



Part C Data Notes

2010-11 Reporting Year and Fall 2011

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 or other changes that data users may find notable or of interest in the data from the previous year.

The data notes are organized as follows: Child Count, Settings, Exiting, and Dispute Resolution.

2011 Child Count

Alabama

Alabama does not serve at-risk or infants and toddlers older than age 3.

Alaska

Alaska does not serve at-risk or infants and toddlers over the age of 3.

American Samoa

American Samoa served fewer children in this reporting period due to the following program factors:

1. The program changed its eligibility criteria when the newborn hearing screening program (NBHS) was launched; children with hearing concerns were no longer automatically eligible for Early Intervention services until they had a referral from the NBHS program.
2. The program lost Child Find staff, which limited the program's child awareness activities to radio ads and interagency collaboration (i.e., local hospital, other public health programs such as Maternal and Child Health, Department of Human Services Child Care program).
3. In addition to no Child Find staff, the program was significantly understaffed, with only one service coordinator performing developmental services.
4. The main service coordinator was promoted to program manager (note: the program is close to hiring new service coordinators; the process is currently in applicant screening phase.)
5. The program changed its eligibility determination to: (a) Pending cases—new referrals being screened and assessed to determine eligibility, (b) Monitored cases—infants and toddlers not determined eligible upon completion of screening and assessment but needing follow-up/monitoring, (c) Active cases—infants and toddlers who are eligible and have received individualized family service plans (IFSPs).

California

California Department of Education (CDE) data were not made available to the Department of Developmental Services (DDS) ahead of the February 1, 2012, submission due date. Furthermore, CDE has informed DDS that specific data elements, required under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), will be unavailable for an indefinite period of time.

California does not serve children over 3 years of age in the Part C program.

NOTE: Child count data contain only DDS data and do not include data collected annually from CDE.

Guam

Guam does not serve at-risk or infants and toddlers over the age of 3.

Illinois

Illinois submitted incorrect data on February 1, 2011, and is resubmitting these data as a revision of that submission with the corrected child count data for the prior year.

Kansas

Kansas does not serve at-risk or infants and toddlers over the age of 3.

Louisiana

Louisiana does not serve at-risk or infants and toddlers over the age of 3.

Maine

Maine does not serve at-risk or infants and toddlers over the age of 3. Maine will not provide information for "Optional Section D."

Massachusetts

Massachusetts attributed the decrease in the number of children reported in the child count under the Asian and Multi-race categories to an error in the computer script used to produce last year's child count data. Last year, the script resulted in undercounting the number of Hispanic children by identifying these children under one of the other race categories.

Michigan

Michigan does not serve at-risk or infants and toddlers over the age of 3.

New Mexico

New Mexico reported a large increase in the number of children counted in the optional section of the Data Transmission System (DTS). This resulted in a more accurate cumulative count of children.

New York

New York does not serve children ages 3 or older. However, under certain circumstances, children ages 3 or older are allowed to remain in the Part C program until the effective date of their Committee on Preschool Special Education (CPSE). The numbers reported exclude 419 children over age 3 who were enrolled in the NY Early Intervention Program on October 1, 2009. New York does not serve at-risk children.

There was a decrease from 846 children with unknown race/ethnicity in the last reporting period to 405 in this reporting period. Much of this decrease in unknown race/ethnicity was a result of New York City's efforts in getting more complete race/ethnicity data.

The New York Early Intervention Program experienced a decrease in the overall child count of 2,337 (7.5%) from 2010 to 2011. This decrease was most pronounced in New York City.

Pennsylvania

Pennsylvania does not serve at-risk children or those older than age 3.

Rhode Island

This year Rhode Island reported its data in accordance with the Department of Education's 2007 Guidance for Race or Ethnicity. The Rhode Island Early Intervention Care Coordination System (RIEICCS) allows providers to check multiple races in compliance with the OMB standards. For this report, the following reporting categories were used based on family report:

- Hispanic/Latino of any race;
- Non-Hispanic/Latino, the five federal categories were used,
- Two or more races are selected and Non-Hispanic/Latino, two or more races was used.

RIEICCS system data were validated through a raw data download to an Access database. Changes to the collection of race have now been fully implemented. White and Two or more Races increased by more than 10%. Race collection policies were also re-distributed to all providers. This factor along with the continued increase in enrollment caused a change from the previous year's count.

South Carolina

South Carolina does not serve at-risk children or those older than age 3.

Tennessee

Tennessee had a significant increase in the Birth to 1 age group for the 2011 child count data. The data were drilled down to the Tennessee Early Intervention System-Point of Entry (TEIS-POE) level. Five POE districts experienced a significant increase in this age group. Tennessee believes that this increase was due to improved relationships with medical providers and hospitals. Tennessee reported a significant increase in the category Two or more races and a significant decrease in the race categories of Hispanic and Asian. Tennessee believes these significant changes were due to the changes in race categories in 2010. Tennessee did not reclassify children, but elected to use new categories as new children entered the program.

Texas

The child count for the Texas Part C program decreased approximately 18% from 2010 to 2011. This decrease was due in large part to changes in eligibility criteria that were implemented in response to reduced funding for the program.

Virgin Islands

The Virgin Islands does not serve at-risk children or those older than age 3.

Virginia

Virginia does not serve at-risk children or those older than age 3. This data submission included 1,023 infants and toddlers receiving services (free appropriate public education (FAPE)) through the public schools.

The state's child count continues to increase annually because of strong child find activities. Most of the child count by race ethnicities increased during this time. While the numbers increased, there was no significant change in the ratios among the race ethnicities.

2011 Settings

Alaska

Alaska does not serve at-risk children or those older than age 3.

American Samoa

American Samoa attributed the overall increase in community-based setting to contract issues with service providers; service coordination was increased to try and fill in for the lapse in other services. During this time, service coordination was provided more frequently in community settings. In 2011, the contract issues were resolved, and the program went back to more frequent service delivery in the home. Typically, services are provided in the home unless a family refuses home visits.

Arizona

Arizona attributed the decline in the percentage of children reported as receiving Part C services in other settings to a 3-year trend. The percentage of children reported as receiving services in other settings in 2009 was 25%, in 2010 was 14%, and in 2011 was 7%. This decline was directly linked to changes in how settings data are collected and reported through the AZ Part C data system. Settings data can now be collected from IFSPs in many instances, and the percentage of records containing valid and reliable settings data has improved to 99.99%.

Arkansas

Arkansas attributed the overall decrease in community-based programs to a decrease in the number of children served in the Early Intervention Program. Arkansas continues to provide clarification of policies and procedures surrounding natural environments.

The overall increase in other setting was due to more families wanting children in these settings and the state initiatives that are in place to serve children in their natural environments. Arkansas has improved in this area by providing clarification of policies and procedures surrounding natural environments.

California

California stated that DDS will continue to collaborate with CDE to resolve the issue that specific data, required under Part C of IDEA, will be unavailable for an indefinite period of time. CDE data were not made available to DDS for the February 1, 2012, submission deadline and informed DDS.

NOTE: Table 1 contains only DDS data and does not include data collected annually from CDE. California does not serve children over 3 years of age in the Part C program.

California attributed the increase in community-based settings to an overall increase in the number of children served in California's Early Start program, many of whom were served in community-based settings. Additionally, there was an increase in training and technical assistance given to the regional center system on transitioning to natural environments especially in a major portion of the Los Angeles service area, where services were moved from segregated programs to community-based natural environment settings.

Connecticut

Connecticut included the following in the category for other settings: children who received primary services in the hospital, children seen in the offices of child protective services Department of Children and Families (DCF)) during supervised visits, and the families of children seen at the shelter where they were temporarily living. IFSP justification pages for all these children are on file with the lead agency.

Delaware

Delaware noted that this is the first full year that it has collected the category multi-racial; ARRA funds have allowed for additional services to be provided in home and community environments.

Florida

Florida reported 211 children with no primary setting in the other settings category. A worksheet that showed the crosswalk between Florida's location of service codes and OSEP/Westat primary setting categories was attached in the submission.

Florida attributed the overall decrease in children served in community-based and other settings to an overall decrease in children served and a higher percentage of children being served in the home setting.

Guam

Guam does not serve at-risk children or those older than age 3.

Hawaii

Hawaii attributed the overall increase in the proportion of children served in other settings to programs being unable to fill their position vacancies over an extended period of time and families being offered services at the program until staff vacancies were filled.

Kansas

Kansas does not serve at-risk children or those older than age 3.

Louisiana

Louisiana does not serve at-risk children or those older than age 3.

Maine

Maine does not serve at-risk children or those older than age 3.

Missouri

Missouri attributed the overall increase in home setting to the increase in child count, as both grew from 2010 to 2011 by the same percentage.

Nevada

The number of children receiving the majority of their early intervention services in community-based settings increased from 2010 to 2011. The primary reason for this change was the success of early intervention service provider programs in working with community-based organizations to increase opportunities for integration of children with disabilities in community-based play groups.

The number of children receiving the majority of their early intervention services in settings considered “other” also increased from 2010 to 2011. The primary reason for this change was that the budget for state-operated early intervention service provider programs required them to provide therapy services in clinic-based settings.

New Mexico

New Mexico attributed the overall increase in use of community-based settings was because the FIT Program continued to encourage providers to provide services in the natural environments that the children were in during the day. This resulted in an increase in the number of children being served in early learning in the community, such as child care centers, Early Head Start, etc.

New York

New York does not serve children ages 3 or older. However, under certain circumstances, children ages 3 or older are allowed to remain in the Part C program until the effective date of their CPSE. The numbers reported excluded 419 children over age three who were enrolled in the NY Early Intervention Program on October 1, 2009. New York does not serve at-risk children.

There was a decrease from 846 children with unknown race/ethnicity in the last reporting period to 405 in this reporting period. Much of this decrease in unknown race/ethnicity was a result of New York City's efforts in getting more complete race/ethnicity data.

The New York Early Intervention Program experienced a decrease in the overall child count of 2,337 (7.5%) from 2010 to 2011. This decrease was most pronounced in New York City.

North Carolina

North Carolina does not serve at-risk children or those older than age 3.

Ohio

In 2011, Ohio observed an increase in the proportion of infants and toddlers served in home settings and a decrease in those served in community-based and other settings. The state largely attributed this change to the manner in which primary setting was calculated. In previous years, this calculation was simply based upon the primary setting recorded by the service coordinator on the IFSP. In order to attempt to gain a more in-depth understanding of where Ohio's Help Me Grow children are receiving services, all services listed on the IFSP were examined and taken into account. The total number of minutes per year was

calculated for each service and added up to get a total for each setting, and whichever accounted for the most total minutes was considered to be the primary setting.

A 'match' comparison was also computed in order to determine what percentage of primary settings recorded by the service coordinators matched the calculation of primary setting using the most total minutes per year. Eighty-six percent of children had the same primary setting, regardless of method used for calculation.

Rhode Island

This year Rhode Island reported its data in accordance with the Department of Education's 2007 Guidance for Race or Ethnicity. RIEICCS allows providers to check multiple races in compliance with the OMB standards. For this report, the following reporting categories were used based on family report:

- Hispanic/Latino of any race;
- Non-Hispanic/Latino, the five federal categories were used,
- Two or more races are selected and Non-Hispanic/Latino, two or more races was used.

(RIEICCS) system data were validated through a raw data download to an Access database. Changes to the collection of race have now been fully implemented. White and Two or more Races increased by more than 10 percent. Race collection policies were also re-distributed to all providers. This factor along with the continued increase in enrollment caused a change from the previous year's count.

South Carolina

South Carolina does not serve at-risk children or those older than age 3.

Tennessee

Tennessee had a significant increase in the Birth to 1 age group for 2011 child count data. The data were drilled down to the TEIS-POE level. Five POE districts experienced a significant increase in this age group. Tennessee believed that this increase was due to improved relationships with medical providers and hospitals. Tennessee reported a significant increase in the race category of Two or more races and a significant decrease in the race categories of Hispanic and Asian. Tennessee believed these significant changes were due to the changes in race categories in 2010. Tennessee did not reclassify children, but elected to use new categories as new children entered the program.

Utah

According To Utah, data were collected and compiled using the Baby Toddler Online Tracking System (BTOTS), Utah's statewide database system. All contracting early intervention providers verify annually that their BTOTS data are complete and accurate and that data are collected using race and ethnicity information per OSEP's revised guidelines.

Significant year-to-year changes were observed in the number and percentage of children served in community-based and other settings from 2010 to 2011. An increase in the percentage of children served in the community setting occurred due to continued technical assistance emphasizing serving children in natural environments. The increase in the number and percentage of children served in the other setting occurred due to the correction of miscoded service settings in two early intervention programs from 2010 to 2011.

Virgin Islands

Virgin Islands does not serve at-risk children or those older than age 3.

Virginia

Virginia does not serve at-risk children or those older than age 3. This data submission included 1,023 infants and toddlers receiving services (FAPE) through the public schools.

Virginia stated that the overall increase in home settings from 2010 to 2011 was due to Virginia's child count continuing to increase annually because of strong child find activities. Virginia continued to provide the vast majority of services in the home. Providing services in the natural environment has been a focus of Virginia's Early Intervention services. This commitment was evidenced by increasing rates paid for services in the natural environment.

Wisconsin

The Wisconsin Birth to 3 Program has been conducting ongoing work with its data systems and data reporting. Over the past year, it added a new field into its Birth to 3 program data reporting system, PPS (Program Participation System), to more accurately record the primary location of a child's Birth to 3 program services. Wisconsin instructed local Birth to 3 Programs to begin using the new field in 2011; however, it was not able to develop a report using the new field in time for the February 2012 settings submission.

According to a report using the new primary location field, Wisconsin is at 96.13% compliance with settings in the natural environment.

2010-11 Exiting

Alabama

Alabama's Part C Program does not use the category Part B eligible, continuing in Part C.

Alabama attributed the overall increase in Part B eligible, exiting Part C to its ongoing collaboration, training, and communication between Part B and Part C at both state and local levels, which may have affected the data in this category.

The overall increase in withdrawal by parent/guardian was due to the increased utilization of developmental screening tools.

American Samoa

American Samoa changed eligibility requirements in this reporting period. During IFSP reviews, more children were found age appropriate or no longer required services. These two factors resulted in a higher exit count for this reporting period.

Arizona

Arizona reported an increase in the number and percentage of children reported as Part B eligible, exiting Part C and a corresponding decrease in the number and percentage of children reported as Part B eligibility not determined.

The reason for this is because the state developed and implemented new exit data analysis tools and also developed procedures for reviewing and tracking the exit data throughout the year. This resulted in significant improvement in the timely and accurate collection of exit data. The 2010 exit report reflects the implementation of this change.

In addition to reporting the number of infants and toddlers exiting Part C from October 2009 through September 2010, Arizona has also made available, upon request, interim counts of infants and toddlers exiting Part C from October 2010 through June 2011.

Arkansas

Arkansas attributed the overall increase in Part B eligible, exiting Part C for 2009-2010 to more intensive training on reporting and the transition process. This increase was also due to the increase in the number of clients exiting from the previous year.

Delaware

Delaware attributed the overall decrease in no longer eligible for Part C prior to reaching age 3 category to fewer children reported exiting in 2010. This decrease was most pronounced under the category no longer eligible for Part C prior to reaching age 3 because Part C experienced an increase in the number of children demonstrating greater needs; these children remained in Part C until the age of 3 with additional children exiting as Part B eligible or awaiting Part B eligibility.

District of Columbia

In FFY 2010, the District experienced an increase in the number of late referrals (children entering the Part C system within 3 months of their third birthday). They believed that this increase accounted for the increase in Part B eligibility not determined and the decrease in Part B eligible, exiting Part C. The Part C Program does its best to confirm each child's eligibility status prior to the child exiting the system; however, in the case of late referrals, this is not always possible.

Florida

Florida attributed the overall increase from 2009 to 2010 in attempts to contact unsuccessful to policy clarification from OSEP on which children should be closed as lost to follow-up due to attempts to contact unsuccessful and improved data integrity.

Florida does not serve children beyond age 3; therefore, no data were reported for Part B eligible continue in Part C.

Guam

Guam does not serve children beyond age 3; therefore, no data were reported for Part B eligible continue in Part C.

Hawaii

Hawaii does not serve children beyond age 3; therefore, no data were reported for Part B eligible continue in Part C.

Iowa

Iowa does not serve children beyond age 3; therefore, no data were reported for Part B eligible continue in Part C.

Kansas

Kansas does not serve children beyond age 3; therefore, no data were reported for Part B eligible continue in Part C.

Louisiana

Louisiana does not serve children beyond age 3; therefore, no data were reported for Part B eligible continue in Part C.

Maine

Maine reported the overall increase in no longer eligible for Part C prior to reaching age 3 was because for the past 2 years, transition from Part C to Part B and Part B eligibility had been chosen as areas of focus of training and intensive on-site monitoring.

The emphasis on these areas was seen as the driving force that led to earlier reviews of children to determine their eligibility status. Children who improved to the point where they were no longer eligible for Part C left the program prior to reaching age 3.

The overall decrease in Part B eligibility, not determined was because for the past 2 years, transition from Part C to Part B and Part B eligibility were chosen as areas of focus of training and intensive on-site monitoring.

The emphasis on these areas was seen as the driving force that led to earlier reviews of children to determine their eligibility status. As a result of the earlier eligibility status, more children had Part B eligibility determined by age 3.

Maine does not serve children beyond age 3; therefore, no data were reported for Part B eligible continue in Part C.

Maryland

The state noted an increase in infants and toddlers who were no longer eligible for Part C prior to reaching age 3. The state was unable to explain this change.

The decrease in the number of children who were Part B eligible, exiting Part C was due to families having the option to receive early intervention services on an IFSP after age 3.

The increase in children who were Part B eligible, continuing in Part C was due to the Maryland Infants & Toddlers Program implementing the Extended IFSP Option on February 1, 2010, which provided early intervention services to children on an IFSP after the age of 3 for Part B eligible children.

Massachusetts

Massachusetts attributed the overall increase in Part B eligible, exiting Part C was because it does not offer services for children under Part C beyond the age of 3.

Massachusetts attributed the increase in the percent of children under Part B eligible as well as the decrease in the percent of children under Part B eligibility not determined to an error in data compilation. Last year's report included all children whose parents opted out of being referred to an LEA under the Part B eligibility not determined category.

The lead agency realized that these children were potentially eligible for Part B and, based on their exiting reason, were under an appropriate exiting category this year.

The decrease in the percent of children under not eligible for Part B, exit with no referrals was due to lead agency guidance to local early intervention programs regarding ensuring that all children were transitioned to appropriate community resources.

The increase in the percentage of children under withdrawal by parent or guardian was due, in part, to the increase in the annual family fee that became effective on September 15, 2010.

Missouri

The overall decrease in attempts to contact unsuccessful was seen across all regions of the state and was attributed to re-training of directors and service coordinators, additional staff, and improved case management.

Nebraska

Nebraska reported that the overall increase in Part B eligible, continuing in Part C was because the requirements are the same for Part C as for Part B, so these children were essentially all eligible for Part B, but chose to remain in Part C.

New Mexico

New Mexico attributed the overall increase in no longer eligible for Part C prior to reaching age 3 to the importance of annual re-determination of eligibility, which can result in more children being determined to be no longer eligible for FIT Program services.

The overall increase in exit to other program with referrals was due to the FIT Program encouraging providers to make referrals to Head Start and other early childhood providers as part of the transition process.

New York

General instructions for Table 3 require that the 6,678 children turning 3 years old prior to the reporting period (July 1, 2010, to June 30, 2011) be excluded from the report. 66 children with unknown race/ethnicity were distributed by apportioning the unknown children within each county in direct proportion to the distribution of children in that county with known race/ethnicity or, for New York City, apportioning the unknown race/ethnicity using the results of a match of New York City Early Intervention eligible with the race/ethnicity reported by their birth mother from birth certificate records. 24 children with unknown gender were distributed by apportioning them in direct proportion to the distribution of children with known gender.

In exiting reports prior to PY 2003-04, children moving out of county were assigned to exit category moved out of state. For the current reporting period, 755 children fell into this category. In an effort to determine their true program status or exit category, these children were matched against both enrolled

children and children closed during the program year. Matching criteria included the child's name, sex, date of birth, Social Security Number, Medicaid ID and mother's maiden name. Based on the results of this match, 334 children were found to be enrolled in the EIP in another county and were removed from the exit report; the remaining 421 children could not be located (unable to be matched) and were under 3 years of age; therefore, the state categorized these children as attempts to contact unsuccessful.

Six children exited the EIP during the year with a NYS exit reason that did not explicitly correspond to a federal exit category and whose status could not be resolved by any of the previous steps. Based on additional guidance from OSEP, these children were assigned to an exit category based on their age at time of program exit. All of these children were under age 3, and were placed in the attempts to contact unsuccessful category.

The increase from PY 2009-10 of 28.6 percent (1,029 children) in the not Part B eligible, exit with no referral category occurred exclusively in New York City. There was a corresponding increase of 908 New York City EI children in the category of Part B eligible, exiting Part C, which was likely due to increased evaluations for Part B eligibility in New York City.

The decrease from PY 2009-10 of 86.1 percent (173 children) identified as two or more races was the result of the recent changes that allowed for multiple races to be selected and an increasing awareness of this option.

North Carolina

In July 2010, the NC Department of Health and Human Services transitioned to a new Health Information System (HIS). With the transition to the new system, the state updated its exit reason categories to match with the OSEP definitions. This change from the old CECAS system likely accounts for the percentage change between exit reasons categories from last year to this year.

Furthermore, North Carolina made the transition to multiple races reporting for the 2008 reporting period. The decrease from PY 2009-10 of 11.0 percent (210 children) identified as Asian was due to the overall decline in EI enrollment of 3.1 percent, the increased utilization of the option to select multiple races, and a comparatively small population compared to the EI population as a whole.

Oregon

Oregon does not serve children beyond age 3; therefore, no data were reported for Part B eligible continue in Part C.

Puerto Rico

Puerto Rico attributed the overall increase in Part B eligible, not determined to the increase in the total number of children served in 2009 and 2010. As part of the notification process, a child's information is referred to DOE, which should facilitate the eligibility determination for Part B. More pre-school coordinators are being allocated at the local districts; these personnel were reoriented about the importance role of the timely Part B registry and eligibility determination.

Rhode Island

RIEICCS allows providers to check multiple races in compliance with the OMB standards. For this report, the following reporting categories were used based on family report.

- Hispanic/Latino of any race;
- Non-Hispanic/Latino, the five federal categories were used,
- Two or more races are selected and Non-Hispanic/Latino, two or more races was used.

Categories that changed by more than 10% (and more than 10 count) were reviewed. The number reported in the two or more races category decreased slightly this year. State staff continued to remind staff that more than one race can be selected.

The number of infants and toddlers reported as Black also decreased, while the number of Hispanic infants and toddlers continued to increase. Hispanic was the only race category that was not affected by the mixed race category.

The state found the changes to be naturally occurring and will continue to monitor.

The discharge categories moved out of state, not eligible for Part B, exit with referrals to other programs, and attempts to contact unsuccessful changed by more the 10%. The state found the change to be naturally occurring and will continue to monitor all categories.

For Part B eligibility categories, the state notifies each LEA of children who may be eligible for Part B twice a year. EI providers also contact LEAs with all children who may be eligible for Part B, even for late referrals. When eligibility for Part B was not determined by their third birthday, each LEA could follow-up with the status of these children. Category 3, Part B eligible, continue in Part C is not an option in Rhode Island.

The data were extracted from the statewide RIEICC system. State staff reviewed and edited data for reporting. These data may change due to future edits, updates and corrections. Please review report print dates when comparing data.

South Carolina

South Carolina attributed the overall increase in no longer eligible for Part C prior to reaching age 3 to overidentification at time of initial eligibility. The Assessment Evaluation and Programming System was used to determine the state's eligibility during this timeframe. The tool overidentified eligible children, who, upon annual re-evaluation, were found to be ineligible.

The overall decrease in Part B eligibility not determined was attributed to the timeframe when the BabyNet State Office began entering exit data for closed records. The state suspected that the use of this code reflected families who chose to not pursue Part B eligibility and would correspond with the number of families who declined a transition conference. Drill-down to root causes is underway, and data system code definitions are under revision.

South Dakota

South Dakota attributed the overall decrease in withdrawals by parent/guardian to the following:

- A more restrictive eligibility criteria means they were seeing children with more severe delays, thus parents wanted their child to continue receiving services until they transitioned from the program.
- Fewer children were served in FFY 2010 than in FFY 2009.
- The downturn in the economy has made families seek out services for their children that may have otherwise been private pay.
- Service coordinators were selecting exit categories more appropriately.

Tennessee

Tennessee had three exiting reasons with a significant decrease. Eligibility for Part B not determined, withdrawal by parent, and attempts to contact unsuccessful. 618 data were drilled down by the nine Tennessee Early Intervention System (TEIS) district offices. As no exiting category had a significant increase, it was believed this change was due to the overall decrease in children exiting, although the overall number of children exiting did not have a significant change.

Tennessee had two race/ethnicity categories with a significant decrease: Hispanic/Latino and Black or African American. 618 data were drilled down by the nine TEIS district offices. As no race/ethnicity category had a significant increase, it was believed this change was due to the overall decrease in children exiting although the overall number of children exiting did not have a significant change.

Texas

Texas attributed the overall increase in number of children who exited the program from 2009-2010 to 2010-11 to changes in eligibility criteria and a slightly higher rate of withdrawal by parent due to better collaboration between the Part C program and the Children's Protective Services (CPS) program about family engagement and participation in Part C services.

Utah

Data were collected and compiled using BTOTS, Utah's statewide data system. Each contracting early intervention provider verified its BTOTS data were complete and accurate. BTOTS data included 73 infants and toddlers exiting during the reporting period who were identified as having two or more races. Utah does not offer the option for parents whose children have been determined eligible for Part B services to have their child remain in Part C services under USC 1432(5)(B)(ii) and 1435(c). Therefore, the exit category Part B eligible, continuing in Part C was reported as not applicable.

Utah does not serve children beyond age 3; therefore, no data were reported for Part B eligible continue in Part C.

Vermont

Vermont does not serve children beyond age 3; therefore, no data were reported for Part B eligible continue in Part C.

Virgin Islands

The reason for the overall increase in Part B eligibility not determined from 2009 to 2010 seemed to be that in the past, the district of St. Croix's Part B program would send a list of children who were eligible for Part B services and their IEP date to the Part C program so that they could document their eligibility. The St. Croix district Part B program no longer provides this information to the Part C program. Therefore, Part C no longer presumes that their clients will be eligible for Part B services. Since they no longer receive any feedback, Part C does not know their eligibility. They are working to resolve this issue.

Virgin Islands does not serve children beyond age 3; therefore, no data were reported for Part B eligible continue in Part C.

Virginia

Virginia does not serve children beyond age 3; therefore, no data were reported for Part B eligible continue in Part C.

West Virginia

According to West Virginia:

- Out of the 54 children who exited with reason not eligible for Part B, exiting without referrals, 40 were listed as parents did not consent to transition planning.
- Out of the 355 children who exited with reason Part B eligibility not determined, 138 were listed as family requested referral not be made and 213 were listed as referral has been made, awaiting Part B determination.
- Out of the children who exited with reason withdrawal by parent or guardian, most were listed as parents declined further IFSP services and others were listed as parents were dissatisfied with IFSP services.

Wyoming

Wyoming does not serve children beyond age 3; therefore, no data were reported for Part B eligible continue in Part C.

2010-11 Dispute Resolution

Arizona

Arizona's Part C Program does not use Part B due process hearing procedures.

California

According to California in FFY 2009, DDS restructured the complaint process to fully comply with current federal regulations and statutes, enabling parents to request a hearing, mediation, or file a complaint at any time. Many parents filed all three processes at the same time, but the issue was resolved informally at the local level; therefore, many mediations were not held. This new process, combined with the state's stricter guidelines for eligibility, requirement to access private insurance for medical services, and prohibition against "non-required" services were major contributors to the marked increase in the number of hearing and mediation cases filed in FFY 2009.

Florida

Florida's Part C Program does not use Part B due process hearing procedures.

Guam

Guam's Part C Program does not use Part B due process hearing procedures.

Hawaii

Hawaii's Part C Program does not use Part B due process hearing procedures.

Idaho

Idaho had one formal complaint and a request for hearing in August 2010, but the complaint and the request were withdrawn by the parent. The reason for the withdrawal was because the timeline for resolution was met.

Illinois

The number of signed complaints filed increased from 11 in 2009-10 to 16 in 2010-11. The reason for this increase could not be identified by reviewing the content of the complaints. The number of signed complaints continued to remain relatively small when compared to the number of families enrolled in the program (approximately 19,000), as seen in complaints within extended timeline in six instances to allow staff time to investigate complaints, including receiving and reviewing additional information from families and documentation from providers. No mediation requests or due process complaints were received in 2010-11, with only one mediation request received in 2009-10.

Iowa

Iowa's Part C Program does not use Part B due process hearing procedures.

Kansas

Kansas's Part C Program does not use Part B due process hearing procedures.

Louisiana

Louisiana's Part C Program does not use Part B Due Process Hearing Procedures.

Maine

Maine reported no cases initiated for children served under Part C during the July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011 reporting period.

Nevada

Nevada reported no mediation or due process hearing requests filed during this reporting period.

North Carolina

North Carolina reported one case in due process hearing pending due to being held in fiscal year 2011–2012. Actual date July 19, 2011.

Pennsylvania

Pennsylvania's Part C Program does not use Part B due process hearing procedures.

Rhode Island

Rhode Island's Part C Program does not use Part B due process hearing procedures.

Texas

Texas Part C used the state fiscal year as the reporting period: September 1, 2010 through August 31, 2011.

Vermont

Vermont does not make decisions using the timeframes of Part C but follows Part B's 45-day timeline procedures.

Washington

Washington's Part C Program does not use Part B due process hearing procedures.

Wisconsin

According to Wisconsin, the due process complaint was not completed within the timeline according to Part C procedures because extensions were requested due to mediation.