PART C EXITING DATA NOTES

2013-14 Reporting Year

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

Arkansas

Area 1. No Longer eligible for Part C prior to reaching age three: There is an increase of 47 in this area due to better training that was implemented during this timeframe. There was training around Child Outcomes that has helped programs properly working with children in meeting their goals.

Area 4. Not eligible for Part B exit with referrals to other programs: There is an increase of 81 in this area due to better training that was implemented during this timeframe. There was training around Child Outcomes that has helped programs properly working with children in meeting their goals. That means that these children did not show eligibility or the need to continue services into Part B.

Area 6. Part B eligibility not determined: There was an increase of 39 children who could not determine eligibility due to the fact that some children just leave the program without an exit conference, therefore unable to tell the possible eligibility.

Area 9. Withdrawal by parent: There was a decrease in the number of clients who withdrew from our program at parent’s requests. This is due to the fact that more parents are becoming aware of the services that we provide and their need for our services. Parents are seeing the need to continue their children in our program.

Area 10: Attempts to contact unsuccessful: There is an increase in the number of families who we could not contact. This is due to the fact that families in some area of the state move or change their phone numbers frequently and do not provide updated phone numbers as a result.

District of Columbia

For Year 2013-14:

The two areas requiring clarification are:

1. No longer eligible for Part C prior to reaching age three; and

2. Not eligible for Part B, exiting with no referrals.
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On July 1, 2013, the District of Columbia changed its eligibility criteria from 50% delay in 1 or more areas, to 50% delay in 1 or more areas or 25% delay in two or more areas. This additional eligibility criterion has resulted in an increase in the number of children who exit Part C functioning closer to that of their typically developing peers. This increase is reflected in both of the exiting categories referenced above.

Florida

Statewide, Florida’s Part C program showed a 21.52% increase in children exiting Part C with a disposition reason of “Not elig for Part B exit w/referrals”. There appears to be at least 2 causes for this increase: 1) Several Local Early Steps programs held trainings with their Service Coordinators on the definitions and appropriate assignment of the disposition reason, resulting in an increase in the appropriate use of this disposition category and 2) Several Local Early Steps programs have built stronger relationships with community resources, such as HeadStart, local Early Learning Coalitions, and parenting resource programs, increasing the number of referrals for children not eligible for Part B.

Georgia

This decrease was due to an improvement in the process of determining eligibility and more timely referrals into the Part B program.

Indiana

This data note is being submitted in response to OSEP’s analysis comparing the 2012-13 to the 2013-14 data for which differences of greater than 20% were found. The data that were submitted are accurate and of high quality, so no new data will be submitted or changed in response to this inquiry. Indiana attributes the year to year changes as follows:

1. No longer eligible for Part C prior to reaching age three: Indiana has placed significant emphasis on aligning early intervention services to meet child outcomes. This continued effort over the past several years has resulted in an increased number of children achieving outcomes and no longer needing early intervention services, at an earlier age. Therefore, Indiana is seeing an increased number of children no longer eligible for Part C prior to reaching age three. As the state continues to align child outcomes and services, this is a number that is expected to rise.

2. Part B eligible exiting Part C: The state continues to strive to improve outcomes and align services for children; therefore, as children continue to make gains in their development, we are seeing a decrease in the number of children being determined eligible for Part B services. However, because Part B eligibility is determined by the local school system, Service Coordinators are requested to report any concerns to the state office. In addition, the Part C is collaborating with Part B on transition projects, including a collaborative evaluation project to enhance transition to Part B.
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4. Not eligible for Part B exit with referrals to other programs: As the State continues to strive to improve outcomes and align services for children there has been an increase of children that are not eligible for Part B services, with referrals to other programs. The First Steps program and Service Coordinators will continue to review these exits and referrals for any potential concerns.

5. Not eligible for Part B exit with no referrals: Indiana has placed significant emphasis on aligning early intervention services to meet child outcomes. This continued effort over the past several years has resulted in an increased number of children achieving outcomes and no longer needing early intervention or Part B services. As the state continues to align child outcomes and services, this is a number that is expected to rise.

6. Part B eligibility not determined: Throughout the year, there are extenuating circumstances when a child’s eligibility is not determined before the age of three. Both part B and Part C work diligently to review the circumstances those events. Such events may involve family requests, late referrals, as well as system delays. At this time, the Part C program has not identified any systemic concerns or trends on the side of the First Steps system. However, the program will continue to work with the Part B system. In addition the program will continue to monitor all transition timelines.

7. Deceased: The number of children who pass away while enrolled in the First Steps program is very small; therefore a slight change in the number of children who pass away will have a large impact on the overall percentage.

9. Withdrawal by parent (or guardian): According to State and Federal regulation, families have the right to withdraw their child from the program at any time. The program provides the family with their rights to return to the program; this is monitored and families are encouraged to re-referral any time a concern is present. At this time, the state has not identified systemic trends or concerns with this number at this time.

10. Attempts to contact unsuccessful: Indiana has an aggressive contact policy and every attempt is made to locate families but there are times contact is unsuccessful. At this time, the state is confident of the process and there are no systemic issues or concerns with this increase.

Kansas

2013-14 Part C Exiting: The 20.39% reduction in the count of children found in the “No longer eligible for Part C prior to reaching age three” category, between years 2 and 3 of the report, is the result of Kansas Part C staff clarifications to local programs on the use of exit reasons during the 2013-14 reporting period. The increased counts for the “Withdrawal by parent (or guardian)” and “Part B eligibility not determined” categories are also the result of these clarifications.
**Kentucky**

Exiting data for 2012-13 and 2013-14 revealed significant differences in the following categories: No longer eligible for Part C prior to age three; Part B eligible; Not eligible for Part B exit with referrals; Not eligible for Part B exit no referrals; Part B eligibility not determined; and Withdrawal by parent. The 2013-14 data was entered by locals using a specific data guide of definitions to ensure accuracy and consistency in the data. The 2012-13 data was entered without this guide and reflects misinterpretation of the reason for exit by individual service coordinators. The data guide has been incorporated into the Policy and Procedures Manual. Additionally, all Point of Entry contracts now have specific performance goals for accuracy in data entry.

**Louisiana**

In Year 2 (2012-13) Louisiana changed its eligibility criteria to a more restrictive eligibility. The year to year changes for most of the exit categories (both for increases and decreases in numbers) is a result of this change.

Line 1—more children exited in Year 2 who were no longer eligible due to the more restrictive criteria.

Line 2—even though the children were no longer eligible for Part C, they may have been eligible for Part B, so there was an increase across years due to the criteria change as more children exited.

Line 4—due to the increased number of exits, more children were referred to other programs at exit

Line 5—due to increased number of exits, more children exited and had no referrals

Line 6—due to the criteria change, some children exited without going through eligibility determination for Part B.

Line 8—no explanation for an increased number of children moving out of state can be determined. The Part C system is not aware of any situation which caused such a variation from Year 2 to 3

Line 9 and 10—as families became aware of the criteria change, they withdrew their children from the program or chose not to return calls/letters as their children may not have been found to be eligible.

**Maryland**

Increase in the number (49) Part B Eligible exiting Part C

Nine jurisdictions are responsible for the slight increase. The slight increase with no significant impact to any one local jurisdiction may be due to more children exiting Part C. This group represented 14.3% of all kids exiting in 2011-2012 and only increased to 14.7% of all kids exiting in 2012-2013.

Increase in the Number (149) Part B eligible continuing in Part C.
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Eighteen jurisdictions are responsible for the increase. Slightly more families in Maryland are choosing to stay on an Extended IFSP rather than receiving services through a Preschool Special Education on an IEP: 30.5% of all children exiting the Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program (MITP) in 2011-2012 and 31.9% of all children exiting from the MITP in 2012-2013.

Decrease in the number (59) Part B eligibility not determined

Eight jurisdictions are responsible for the decrease. More families are participating in the Part B eligibility determination process so they can find out if their child can stay on an IFSP after age 3.

Increase in the Number (76) Withdrawal by Parent (or guardian)

Eleven jurisdictions are responsible for the increase. Two of Maryland’s largest jurisdictions accounted for almost 3/4 of this increase. These jurisdictions have highly transient populations.

Decrease in the Number (112) Attempts to contact unsuccessful

Eleven jurisdictions are responsible for the decrease. The MSDE, Division Special Education/Early Intervention Services shared local parent withdrawal data and targeted local strategies at a Professional Learning Institute for local directors. This included implementing a follow-up monitoring protocol. Staff put into effect contact via telephone, US mail, email, and text messaging.

Mississippi

Mississippi First Steps Early Intervention Program increased training on what is age expectation, and Mississippi families who have children with a disability are becoming more stable in their communities.

Missouri

This data note references reporting year 2013-14. Data were resubmitted 6/3/2015.

Flags and explanations for large year to year changes include the following:

2. Part B eligible, exit Part C: There were more children with an IFSP in this year, and the state conducted several trainings in this year on transition requirements for eligibility and IEP to be completed by age three

8. Moved out of state: unknown

9. Withdrawn: There were more mandated referrals in this year and families did not want to participate in the Part C program

Total: There were more children with an IFSP in this reporting year.
Nebraska

Nebraska’s data system collects data on children birth to age 21.

In 2013-2014 an increase in validity checks of LEA data provided more accurate reporting of 1) Children no longer eligible for Part C prior to reaching age three.

In 2013-2014 the method of extracting exit data was enhanced to more accurately determine 2) Part B eligible exiting Part C.

In previous years when a child was continuing Part C services, all children birth through age 2 were counted in the category 3) Part B eligible continuing in Part C. In 2013-2014, only students age 3 were counted in this category when appropriate.

New Mexico

Increases of more than 20 children or more than 20% in the various exiting categories are the result of the New Mexico Family Infant Toddler (FIT) Program (IDEA Part C Program in NM) three year old choice law being revoked in New Mexico, and the requirement that all three year old children in the FIT Program must transition to IDEA Part B services if eligible, or otherwise exit FIT Program services at age three. This has resulted in an increase in various exiting categories on the report.

Ohio

Several of our exiting categories are above the 20/20 threshold, which can be primarily explained by a 20% overall reduction in exits (due to serving fewer children overall in that time period). There was a 40% or more decrease in exits with the reasons, “Attempts to contact unsuccessful” and “Withdrawn by parent (guardian) before age 3.” These decreases are likely attributable to keeping a higher percentage of children until age 3 and also to a higher percentage of children exiting due to no longer being eligible for Early Intervention.

Oklahoma

SoonerStart did not receive verification of Part B eligibility determination from the LEA or parents before the children were closed in the Part C database with this status code. Fewer children were eligible for Part B services and were referred to other programs because early intervention services provided by Part C were successful in mitigating developmental delays for toddlers at age 3.

Oregon

2013-14 Not Eligible for Part B Exit with No Referrals - The majority of the increase in this category were attributable to four of the nine EI contracted areas. As compared to 2012-13 data, in 2013-14 Oregon experienced a 2.58% increase in EI enrollments, which would have an overall positive effect on the
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increase in code 13. Also, staff in these areas received training on how to better identify the correct exit codes which could be responsible for some of the increase.

Puerto Rico

1. In year 3, a smaller number of children (21) exited Part C since they achieved results in IFSP.

2. The eligibility to Part B of 542 children was determined before exiting Part C. Part C cannot provide the reasons for the difference of 288 children since Part B does not provide data on children determined as eligible for Part B. For reasons mentioned before, the percent change was 34.7 compared to year 2.

4. When a child is determined not eligible for Part B, the service coordinator provides information of community resources for the child in order for that child to continue receiving services until he/she reaches age five. Part C is required to provide this information but the ultimate decision relies on the family. If the family asks for a referral, then it will be provided. One more child compared to year 2 was determined not eligible to Part B before exiting Part C and the family asked for a referral.

5. If the family is satisfied with Part B’s decision no referrals are provided. One less family was satisfied with Part B’s decision, so one less referral was provided in that period.

6. The eligibility to Part B of 343 less children compared to year 2 was not determined before exiting Part C and families are not required to inform the service coordinator that determination.

8. In P.R. some families have opted to reinvent themselves and start family businesses before deciding to move out.

9. During year 3, the Early Intervention Program underwent changes in service coordination and provision of services personnel because two (2) of the corporations resigned their contracts. Although continuity of services was not affected, some of the families decided to withdraw from the Program.

10. Strategies were carried out in order to lower the quantity of children that exit the Program because of unsuccessful attempts to contact the family. Some of these strategies include capacity building, visiting the children’s homes, contacting the provider, having more than one contact phone number, and sending letters through regular mail.

Tennessee

To analyze the Part C Exiting information, the lead agency performed comparisons of the data for the last two years (FY 2012-13, FY 2013-14) by Early Intervention Service (EIS) programs which are the nine Tennessee Early Intervention System (TEIS) Point of Entry (POE) offices across all exit reasons. It was found that there were two exiting reasons above the 20/20 threshold: “618 – Moved out of State” and “618 – Parent Withdraw.”
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The increase in “618-Moved Out of State” was largely attributable to one particular TEIS-POE. In reviewing the data, there was no apparent cause for concern that the exit reason was applied erroneously. The POE with the largest increase in this exit reason includes a military base, which is likely a contributing factor for the increase in this exit reason.

The increase in “618-Parent Withdraw” was largely attributable to three TEIS-POEs, who experienced an increase in the number of children served when comparing 2012-13 to 2013-14 data. It was determined that the increase in the use of this exit reason was appropriate given the 5% statewide increase in 618 child count for the last two years.

Washington

No longer eligible for Part C prior to reaching age 3: New provider reorganization in one of the larger counties within Washington State occurred during this period. This one county represented 30 of the total 84 change from year to year. Larger programs generally review eligibility more often than smaller ones.

Part B eligibility not determined: The decrease appears to be due to better communication between Part C providers and Part B School Districts due to increased usage of electronic transition notification system.

Withdrawal by parent (or guardian): This data point has shown gradual increase from year to year. In geographic areas where large military populations reside, withdrawals increased greater than those areas with little or no military presence.

We’ve detected that additional training should be provided about the usage of “Withdrawal “and the usage of “No longer eligible for Part C” categories, based on our Data Management System Help Desk Inquiries. Both data points showed significant increases.

Washington

Between SY 12-13 and SY 13-14, WV had an increase of 47 exiters that were reported in the category “moved out of state” and an increase of 80 exiters that were reported in the category “withdrawal by parent or guardian.” West Virginia’s Part C Program has been seeing a steady increase in our child count numbers. As we have more children entering the program, it makes sense that we will have an increase in exiters. Also, there has been an increase in the number of people moving from WV, particularly in the
northern part of the state, in search of jobs. The latter reason could possibly be attributing to more children exiting West Virginia Part C with the exit reason “moved out of state.”