002	not applicable
East Butler Public Schools	3100003	\$28,893.46
Plattsmouth Community Schools	3175660	\$81,599.50
Weeping Water Public Schools	3178540	not applicable
Louisville Public Schools	3173050	\$25,279.00
Conestoga Public Schools	3174200	not applicable
Elmwood-Murdock Public Schools	3101992	\$11,565.64
Hartington Public Schools	3171520	\$33,797.00
Randolph Public Schools	3175930	\$26,151.50
Laurel-Concord Public Schools	3100004	\$22,459.00
Wynot Public Schools	3178990	not applicable
Coleridge Community Schools	3105310	not applicable
Chase County Schools	3100163	not applicable
Wauneta-Palisade Public Schools	3100018	not applicable
Valentine Community Schools	3178020	not applicable
Cody-Kilgore Public Schools	3105280	\$9,174.50
Sidney Public Schools	3176710	\$65,038.42
Leyton Public Schools	3100072	not applicable
Potter-Dix Public Schools	3175810	not applicable
Sutton Public Schools	3177520	\$13,287.50
Harvard Public Schools	3171550	not applicable
Clay Center Public Schools	3105220	not applicable
Leigh Community Schools	3172720	\$11.05
Clarkson Public Schools	3105160	not applicable
Howells Public Schools	3100005	not applicable
Schuyler Community Schools	3176450	not applicable
West Point Public Schools	3100006	\$83,473.00
Bancroft-Rosalie Comm Schools	3103440	\$86,924.50
Wisner-Pilger Public Schools	3100008	not applicable
Anselmo-Merna Public Schools	3100010	not applicable
Broken Bow Public Schools	3100011	not applicable
Ansley Public Schools	3103060	\$16,294.50
Sargent Public Schools	3176410	\$12,284.00
Arnold Public Schools	3100073	\$10,110.50

Callaway Public Schools	3100012	\$534.00
So Sioux City Community Schools	3176860	\$165,149.56
Homer Community Schools	3172000	not applicable
Chadron Public Schools	3104980	not applicable
Crawford Public Schools	3105520	not applicable
Lexington Public Schools	3172810	not applicable
Overton Public Schools	3175060	not applicable
Cozad City Schools	3105460	\$23,195.50
Gothenburg Public Schools	3171100	\$53,458.00
Sumner-Eddyville-Miller Schools	3177340	not applicable
Creek Valley Schools	3100140	\$5,414.50
South Platte Public Schools	3100110	not applicable
Ponca Public Schools	3175770	not applicable
Newcastle Public Schools	3174310	not applicable
Allen Consolidated Schools	3102880	\$7,855.00
Emerson-Hubbard Public Schools	3100141	\$15,661.50
Fremont Public Schools	3170710	\$97,628.47
Dodge Public Schools	3169780	not applicable
Scribner-Snyder Community Schools	3100076	\$10,979.99
Logan View Public Schools	3100114	\$47,053.50
North Bend Central Public Schools	3100115	\$1,847.00
Omaha Public Schools	3174820	\$2,520,524.50
Elkhorn Public Schools	3170110	not applicable
Douglas Co West Community Schools	3100165	\$42,939.00
Millard Public Schools	3173740	\$1,136,624.13
Ralston Public Schools	3175900	\$64,190.00
Bennington Public Schools	3103990	not applicable
Westside Community Schools	3178660	\$23,190.50
Dundy Co Stratton Public Schools	3100077	not applicable
Exeter-Milligan Public Schools	3100133	not applicable
Fillmore Central Public Schools	3100118	not applicable
Shickley Public Schools	3176650	not applicable
Franklin Public Schools	3100065	\$3,796.50
Maywood Public Schools	3173440	\$13,190.50
Eustis-Farnam Public Schools	3100111	\$15,921.00
Medicine Valley Public Schools	3173600	not applicable
Arapahoe Public Schools	3103090	\$25,731.00
Cambridge Public Schools	3100015	\$989.00
Southern Valley Schools	3100109	not applicable
Southern School District 1	3177180	not applicable
Beatrice Public Schools	3103600	\$4,972.50
Freeman Public Schools	3100116	\$1,803.50
Diller-Odell Public Schools	3100125	\$21,272.00

Garden County Schools	3170800	not applicable
Burwell Public Schools	3104640	\$1,715.50
Elwood Public Schools	3170220	\$17,118.50
Hyannis Area Schools	3172210	\$8,396.50
Greeley-Wolbach Public Schools	3100148	not applicable
Spalding Public Schools	3176890	not applicable
North Loup Scotia Public Schools	3174400	\$18,843.50
Grand Island Public Schools	3100016	\$144,108.89
Northwest Public Schools	3174580	not applicable
Wood River Rural Schools	3178940	\$17,207.00
Doniphan-Trumbull Public Schools	3100121	\$7,282.00
Giltner Public Schools	3171010	not applicable
Hampton Public Schools	3171370	not applicable
Aurora Public Schools	3103360	not applicable
Alma Public Schools	3100080	not applicable
Hayes Center Public Schools	3109120	not applicable
Hitchcock Co School System	3100120	\$20,791.00
O'Neill Public Schools	3174850	\$42,364.00
Ewing Public Schools	3100020	\$6,631.50
Stuart Public Schools	3100082	\$10,964.50
Chambers Public Schools	3105010	not applicable
West Holt Public Schools	3100172	\$18,864.50
Mullen Public Schools	3174040	\$12,758.00
St Paul Public Schools	3100085	\$1,235.00
Centura Public Schools	3162950	\$39,941.00
Elba Public Schools	3170020	not applicable
Fairbury Public Schools	3170440	not applicable
Tri County Public Schools	3105970	\$4,651.00
Meridian Public Schools	3173660	\$194.50
Sterling Public Schools	3177190	\$6,030.48
Johnson Co Central Public Schools	3100176	\$3,116.32
Wilcox-Hildreth Public Schools	3100134	\$251.50
Axtell Community Schools	3103420	not applicable
Minden Public Schools	3173830	\$81,778.30
Ogallala Public Schools	3174760	\$23,673.50
Paxton Consolidated Schools	3175360	\$1,705.00
Keya Paha County Schools	3172480	\$10,138.50
Kimball Public Schools	3172570	\$74,238.93
Creighton Public Schools	3105550	\$38,239.00
Crofton Community Schools	3105630	\$16,980.00
Niobrara Public Schools	3174370	\$22,637.00
Santee Community Schools	3176400	\$261.50
Wausa Public Schools	3178450	\$7,836.50

Bloomfield Community Schools	3104140	\$29,405.00
Lincoln Public Schools	3172840	not applicable
Waverly School District 145	3100021	\$17,523.66
Malcolm Public Schools	3173290	\$83,734.42
Norris School District 160	3100088	\$5,350.27
Raymond Central Public Schools	3104950	\$25,411.00
North Platte Public Schools	3100022	\$259,376.00
Brady Public Schools	3104290	\$6,461.00
Maxwell Public Schools	3100023	\$12,578.68
Hershey Public Schools	3171820	not applicable
Sutherland Public Schools	3100024	not applicable
Wallace Public School District 65 R	3178260	not applicable
Stapleton Public Schools	3177100	not applicable
Loup County Public Schools	3173120	not applicable
Madison Public Schools	3173230	not applicable
Norfolk Public Schools	3174430	\$136,810.00
Battle Creek Public Schools	3103540	\$8,874.00
Newman Grove Public Schools	3174340	\$2,845.00
Elkhorn Valley Schools	3100025	not applicable
Mc Pherson County Schools	3173560	not applicable
Central City Public Schools	3104920	not applicable
Palmer Public Schools	3100089	\$7,271.65
Bayard Public Schools	3100090	not applicable
Bridgeport Public Schools	3100105	not applicable
Fullerton Public Schools	3100091	\$1,993.87
Twin River Public Schools	3100129	\$43,899.50
Johnson-Brock Public Schools	3172335	\$6,037.00
Auburn Public Schools	3103330	\$62,523.58
Superior Public Schools	3100029	\$105,845.00
So Central Ne Unified System 5	3100122	not applicable
Syracuse-Dunbar-Avooca Schools	3177550	not applicable
Nebraska City Public Schools	3174160	not applicable
Palmyra District O R 1	3175210	\$28,755.39
Pawnee City Public Schools	3175330	\$16,215.50
Lewiston Consolidated Schools	3172780	\$20,526.90
Perkins County Schools	3100157	\$47,056.50
Holdrege Public Schools	3171940	\$137,099.59
Bertrand Public Schools	3104020	\$7,961.46
Loomis Public Schools	3172990	not applicable
Pierce Public Schools	3175510	not applicable
Plainview Public Schools	3175570	not applicable
Osmond Public Schools	3175030	\$1,808.00
Columbus Public Schools	3105340	\$29,386.00

Lakeview Community Schools	3100112	\$14,283.00
Humphrey Public Schools	3172150	\$20,468.50
Cross County Community Schools	3100130	\$33,200.00
Osceola Public Schools	3175000	\$12,099.50
Shelby Public Schools	3176590	\$8,512.68
High Plains Community Schools	3100123	not applicable
Mc Cook Public Schools	3173470	\$1,274.50
Southwest Public Schools	3100178	not applicable
Falls City Public Schools	3170530	not applicable
Humboldt Table Rock Steinauer	3100179	\$35,437.18
Rock County Public Schools	3176170	\$10,889.00
Crete Public Schools	3100095	\$63,185.00
Dorchester Public Schools	3169840	\$874.00
Friend Public Schools	3100096	\$10,925.54
Wilber-Clatonia Public Schools	3178720	\$49,343.74
Bellevue Public Schools	3103810	not applicable
Papillion-La Vista Public Schools	3175270	\$195,212.18
Gretna Public Schools	3171220	\$81,581.32
South Sarpy Dist 46	3175630	not applicable
Ashland-Greenwood Public Schools	3100034	\$60,880.90
Yutan Public Schools	3179080	\$65,815.70
Wahoo Public Schools	3178210	\$29,523.10
Mead Public Schools	3173590	\$17,798.69
Prague Public Schools	3100040	not applicable
Cedar Bluffs Public Schools	3104870	\$2,378.53
Minatare Public Schools	3173800	not applicable
Morrill Public Schools	3100097	\$53,795.00
Gering Public Schools	3100098	\$120,621.00
Mitchell Public Schools	3173890	not applicable
Scottsbluff Public Schools	3176470	not applicable
Milford Public Schools	3173710	not applicable
Seward Public Schools	3176560	\$65,551.71
Centennial Public Schools	3100099	not applicable
Hay Springs Public Schools	3171610	\$35,526.00
Gordon-Rushville Public Schools	3100170	not applicable
Loup City Public Schools	3173090	\$50,211.00
Litchfield Public Schools	3172910	not applicable
Sioux County Public Schools	3176800	\$665.50
Stanton Community Schools	3100041	\$3,817.00
Deshler Public Schools	3105910	\$8,707.67
Thayer Central Community Schools	3100132	not applicable
Bruning-Davenport Unified System	3100124	\$6,403.50
Theftord Public Schools	3177730	\$13,150.50

Pender Public Schools	3175390	\$39,541.50
Walthill Public Schools	3178300	not applicable
Umo N Ho N Nation Public Schools	3119560	not applicable
Winnebago Public Schools	3178810	\$33,073.00
Ord Public Schools	3174940	not applicable
Arcadia Public Schools	3103120	\$6,694.00
Blair Community Schools	3104100	\$132,009.50
Fort Calhoun Community Schools	3170650	\$14,926.65
Arlington Public Schools	3103130	\$8,322.46
Wayne Community Schools	3178520	\$47,997.00
Wakefield Public Schools	3178240	not applicable
Winside Public Schools	3178840	\$19,028.00
Red Cloud Community Schools	3175990	\$8,835.49
Blue Hill Public Schools	3104200	not applicable
Wheeler Central Schools	3178670	\$10,929.00
York Public Schools	3179050	not applicable
Mc Cool Junction Public Schools	3173500	\$29,614.00
Heartland Community Schools	3100117	not applicable

New Hampshire

The Concord School District was not required to reserve 15% of CEIS because of disproportionality. A yes was accidentally reported under column C2A. The necessary changes have been made and resubmitted to OSEP.

Although it appears from Table 8 that Greenland allocated more than its 15%, the CEIS allocation was based on two districts that combined their IDEA entitlement as a School Administrative Unit (SAU). The total entitlement for the districts of Greenland and Rye (SAU 50) is \$371,432.96 of which 15% would be \$55,714.95. Therefore the CEIS allocation reported would be under the 15%.

It did not appear that Table 8 gave us the opportunity to report by SAU.

New Jersey

The following districts, Berkley Heights, Glassboro, Sterling HS District, Stratford Borough, and Union City, reported 0 students served during the 2009-10 SY. The Office of Special Education inadvertently reported incorrect figures for these districts due to a data entry error. These districts were not required to set aside funds for CEIS nor did they reserve funds voluntarily.

The number of students served for 2009-10 for Egg Harbor City should have been 0, and the number of students for Egg Harbor Township should have been 166. The information for these districts was inadvertently transposed in the final submission. The number of students served for 2009-10 for South Hackensack should have been 0, and the number of students for Hackensack should have been 127. Again, the information for these districts was inadvertently transposed in

the final submission. The original numbers presented above represent data errors that occurred at the NJ Office of Special Education after the correct data were received from the LEAs.

School District of the Chathams did not reserve funds and did not serve students, and these data were accurately reported by the Office of Special Education in the original submission.

With the changes and clarifications mentioned above, the issues identified by OSEP in New Jersey's 2010 Table 8 file have been resolved.

New Mexico

New Mexico reported a "not applicable" for the determination for the New Mexico School for the Deaf. According to 34 CFR 300.600(d), the state must monitor the LEAs located in the state, using quantifiable indicators in each of the following indicators in each of the following priority areas, and using such qualitative indicators as are needed to adequately measure performance in those areas. 34 CFR 300.600(a) (2) requires the state to make determinations annually about the performance of each LEA in the state using categories in 34 CFR 300.6-3(b) (1), which includes information from the state's annual performance report. Not all of the indicators apply to the New Mexico School for the Deaf, such as disproportionate representation, least restrictive environment, 60-day timeline, etc. The school is monitored on the indicators that apply and are publically reported. However, the determination criteria do not apply to the school.

New York

The NYS Executive Budget directed the state education department to distribute one-half of the 2009-10 ARRA funds in the 2009-10 school year and the other half in the 2010-11 school year. Reporting the full amount of ARRA funds in 2009-10 affected the automatic calculation of 15% that school districts were required to reserve for CEIS and also for districts that voluntarily reserved up to 15%. The data reported for the actual amounts that school districts reserved for CEIS are the amounts that school districts budgeted in their federal aid applications. They will be less than 15% for the required districts. When the state reports 2010-11 data in Table 8, it will not report any ARRA funds as part of the 2010-11 IDEA allocation since it was required to report the full amount of ARRA in 2009-10. This will mean that in 2010-11, the amounts that school districts reserve for CEIS will calculate to more than 15%.

North Carolina

Because federal funds are available for a 27-month period, LEAs that had CEIS funds for 2008-09 had carryover funds available in 2009-10 and provided CEIS in 2009-10 even though they did not request any 2009-10 CEIS funds.

Ohio

LEA reserved more than 15% for voluntary CEIS – The LEA in question is a County Board of Developmental Disabilities. The LEA failed to input all the required data for the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) to accurately report the correct amount available for voluntary

CEIS. ODE is in the process of working with the LEA to determine if this amount of funds was actually expended.

LEAs did not reserve funds for CEIS in SY09-10 but reported students receiving CEIS – ODE contacted all 39 LEAs that did not reserve funds yet reported students as receiving CEIS. For some of the LEAs in question, data are displayed as not applicable999. This is a data error and should have been reported as 0. The remaining LEAs reported students based on prior year CEIS and the requirement to report student data for two years consecutively. They did not use CEIS funds for the reporting year.

LEAs reserved funds for CEIS but did not report students receiving CEIS – ODE contacted all 31 LEAs that reserved funds for CEIS but reported no students. LEAs reported that this was the first year they had used the CEIS voluntary option, used the funds for professional development, and planning and as such did not have students to report prior to the end of the year.

ODE continues to refine and update its data collection tools and LEA reporting documentation to ensure that ODE is receiving and reporting the most accurate data available.

Oklahoma

Ten LEAs exceeded the 50% reduction limit for MOE on Chart 1. Originally, flexibility and reduction of MOE were calculated by comparing the total federal subgrant allocation the LEA received under the Part B Grants to States program in FFY 2008 plus the total amount of ARRA funds to the total federal subgrant allocation the LEA received under the Part B Grants to States program in FFY 2009. After reviewing and revising our procedures, district-level allocations were revised, and the MOE was recalculated. The correct reduction for the 50% flexibility was established using federal guidance revised April 13, 2009. The total federal subgrant allocation the LEA received under the IDEA Part B Grants to States program in FFY 2008 was compared to the total subgrant rants allocation from FFY 2009, including the ARRA funds. All of the LEAs reported on Chart 1 were determined to be eligible to take advantage of the MOE reduction under IDEA 613(a)(2)(C) for this fiscal year. Districts that exceeded the 50% reduction limit satisfactorily met one or more of the approved exceptions to MOE and submitted documentation that one or more of the exceptions had been met. There is not an issue with any of the LEAs identified on Chart 1.

Twenty-four districts reduced MOE and had no increase in allocation. Originally, flexibility and reduction of MOE were calculated by comparing the total federal subgrant allocation the LEA received under the Part B Grants to States program in FFY 2008 plus the total amount of ARRA funds to the total federal subgrant allocation the LEA received under the Part B Grants to States program in FFY 2009. After reviewing and revising our procedures concerning the reporting of allocations in the MOE calculation, district-level MOE was recalculated. The correct reduction for the 50% flexibility was established using federal guidance revised April 13, 2009. The total federal subgrant allocation the LEA received under the IDEA Part B Grants to States program in FFY 2008 was compared to the total subgrant grants allocation from FFY 2009, including the ARRA funds. All of the LEAs reported on Chart 1 were determined to be eligible to take advantage of the MOE reduction under IDEA 613(a)(2)(C) for this fiscal year. Districts that exceeded the 50% reduction limit satisfactorily met one or more of the approved exceptions to

maintenance of effort and submitted documentation that one or more of the exceptions had been met. There is not an issue with any of the LEAs identified on Chart 2.

MOE was reduced and one district was required to reserve funds for CEIS. Pleasant Grove was not required to set reserve funds; it chose to reserve funds for CEIS; therefore the percentage could be below 15%. The Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) reported incorrectly.

Twenty LEAs reserved less than 15% of funds for required CEIS. The districts cited were not required to set aside funds for CEIS activities. The LEAs voluntarily set aside funds.

Six LEAs reserved funds for CEIS but did not report students receiving CEIS. The LEAs set aside funds for CEIS voluntarily; they were not required to set aside funds. The districts have been notified of 300.226 concerning early intervening services and proper reporting procedures.

LEAs reported the provision of CEIS for students when no IDEA Part B funds were voluntarily or mandatorily set aside for this activity. The CEIS under Part B of the IDEA Memorandum published on August 14, 2006, allowed LEAs to use some Part B funds for CEIS that has the potential to benefit both special education and general education, not exceeding 15% of the Part B funds of IDEA. LEAs did not accurately report correct data concerning tracking of students who received CEIS, as the 80 districts cited in Chart 6 were not required or did not choose to set aside any funds for CEIS activities. OSDE contacted districts regarding Table 8 submission for the 2009-10 school year that reported that they used CEIS funds to serve children but did not set aside federal funds for these activities. Districts reported data entry errors and assured the OSDE that they did not use IDEA funds in the 2009-10 school year to serve children who were not identified with disabilities. Some districts stated that they just put in a number because they did not know what to put in that box on the data report. OSDE will change the data report for future reporting so this is no longer an issue. Questions posed on the end of the year data report will be rephrased to read, "Did you set aside IDEA funds under Project Code 623 for children not identified with disabilities? If yes, how many children received CEIS services?" LEAs that misreported have received information and training to ensure that future information collected will be accurate.

Eleven LEAs reserved funds for required CEIS and Voluntary CEIS. All districts noted voluntarily reserved funds for CEIS. This was a data entry error by the OSDE.

Oregon

The MOE reduction data (columns B3 & B4) for four districts were incorrectly reported. The correct information for those four districts is presented in the table below and can be located on the Oregon Department of Education website at this link:

<http://www.ode.state.or.us/search/page/?=2902>.

B1A. LEA/ESA Name	B1B. LEA/ESA NCEIS ID#	B2. For each LEA/ ESA, specify the determination under 34 CFR 300.600(a) (2) that controls whether the LEA may be able to reduce MOE during SY 2009-10	B3. Reduction of local and/or state funds taken pursuant to 613(a)(2)(C) by the LEA/ESA during SY 2009-10 (\$ amount)	B4. Percent of the available reduction taken by LEA /ESA during SY 2009-10 (%)
Centennial SD 28J	4102800	Meets the requirements and purposes of Part B	765138.59	100
Gaston SD 511J	4105430	Meets the requirements and purposes of Part B	50104.49	100
Harney County SD 3	4102490	Meets the requirements and purposes of Part B	115466.14	100
Knappa SD 4	4100040	Meets the requirements and purposes of Part B	not applicable	not applicable

Pennsylvania

Since the Mutually Agreed Upon Written Agreements, agencies (MAWAs) do not receive 619 funds as districts, but rather as MAWAs, and because MAWAs do not serve children K-12 and therefore cannot be required to use or voluntarily use CEIS funds, those LEAs would report \$0 under A3A and A3B.

Rhode Island

The Rhode Island Department of Education provided technical assistance to LEAs as needed. Despite intense technical assistance provided to one LEA, it continued to struggle with expending early intervening services funds and thus tracking students. One of the LEAs budgeted to hire a specific type of professional personnel for delivery of EIS. The LEA did not spend the money for EIS as the personnel position was never filled. Therefore, there were no services provided or children to report related to that personnel position. In many cases, expenses expected for training did not come to fruition or come to as high of a cost as expected. The unexpended funds were applied to EIS in FFY 2010.

Three districts in Rhode Island were reported as reserving more than 15% of funds. The state calculates the 15% reserve based on the total funds budgeted.

Rhode Island does not have the number of students who received CEIS in the two districts that did not report this information in FFY 2009 due to district tracking and reporting difficulties that year and subsequent district staff turnover, making correction in arrears not feasible. The two districts received training and have successfully reported students who received CEIS in subsequent years' collections.

The discrepancy in the districts that reported reserving either too much or too little for CEIS in FFY 2009 is due to the FFY 2009 practice of basing the CEIS on budgeted funds rather than total allocation. A correction has been made in the system so that districts now base the CEIS percentage on total allocation rather than budgeted amount.

South Carolina

The amounts reported for voluntary CEIS expenditures by three LEAs were inaccurately reported. Please see corrections for 2009 Table 8 CB3 below:

LEANAME	NCESID	09 C3B Reported 6/17/2011	09 CB3 Corrected 9/24/2012
Bamberg County School District 01	4500930	\$134,196	\$128,197
Barnwell County School District 29	4501050	\$110,581	\$63,185
Sumter County School District 02	4503720	\$714,064	\$18,619

South Carolina feels confident that the revisions to our fiscal procedures will eliminate such issues in the future. The South Carolina Department of Education Office of Exceptional Children now has in place a fiscal team and the following process for CEIS amount verification.

1. Maximum available CEIS amount is entered on LEA Grant Award Notification
2. LEA completes Grant Application and submits to the SEA for review and approval
3. LEA CEIS amount verified by fiscal support staff and fiscal team lead during LEA application process before approval
4. LEA is notified of approval or required revisions for resubmission
5. LEA CEIS amount verified by Quality Assurance and Fiscal Team lead before submission of Table 8 data
6. Formatted Table 8 data edit check for mandatory amount of 15% and voluntary amount of 15% or less prior to submission.

Tennessee

Bedford County, Franklin City, and Tipton County School Districts did not reserve funds from SY 2009-10 for CEIS; however, the three school systems did reserve funds in the prior year (FY 2009) and expended those funds through September 30, 2009.

Sweetwater City did not budget CEIS funds in the original FY 2010 application. During the fiscal year, the LEA did submit an amendment to include these funds and services. The number

of students reported is correct. Due to a clerical error, funds in the amount of \$59,357.70 were not reported.

The state has established procedures to ensure that all information submitted for Table 8 in the future is accurate by following these steps:

- Central office staff maintain a listing of all LEAs reserving funds for CEIS during each fiscal year to include any amendments to the application
- District staff are charged with maintaining a separate listing of these data for each LEA they are assigned; the lists are then reviewed and confirmed for accuracy
- CEIS data are submitted in the fall to include data from the previous fiscal year. This data is also reviewed and verified prior to submission to the central office. Monitoring visits confirm that backup documentation is available to support the submissions by LEAs.

Texas

Some LEAs did not receive a determination rating in FFY 2009 (B2) because the LEA was not operational during the year information was collected. Some LEAs that were eligible to reduce their MOE exceeded 50% (B3). The state identified those LEAs and took appropriate action. Some LEAs that were not eligible to reduce their MOE reduced it. The state has identified those LEAs and has taken appropriate action.

Some LEAs voluntarily spent CEIS funds in 2009-10 (C3B) from their IDEA-B ARRA fund source, but will not serve students until 2010-11. Therefore, they reported 0 students served in 2009-10 (D2).

Vermont

Two ESAs voluntarily reserved funds for CEIS in 2009-10 but did not report any children served by CEIS during that year. The reasons are as follows: The ESA Franklin Northwest Supervisory Union (NCES ID 5099920) originally budgeted \$10,000 for CEIS, but no funds were actually used for CEIS. Therefore, the ESA did not report any students served by CEIS. The ESA Orange East Supervisory Union (NCES ID 5099927) used \$15,942 of the \$27,168 budgeted for CEIS; however, the supervisory union did not spend CEIS monies until late in the 2009-10 school year. It purchased assessment materials and related equipment that it began using in 2010-11. Since it did not use the assessments in 2009-10, it reported that no children were served by CEIS funds for the 2009-10 school year. The Orange East Supervisory Union is now implementing the assessments and is tracking students benefiting from the purchased materials and equipment.

Virginia

The state reported different figures for column C2B and column A5 for one LEA. The LEA was required to set aside the 15%, but did not do so until the next grant award. The reporting format for Table 8 did not allow for this to be reported.

For Falls Church City Schools, Mecklenburg County Schools, and Powhatan County Schools, the amounts originally submitted for these three school divisions reflected the amounts expended for CEIS. These three divisions did reserve the required amounts for CEIS for the 2009-10

school year. Also, all funds were properly expended. The data were reported correctly for FFY 2010.

Washington

The state attributed the amount calculated as a reduction of local and/or state funds for SY 2009-10 for Palisades School District to be an accounting coding error as the district of less than 20 students did not accept 611 funds in FFY 2009 nor did the district report any students with disabilities for either 2008-09 SY or 2009-10 SY.

Wisconsin

Several LEAs required to set aside Part B funds for CEIS during FFY 2008 did not expend the entire required 15% during that year. The remainder was “carried over” into FFY 2009 as required CEIS funds to spend. Ten of these LEAs only budgeted and expended the required CEIS carryover from FFY 2008 during FFY 2009. No new FFY 2009 Part B funds were set aside for the CEIS activities.

All the LEAs that used CEIS carryover funds during FFY 2009 submitted student information related to FFY 2008 and FFY 2009. This was reported on the FFY 2009 Table 8 data. However, no CEIS funds were reported for FFY 2009 as they were not FFY 2009 Part B grant funds, they were attached to the FFY 2008 Part B grant.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) accurately reported the total number of children receiving CEIS under IDEA in LEAs during SY 2009-10. WDPI reported one child received CEIS in Lac du Flambeau #1 School District, and one child received CEIS in Pulaski Community School District.

Wyoming

The state reported that some LEAs voluntarily used 15% of funds in section C3A, but no students were reported in section D2 for one or more of the LEAs. One district initially indicated it would be using CEIS funds (volunteer); however, the district never used the funds, so no student-level data were necessary. The district completed an amendment to its grant application and spent the grant funds on other allowable costs.

The state reported different figures for column C2B and column A5 in one or more LEAs. These data were initially reported incorrectly, but when the state reviewed its accounting file, these data were updated and corrected.

The state reported a “not applicable” in the determination for Wyoming Department of Health in 2008-09. This was an oversight that occurred during the reporting of the data. The determination should have been entered as Needs Assistance, and this datum has been corrected.