



# 2021 CIFR Part B Fiscal Webinar Series

Maintenance of Effort (MOE) Reduction  
and Coordinated Early Intervening  
Services (CEIS) Data Collection and  
Reporting

April 2, 2021



# Agenda

- **Overview of Data Collection Requirements**
- **Data Collection Process**
- **Common Data Quality Concerns**
- **State Discussion**
- **Technical Assistance Resources**

# Plan Your Work with CIFR's Customizable Fiscal Timeline Tool

**Download the IDEA Fiscal Timeline!**

<https://cifr.wested.org/customizable-idea-fiscal-timeline-helps-sea-staff-plan-work-and-meet-deadlines/>

- **April/May/June**

- Allocation of Subgrants
- Charter School LEAs
- Excess Cost
- IDEA State Grants
- LEA MOE
- Proportionate Share
- IDEA High-Cost Fund

# Presenters



**Danielle Crain**



**Steve Smith**

# Overview of Data Collection Requirements

# Why Does OSEP Collect the Data?

Authorized by Section 618 of IDEA 2004, the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) uses the data submitted via *EMAPS*:

- Monitoring purposes
- Preparing the Annual Report to Congress
- Public reporting of IDEA Section 618 data
- Responding to ad hoc requests

# Overview of Data Collection Requirements (cont.1)

- Reporting local educational agency/educational service agency (LEA/ESA) allocations under Sections 611 and 619
- Reporting Maintenance of Effort (MOE) data
  - LEA determinations and the year of the data used to make the determinations
  - Amount LEA reduced MOE under 34 CFR 300.205
  - LEA MOE compliance and repayment



# Overview of Data Collection Requirements (cont. 2)

- Reporting Provision of Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS) data
  - LEA reserved CEIS funds (required or voluntary)
  - Reason for required use of CEIS funds
  - Amount of CEIS funds reserved
- Reporting number of children receiving CEIS
  - Number of children served with CEIS funds
  - Number of children who were later identified as students with disabilities



# Which LEA/ESAs are Reported?

For the purposes of the IDEA Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS data collection, states should only report data from LEAs/ESAs that:

1. Meet the definition of LEA in 34 CFR §300.28;
2. Submitted a plan that provides assurances to the SEA that the LEA/ESA meets each of the conditions in §§300.201 through 300.213; and
3. Received an IDEA section 611 and/or IDEA section 619 subgrant under §300.705 and/or §300.816 directly from the SEA for the reporting year.

# Stop and Discuss: How Does Your State Define LEA?

How is it different from the definition in the User Guide?

What challenges do you encounter determining which LEAs to report?



This Photo [http://2016.igem.org/Team:Kyoto/Integrated\\_Practices](http://2016.igem.org/Team:Kyoto/Integrated_Practices) by Unknown author is licensed under CC BY <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>

# Reporting Allocation Data

## LEA/ESA Allocations

- Total LEA/ESA Allocations for Section 611 FFY 2018 (A2A)
- Total LEA/ESA Allocations for Section 611 FFY 2019 Reference Year (A2B)
- Total LEA/ESA Allocations for Section 619 FFY 2019 Reference Year (A3B)

*Reference Year is the federal fiscal year (FFY) about which this submission of the MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey reports the appropriate data elements. FFY 2019 refers to the 2019–2020 school year (SY).*

# Stop and Discuss: Collecting Allocation Data

Who in your state is responsible for maintaining allocation information from year to year?

Who is responsible for calculating this allocation?

What is the process in your state when there is a change in the allocation received from the U.S. Education Department during a fiscal year?



This Photo [http://2016.igem.org/Team:Kyoto/Integrated\\_Practices](http://2016.igem.org/Team:Kyoto/Integrated_Practices) by Unknown author is licensed under CC BY <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>

# Reporting LEA MOE Data: MOE Reduction

- What year's data did the state use to make LEA/ESA determinations (B2Year)
  - If the reference year is FFY 2019 (2019-2020 school year), then the determination needed is the last one made for the LEA/ESA prior to this school year.
- What was the determination for each LEA/ESA (B2)

# Reporting LEA MOE Data: MOE Reduction (cont.)

- The amount of MOE Reduction each LEA/ESA used pursuant to Section 613(a)(2)(C) during [reference school year] (B3)
  - LEA/ESA has increase in IDEA 611 funds
  - Meets Requirements Determination
  - Not identified as having significant disproportionality

# Reporting LEA MOE Data: LEA MOE Compliance

- Did the state determine whether the LEA/ESA met MOE Compliance for [reference year] (B5)
- Did the LEA/ESA meet the compliance standard for [reference year] (B6)
- By the date of this data submission, did the state return non-federal funds to the Department based on the failure of the LEA/ESA to meet MOE Compliance (B7)
- What amount of non-federal funds did the state return to the Department (B8)



# Stop and Discuss: MOE Reduction

When does your state make and announce its annual determinations for each LEA/ESA?

Who in your state agency works with MOE Compliance each year? How does this person get information about whether an LEA/ESA is eligible to take advantage of this reduction? How is this information relayed to the Part B Data Manager for inclusion on this report?



This Photo [http://2016.igem.org/Team:Kyoto/Integrated\\_Practices](http://2016.igem.org/Team:Kyoto/Integrated_Practices) by Unknown author is licensed under CC BY <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>

# Stop and Discuss: LEA MOE Compliance

Does your state determine LEA MOE compliance prior to the May submission date?

Do you understand the reporting logic for the LEA MOE compliance data elements?

Do you typically return funds prior to or after the May submission date?



This Photo [http://2016.igem.org/Team:Kyoto/Integrated\\_Practices](http://2016.igem.org/Team:Kyoto/Integrated_Practices) by Unknown author is licensed under CC BY <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>

# Reporting CEIS Data: Provision of CEIS

- Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality in [reference year] (C2A)
- Was the LEA/ESA identified as having significant disproportionality due to:
  - identification as a child with a disability (C2A.1)
  - identification by disability category (C2A.2)
  - placement in a particular educational setting (C2A.3)
  - disciplinary action (C2A.4)

# Reporting CEIS Data: Provision of CEIS (cont.)

- Amount reserved for required CEIS in the LEA/ESA during [reference year] (C2B)
- Did the LEA/ESA voluntarily use up to 15% of IDEA 611 and 619 funds for CEIS in [reference year] (C3A)
- Amount reserved by the LEA/ESA for voluntary CEIS in the [reference year] (C3B)

# Reporting Children Receiving CEIS Data

- Total number of children receiving CEIS under the IDEA in the LEA/ESA during the [reference year] (D2)
- Total number of children who received CEIS under the IDEA anytime in the past two school years and received special education and related services in the [reference year] (D3)
- Only students receiving CEIS, defined under 34 C.F.R. §300.226(a), with funds that the LEA/ESA voluntarily reserved under 34 C.F.R. §300.226, are to be reported under D2 and D3 in this year's data submission

# Stop and Discuss: Provision of CEIS

Who in your state reviews the data necessary each year to make decisions on whether significant disproportionality exists in individual LEA/ESAs in any of the broad categories listed? How does that information get relayed to the staff working on the MOE reduction portion of this report?

Who is responsible for calculating 15% of the IDEA 611 and 619 funds in your state?

How does an LEA/ESA report data on students who received CEIS a year ago, two years ago, and who may be receiving special education and related services during the reference year? Do they track or follow students who transfer to another district in the state? To another district elsewhere?



This Photo [http://2016.igem.org/Team:Kyoto/Integrated\\_Practices](http://2016.igem.org/Team:Kyoto/Integrated_Practices) by Unknown author is licensed under CC BY <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>

# Data Collection Process



# Who Collects and Processes the Data?

## Fiscal Office

- LEA allocations
  - Section 611
  - Section 619
- CEIS funds reserved
- LEA MOE reductions and compliance

## Program Office

- LEA disproportionate identifications
- LEA determinations

## Data Office

- Students served with CEIS funds
- Students identified as students with disabilities who received CEIS in past two years

# Considerations for Collecting 2019-20 Data

- Create a timeline for contacting state offices
- Review FY19 IDEA 611 and 619 Allocations
- Review voluntary CEIS fiscal data to ensure LEAs implemented CEIS
- Review voluntary CEIS to ensure student data is available
- Are there other considerations you have encountered in the state?

# Common Data Quality Concerns

# Allocation Data Quality Concerns

***Total LEA/ESA allocations for Section 611 and/or 619 FFY contain a zero, 'NA,' or 'M.'***

## **Considerations:**

- Why did the LEA/ESA not receive an allocation?
- Did the LEA/ESA become a newly established charter school?
- Did the LEA/ESA serve children ages 3 to 5 with disabilities?

# LEA MOE Data Quality Concerns

*Percent available reduction taken by the LEA/ESA (B4) is greater than 100%.*

## Considerations:

- Did the LEA/ESA receive an increase in IDEA 611 allocations?
- Did the LEA reduce MOE by the reported amount?
- Did the LEA actually take an MOE exception for the reported amount?

# LEA MOE Compliance Data Quality Concerns

***LEA/ESA did not meet the MOE compliance standard (B6) and by the date of this data submission the state did not return the funds (B7)***

## **Considerations:**

- Does the state have a process in place to return funds?
- What is the timeline to return funds?
- Does the state have a process in place to resubmit the data after the funds are returned?

# CEIS Data Quality Concerns

***Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality in SY XXXX-YY (C2A) was 'Yes' and 15% of the total LEA/ESA allocation for Sections 611 and 619 for FFY XX (A5) does not equal amount reserved for required CEIS in the LEA/ESA (C2B).***

## **Considerations:**

- Did the LEA/ESA receive a notice of significant disproportionality?
- Which grant year did the LEA/ESA reserve the funds for CCEIS?



# CEIS Data Quality Concerns (cont.)

***Did the LEA/ESA voluntarily use up to 15% of IDEA 611 or 619 funds for CEIS (C3A) was 'Yes' and Total number of children receiving CEIS under the IDEA in the LEA/ESA (D2) was zero, 'M,' or 'NA.'***

## **Considerations:**

- Did the LEA/ESA spend the amount reserved for voluntary CEIS?
- Did the LEA/ESA spend the amount reserved for professional development in the reference year?

# Stop and Discuss: Data Quality

- What is your process for reviewing data quality concerns?
- What data warnings do you frequently encounter and how do you address them?
- Are there other areas of data quality concerns?



This Photo [http://2016.igem.org/Team:Kyoto/Integrated\\_Practices](http://2016.igem.org/Team:Kyoto/Integrated_Practices) by Unknown author is licensed under CC BY <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>

# Technical Assistance Resources

# Technical Assistance Resources (cont.)

U.S. Department of Education – *EMAPS User Guide: IDEA Part B Maintenance of Effort (MOE) Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS)*

<https://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/edfacts/emaps-idea-part-b-moe-reduction-ceis-user-guide.pdf>

IDC and CIFR – *618 Data Pre-submission Edit Check Tool – Part B MOE and CEIS*

<https://ideadata.org/resources/resource/162/618-data-pre-submission-edit-check-tool-part-b-moe-and-ceis>

CIFR – *Writing Exemplary Data Notes for Local Educational Agency Maintenance of Effort Reduction Data and Coordinated Early Intervening Services Data*

[https://cifr.wested.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/CIFR-Program-Model\\_Notes.pdf](https://cifr.wested.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/CIFR-Program-Model_Notes.pdf)

IDC and CIFR – CEIS Fiscal and Student Tracker

<https://ideadata.org/resources/resource/1689/using-the-coordinated-early-intervening-services-ceis-fiscal-and-student>

# 2021 Webinar Dates

Each webinar in this series will be held from 2 - 3 pm ET:

- July 1: TBD
- October 1: TBD

Registration will be required to get the link for each webinar.

# Potential July Topics

- IDEA fiscal data processes: Have you documented your processes?
- Preliminary and final LEA allocations
- GEPA reporting
- IDEA grant closeout process
- LEA MOE compliance test data collection
- Proportionate share
- IDEA high-cost fund
- Excess cost
- Risk management activities

# Contact Us



Web: <https://cifr.WestEd.org/>

Email: [cifr\\_info@WestEd.org](mailto:cifr_info@WestEd.org)

Twitter: [https://twitter.com/CIFR\\_IDEA](https://twitter.com/CIFR_IDEA)

The Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR) is a partnership among WestEd, AEM Corporation, American Institutes for Research (AIR), Emerald Consulting, the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the Center for Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) at Utah State University, and Westat. The Improve Group is CIFR's external evaluator.

The contents of this website were developed under a grant from the U.S. Department of Education, #H373F200001. However, those contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government. Project Officers: Jennifer Finch and Charles Kniseley.